

How to Live Successfully: NEW KNOWLEDGE IN HUMAN RELATIONS THAT WILL BENEFIT YOU

**by Marvin C. Katz, Ph.D.
(2017)**

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1. How to achieve the most value	3
2. How self-interest differs from selfishness	6
3. What are the value dimensions?	9
4. What is Ethics?	14
5. What are Ethical Fallacies?	22
6. When are we being moral?	25
7. How Ethics can cope with dilemmas	30
8. What is Social Ethics?	32
9. Schools of thought in Ethics	35
10. On character development	41
11. Ends and Means	45
12. Stranded on an island	48
13. What is a Quality Life?	52
14. How to pursue justice	56
15. How to live successfully	59
16. Basic principles of Ethics	62
17. A golden principle	66
18. Humility, Efficiency, Effectiveness	69
19. Right, wrong, and happiness	74
20. Impulse-control and Moral health	76
21. Measurement in Ethics	79
22. On achieving emotional peace	83
23. How Ethics spreads over the world	86
24. Signs of Hope	90
Afterword	93
Appendix	94
End Notes	105
Bibliography	108

My work involves applying the principles of science to the problems of humanity"
---R. Buckminster Fuller

Chapter One

HOW TO ACHIEVE THE MOST VALUE

There is a new science developing, and although it is in its early stages it is already growing rapidly. Its name is "Ethics." It deals with moral health. Medical Science is concerned with your physical health. This new science is concerned with your success and happiness. It is derived from Value Science founded by Dr. Robert S. Hartman. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_S._Hartman

I can report that research centers working in this field are emerging in Chicago, Salt Lake City, Buffalo, Knoxville, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Raleigh, Pittsburgh, Cambridge, Mass., Paisley, UK, Bucharest, Romania, and Upsala, Sweden.

The Value Scientists told me that they are not in the practice of instructing others how to live. They do employ a value calculus which demonstrates that those who compose value optimize their moral health. What does it mean to "compose value"?

To compose value is to enhance it, to upgrade the value, or in one way or another to be constructive. Thus to compose human value is, for example, to boost up someone, to be a realistic optimist, to compliment a person sincerely, to do acts of kindness, and so forth.

In contrast, those who transpose value develop moral disease. To transpose value is to misuse it, to confuse it, to destroy it, to

downgrade it in some way. To transpose a human value is to cause pain, to manipulate a person, or to show disrespect.

Even worse is to be indifferent to a human being. That is zero value. It is also known as apathy or moral insensitivity.

Someone who displays indifference has a moral blind spot. It often leads to the transposing of values. Further on we will show how transposing values results in a couple of moral fallacies with which everyone should be familiar.

To ecompose value is (when abbreviated) to comp. It means to upgrade value. You gain more value in life when you comp. Much as a music composer creates an original melody you can be a value-composer; you will create new ways to be of service, and to be kind or considerate.

To transpose value is (when abbreviated) to tran. To tran is to confuse, to mix up, to spoil, to goof, to ruin, or to show disrespect. This is seen, in practice, when we name-call, “dis,” or put someone down. To tran is to get **less value** as a result. Since it is in our self-interest to get the most value out of life it is wiser to comp than to tran.

Ethicists are aware that real human suffering exists; as does murderous rage, suicidal despair, cruelty, lust, greed, mass poverty, and illiteracy. Yet this book will emphasize the positive and the constructive efforts that could result in improvements in the human condition. It is designed to help good, ethical people become stronger, be more morally healthy than they already are. It is not in any way a cult of success. This new slant on Ethics is tied to a program of empirical and replicable scientific activity. This book is not a counsel of perfection. It affirms individuality and autonomy, concluding that those are very high values indeed.

People living in an ethical world will still experience negative feelings – such as aggravation, envy, and grief.

Scientists of Ethics have found that in order for a society to maximize value, its members need to have a sense of social responsibility and a sense of inclusivity. Responsibility means ability to respond. *Inclusivity* means a tolerance for strangers, a capacity to accept diversity without the loss of a sense of unity. It means being willing to include more persons into one's social circle.

Inclusivity is an ethical principle which suggests to us all: Be as inclusive as you can. Most people, it seems, are able to accept a number of strangers within the boundaries that they think of as their own nation. However, there is no logic to stop them from extending the edge of that circle they identify with as 'their own.' Logically the circle could even embrace the entire planet Earth. We shall have more to say about this when we turn to the topic of education.

There is a common confusion, namely that between being self-interested and being selfish. Straightening out that confusion will add some clarity. First we state the underlying assumptions; then we differentiate these two concepts which are so often – but mistakenly – used interchangeably.

Chapter Two

HOW SELF-INTEREST DIFFERS FROM SELFISHNESS

THE BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The scientists present some relevant basics; then **explain why they are reasonable** premises to accept.

Assumption (1): We all operate out of self-interest.

Even when we are most altruistic, charitable, or self-sacrificing there is something in it for us. Self-interest is **not** to be confused with selfishness which is a disregard for others along with a lack of respect for them.

If you perform an act of loving kindness it appears on the surface to be selfless. I hold that there is something in it for you, namely a warm feeling that you have done some good, and you are gratified that in some small way you have made the world a better place. So it was in your self-interest to do it.

The person who sees his true self-interest knows these things. For we are all, in this world, just trying to make, at least, a living; at best a life rich in quality. Referring to those who **do** know what is in their interest, Princeton ethics researcher Anthony Appiah put it this way: “We want to make a life for ourselves. We recognize that everybody has a life to make and that we are making our lives together. We recognize value in our own humanity and in doing so we see it as the same humanity we find in others. If my humanity matters, so does yours; if yours doesn’t, neither does mine.” Here is another observation about interests from a Harvard University Moral Psychologist:

“I can’t act as if my interests are special just because I’m me and you’re not, any more than I can persuade you that the spot I am standing on is a special place in the universe just because I happen to be standing on it.” ---Stephen Pinker

There is nothing wrong with **self-interest** provided it is enlightened. In contrast, a **selfish** person thinks "me first." I must "get mine." He or she shows no respect for others, and thus fails to be ethical.

There are some who are not capable of discerning their best interest. Moral Psychologists have found in their research that *psychopaths*, for example, have no, or have rather limited, ability to experience guilt or shame or to feel empathy. They often can't help being selfish. Neurologists have, as of this date, yet to explain the particular type of brain damage from which psychopaths suffer, but they are getting closer.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELF-INTEREST AND SELFISHNESS

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 one is not entitled (theft); or depriving someone of something to which he/she *is* entitled. Selfishness indicates a lack of respect, a failure to value other persons in a way that would be to one's maximum advantage. Optimum moral health is obtained when one Intrinsicly-values other persons. What this means will soon be explained in detail.

Assumption (2): 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 show disrespect to 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. A selfish person asks only: *What's in it for me?* A moral self-interested person asks: ***What's in it for us?***

A case can be made that *selfishness is the root cause of all unjust action through the ages. Every crime and injustice has stemmed from selfishness to some extent (except maybe in cases of utter madness.)* We are social creatures and being selfish is an impediment to living in society. Hence it is important **not to confuse self-interest with selfishness!**

Ethics can teach us to put ourselves in perspective and thereby to live a better life. This assumes that there will be new and better technologies of education. The thesis of this book is that the unselfish people will eventually prevail as people get wise and communication improves. Selfishness will diminish for many reasons as people come to see what is in their true self-interest.

The new knowledge in human relations is concerned with moral value, but isn't *value* an intangible? Can it be measured? What is value? Does it have dimensions? If it does, do they form a spectrum like the colors in a rainbow? Are some values worth more than others? Let's investigate this now.

Chapter Three

WHAT ARE THE VALUE DIMENSIONS?

Assumption (3): It is in our self-interest to get the most value out of life.

The term **value** was just mentioned. What is known about it today is thanks to Dr. Robert S. Hartman. (He is the founder of the Science of Value, of which scientific Ethics is a subdivision, a subset.) One of the scientific results reveals that **value depends upon meaning**: The more value, the more meaning. If something is more meaningful to us, it is more valuable to us. A valuable life is a meaningful life.

Isn't it true that to the degree a map accurately corresponds to its territory one may speak of that map as "a valuable map." And that's what is meant by "value": it measures the degree that something actually is what it is supposed to be. Something has value to the extent its properties match the image you have for things-of-that-sort. When your image indeed corresponds to the features of the thing or event you are judging, you say of it that it has "value," or you say "this is a value!"

This concept will later on be quite important when we define 'morality' - for morality is *moral value*. {Since formal Value Theory logically precedes Ethics, as science, for a clear understanding it is appropriate to discuss value-in-general before getting to specific Ethical concerns.} Ethicists today are aware that value is a matter of degree, and the better we know the relevant facts, the better our value judgments will be. Goodness is defined here as 'full value.' An analogy here serves to illustrate the point:

A good hammer has *everything* a hammer is supposed to have in one's picture of a hammer. A good person likewise has a full set of features and characteristics that a person would ideally have. To call something "good" is to say it "is all there" – it has everything one pictured. {The Appendix will treat these topics in more depth and will include some technicalities that are of interest to the philosopher.}

VALUE DIMENSIONS FORM A SPECTRUM

According to Value Science there are three types of basic values. (This fact was *discovered* – not invented - by Dr. Hartman.) These values are **S**ystemic Value, **E**xtrinsic Value, and **I**ntrinsic Value. Abbreviated these are **S**, **E**, and **I**. The late Dr. Leon Pomeroy, a value-scientist and psychotherapist, claimed – and scientists in the field of Ethics fully agree - that it is as important to know our **SEIs** as it is to know our **ABCs**. Some examples will illustrate these dimensions of value:

Thoughts **are S**-values; things are **E**-values; persons and involvements are **I**-values. They result when the basic value dimensions are applied. If you get involved with someone, *you are Intrinsically valuing* that individual; If you have a deep interest in some field, you are *Intrinsically valuing* it.

People usually **S**-Value theories, systems, ideologies, blueprints, plans, zip codes, circuit diagrams, technical language, scientific models, and all the "isms." They are appropriately valued Systemically. {While S-values are positive values, "black-or-white" thinking, that is, rigid, dogmatic thinking, however, is often a trap; it is what the scientists speak of as "dys-systemic value."}

E-Value is the valuation people usually place upon things of this world: practicalities, empirical matters, know-how, savoir-faire, social, everyday concerns, functionality, diplomacy, worldly considerations, categories, etc.

People are likely to **I**-Value their spouse, their dearest ones, unique persons you love, beloved treasures, masterpieces of art, priceless items, etc. We value those Intrinsically whenever we identify with and bond with them. This is also the dimension concerned with what we emphasize, and with the emotions.

How can we tell when someone is **I**-valuing something? They focus; give it their attention, and come to identify with it. If they **I**-value someone, they to some degree are involved with that person. They likely see qualities in the person that others, who aren't so close, don't see. To illustrate, it is the way many of us felt about our mother when we were small children. That is an example of **Intrinsic valuation**.

Another example may be how a czarina, a Russian princess or queen, felt about her jewelry; or how we today relate to the Mona Lisa; or to an original Van Gogh. Whatever we regard as very special, or as a priceless treasure, we are **I**-valuing. whatever we value as life itself (unless we are depressed and suicidal) also illustrates how we apply **I**-value.

Scientists in the ethics field told me that when people identify with and bond with the following these become **Intrinsic** values: Liberty, Freedom, Integrity, Beauty, Truth, Goodness, Authenticity, Creativity, and so forth. Those are often **I**-valued. When someone **Intrinsically-values** *something they see*, they

may call it "a beauty" or speak of it as "beautiful." When a person *I-values a sound*, he or she will call it "music." When one speaks of a person as "a friend," or as "a partner" one is **I**-valuing that person. Other concepts - which when identified-with become *I-value applications* - are Love, Community, Spirituality, Veracity, Reality, Sharing, Happiness, Ecstasy, Joy, Intuition and Insight. Those are all usually **I**-valued. Now you have a better acquaintance with, **S**, **E**, and **I**.

Value-scientists tell us that we need all of these value types, and that we use them often in daily life. Most interesting is that the three value dimensions form a hierarchy, with **S**-value worth the least; **E**-value worth infinitely more; and **I**-value the most precious of all. An **I**-value is worth far, far more than **any E**-value. The correct hierarchy of values, in symbols, is **S < E < I**. And thus to place **S** above **I**; or to give more weight to **E** than to **I** would be a fallacy.

These dimensions form a spectrum on which the highest of the three basic values is **Intrinsic Value**, or **I**-value. (Another way, yet a way which is equivalent, to express the formula is this: **I > E > S**. When translated into English it says: **I**-value is worth more than **E**-value by a quantum leap; and **E**-value is far greater than **S**-value.) The benefits to you of this knowledge will soon become apparent.

Why is all this relevant to ethics? It is relevant because *an understanding of Value Science precedes an understanding of Ethics for these logical reasons*: Before we can sensibly speak of "a good life," or "a good person," it helps to know what "good" means. Before we can explain moral value, we need to know the meaning of "value." Before we can comprehend Ethics we *need to* - looking through a new lens - *define what Ethics is*.

Once we explain what “Ethics” means to the scientists, we then proceed to argue as to whether Ethics is even necessary in the world today. Some in high places seem to believe that it is dispensable; or they are ignorant of it and believe, **mistakenly**, they can get by without it.

After we elucidate the concept “ethics,” we examine what constitutes erroneous thinking in this field and spell out some of the major mistakes people make that holds them back from living an ethical life, or contributing to an ethical world. These errors are known as the *ethical fallacies*.

Then, in Chapter 6 we address the question: What does it mean to be moral? This leads to a listing of steps that can be taken when confronted with a moral dilemma. Other questions addressed are: Is it moral to use any **means** to get to, an **end-in-view**, or to a goal that we want to pursue, as long as we win? Is an ethical life a just life? What is “justice” anyway? We shall, in Chapter 14, define it, and then analyze it, since justice is intimately connected with ethics. Later we take up the issue: Are there universal principles in Ethics, or are we doomed to being merely tribal, or only culture-bound?

How does “efficiency” differ from “effectiveness” and what does all that have to do with living successfully? Does happiness play a role? Where does impulse-control fit in, if it does?

Further topics discussed are these: Is peace relevant to ethics? Are we a slave to our emotions? Chapter 22 responds to this. Is the entire inquiry utopian; or instead are there definite steps that result in the practice of, ethics? Can it spread - not only to regional towns and cities - but all around the planet to every nation and culture? Such issues are addressed this in Chapters 23 and 24.

Chapter Four

WHAT IS ETHICS?

To be *ethical* (*according to this new paradigm - Ethics as science*) is to have good human relations. To be ethical is to **I-value** oneself and others.¹ The discipline these scientists refer to as "Ethics" arises when persons are Intrinsicly valued. By valuing persons this way an individual can gain value. And that is a fact independently verified by several experiments. In effect the science explains how to "shop for value," if one wants to gain the most value out of life. Soon, with a view to achieving moral clarity for all concerned, we shall explore some of the many ramifications of the definition of "Ethics" in this context. First, though, it is necessary to respond to a question raised by those who live by either the motto, "anything goes," or by the belief, "might makes right."

Understanding that when **I-value** is applied to an individual, or a group of them, we are in the field of Ethics, a question may arise: *Who needs Ethics?* Is it really needed or is corruption and conflict-of-interest the way of life to which we had better adapt? This merits some discussion.

IS ETHICS NECESSARY IN TODAY'S WORLD?

**"A man without ethics is a wild beast
loosed upon this world"**

---Albert Camus

A real comprehension of this topic starts with nature, with some facts about the nature of human beings. Thus the discussion now focuses on ***human nature*** as we inquire whether ethics is relevant today.

Here are the indisputable facts: We have hormones that activate at puberty. They serve to encourage the propagation of the species. Without this, the species could die off. A certain amount of births are needed and sexual desire is the main vehicle; it attracts us to one another. As a result, we form families. If family members are ignorant in human-relation skills, or decline to defer to one another, or to cooperate, we witness some **conflicts** arising.

If selfishness dominates over the will to harmonious relations, then *tension and serious conflict* is inevitable. We expect children to be self-centered; yet wise parents shape and socialize the child into maturity, into becoming a responsible adult.

Tribalism starts with an extended family. The first tribe was an extended family. From tribes ethnic groups derive. And such groups result in distinctive cultures. When one culture's values are incompatible with another culture's values we are liable to see some tension and some conflict. It is known as "*culture clash*."

When a tribe gets large enough to form a small town, the first building they want to build is a meeting hall – or a building for ceremonial rituals that will encourage bonding. The meeting hall is where the tribal chief, or the most-respected elders of the tribe, will set up government and assign a police force; this will later evolve into an army or guard for the authorities. [Today, every city has a mayor. The local police answer to him or her.]

In earlier times the king, or queen, was considered to be sovereign. Many of them encouraged the spreading of the idea that the sovereign was divine, and had a closer connection to the gods than the common folk did. Eventually priests became emperors, and tribal chiefs became shamans. They were the authority that informed ordinary people how to be ‘moral.’ [Today, in Moral Philosophy, we note that one school of thought, one ideology, is known as The Divine Command Theory. ...a source of conflict with those holding other views.]

As Harvey Schoof, a professional in conflict resolution and life-coaching, informs us: “Conflict occurs when our different perspectives clash; when, because of our uniqueness and individuality, we cannot reach a shared or common decision; when our problems and priorities are different; when, or because of our motivations, we emphasize different aspects of the same thing.” These misunderstandings often result in a delay in finding a solution for whatever problem exists.

Such a solution, he tells us, will be a “win-win” situation capturing the essential aspect of different viewpoints without destroying the uniqueness of each viewpoint. Moreover, a basis for disagreement is established so that each party can understand the difference in viewpoints and, more importantly, can understand the value of the difference.” When he speaks of “the value of the difference” he is referring to the emphasis each puts on the values S, or E, or I, or on a combination of them.

We have examined how strife and conflict can originate – even in our intimate settings -- if we don’t know our Ethics. Once we do know Ethics, and how to practice it, we will defer to one another, be considerate, and will, if need be, brush up on our human-relations skills. Is it not about time that we studied, and learned the fundamentals of this body of useful knowledge? Yes, to

restore harmony in situations of strife, and for each of us to attain a quality life, **Ethics is definitely needed in today's world.** And it will eventually be included in the primary school curriculum, especially if those familiar with the fundamentals of Ethics do their part in making it happen.

Here is how The Institute for Global Ethics explains why ethics is needed:

“Ethics are the heart of any strong organization. Whether you're a Fortune 500 company or a small-town school district, studies have consistently found that **ethical decision-making fosters employee morale, boosts brand reputation, encourages loyalty in customers and employees, and improves your bottom line.** Ethics is more than the right thing to do: it's the smart thing to do.

An organization formed without ethics is like a cabin built without nails: no matter how solid it may appear, it will slowly crumble. A culture of ethics is what links people ... connections which, although invisible, make the whole organization immeasurably stronger.

And in this day and age of eroded public trust, ethics are more important than ever. After the mortgage-loan debacle, after Enron, after decades of botched recalls and profit-driven decisions and environmental tragedies, people often assume organizations don't care about them. Trust is no longer given freely. Once an organization has earned the public's trust, however, that connection becomes its most valuable asset.”

Need one argue any further in support of the view that in this world today we would all be better off if more people conducted themselves ethically. A future chapter will explain just how the

concepts of Ethics can spread around the world and find wide acceptance.

Since this is a text on Ethics (both theory and practice), and how it will benefit the reader, how it will help us all flourish, it would be appropriate to grasp this concept in more detail.

WHAT IS ETHICS ABOUT? WHAT ARE THE MEANINGS OF THE TERMS: “RIGHT” AND “WRONG”?

Ethics is about evaluating moral values and principles, working out a basis on which to follow these principles, then living by them, and setting an example of them. These principles *are neither rules nor absolutes*; they are rather voluntary guidelines designed to make life easier, more comfortable, and more trouble-free. Furthermore, it is right to be morally good and to do good. {Because it entails some technicalities, in the Appendix to this book we shall define, in more specific detail, what “good” means. Soon we shall in Chapter 6 take up the topic of “morality” and then clarify what is involved in being *morally good*.} Suffice it to say now that something (or some situation) is good if it is what it’s supposed to be, if it is ‘all there’ under the concept one places upon it when one names or describes it.

Compassionate acts, such as are seen when a person gives a helping hand to another individual, something that occurs every day, are evidence of **an objective moral order**. And it is an objective fact that normal human beings want to survive. Actually we want more than mere survival:

We are pre-wired to seek our personal benefit, of which survival is a minimum necessary requirement. What does it take to survive? Well, it is a fact of Biology that for a cell in our body to be healthy

it helps if the cells surrounding it are healthy. In the same way, if you, or I, or any individual, gets in trouble then we need our neighbors and family to help us out. We need the people around us. Let's call them "our support group."

Isn't it so that each of the people around us has people around them who could serve as their support group? This keeps them strong. This is just plain common sense! So, we deduce, since you need the people around you as your support, you also need the people around them. And where does it stop? It doesn't. Therefore by logical reasoning we conclude that we need the entire human species as our "support group." It would seem that this is a basic fact of empirical ethics:

The human race is a support group for each human individual.

We are, in conclusion, **interdependent**. [Let's be mindful of this so that we may have **awareness** of this important fact.]

And thus it is in our personal best interest to **cooperate**. Hence, let us seek harmonious cooperation; and we will be "doing the right thing."

Let's define some terms in the new paradigm, the new frame-of-reference being presented here. We shall define "consciousness" as: the ability to respond to the environment, and adapt to it. By self-awareness is meant the ability to recognize our own thoughts, and to think the thought, "I am." It is the capacity to assert, "I like the way I'm thinking when I understand something clearly."

When applied to Ethics, self-awareness is shown in a thought such as, "I really like it when I'm being ethical !" And "wisdom" in this context means: the personal resolve to apply – and skill in applying – moral principles to daily life.

As mentioned earlier, and by way of review, the essence of this scientific theory is that "**Ethics**" is a perspective ...a perspective on a human individual, or group of them. It arises when we view the human being as highly valuable, of indefinitely-high value. One idea, of which every ethical individual and every ethical society ought to be keenly aware, is: Do no harm! This shall be a recurrent theme since it is so vital to fully comprehend it as well as to grasp its policy implications. Also, the theory indicates that - if we are ethical - we will make things better, morally better. We are to *add value* if we want to be ethical.

Lots of implications may be deduced from that definition (of the concept "Ethics") and from that basic idea: Make things better!

This concept, "do no harm," implies a renunciation of violence, cruelty, ruthless exploitation, greed, lack of humility, etc.

Also, as part of the theory, techniques and methods are proffered which enable us to make things better. In addition, it encourages us to develop new 'moral technologies', that is, technologies which tend to make our lives easier, simpler, more secure and more comfortable. Such innovations are how we "get from here to there" - how we are more likely to live in a more-civilized world, in an ethical world - one that puts into practice social justice, mutual respect, opportunity for advancement, and thus has less incentives for trouble-making, for needless stress of an anxious sort, for crime and maliciousness. And now you understand what Ethics is, as the concept is employed by the scientists working in this field.

The field of Ethics can be divided logically into two major branches: Individual Ethics and Social Ethics. The former is largely concerned with the study of morality – which itself, as we shall make clear, entails continuous self-improvement aimed toward achieving optimal moral-health. Soon, in Chapter 8 and

subsequent chapters, we shall delve into the concerns and topics of Social Ethics. Let us now define a couple of ethical terms that are relevant to both branches: To comply with the *moral principles*, is what the science means by the term "right." Not to appreciate them, nor care to live by them, is the definition of "wrong."

In what follows we shall address a topic that spans both branches of Ethics as we discuss how people can deceive themselves, resulting in *moral errors* due to confusion about Ethical basics.

It is well-known that there are logical fallacies. Can there be ethical fallacies? Is Ethics a logical study? As you are about to learn, these inquiries can be answered in the affirmative.

Chapter Five

WHAT ARE THE ETHICAL FALLACIES?

False logic results in a *fallacy*. Faulty thinking in the field of ethics will be known as ethical fallacy. As previously explained, Ethics arises when persons are I-valued. This is true by definition. It is time to offer two Ethical Fallacies, the Instrumental Fallacy and the Ideological Fallacy, expressed by Dr. William Kelleher in the following quoted passage.²

"The Instrumental Fallacy To use a person solely as a means to achieve some end entails a negative regard for that person. Using reduces a person to the value of a thing, an instrument. No matter how highly prized, a thing is always potential trash. Every new car will someday be junk. But a person, so long as he or she is a self-conscious, thinking, feeling human being ought never to be regarded as useless trash." The formula depicting this situation is $E > I$, obviously a fallacy, since science has established that $I > E$.

When persons are I-valued they are receiving positive regard, and Ethics - by definition - tells us that individuals always deserve to be viewed in this light; it tells us that all persons always deserve positive regard.

"The Ideological Fallacy: This is the false assumption that ideas are more important than persons are" is the way Dr. Kelleher explains it. Whenever the idea of "gender," or of "race," or "rank" - all intellectual constructs, or conceptions - which have no actual physical existence - are used to separate members of

the human community, and to enable some to claim superiority over others, this is a violation of Ethics. Why? Because it indicates a failure to I-value persons. To hold any of those "isms" such as racism, sexism, or rankism, is to commit The Ideological Fallacy. In symbols this situation is **S > I**, again, a fallacy.

In contrast, Dr. Kelleher has proposed two value axioms. The first is Instrumental Enhancement. What does this mean?

Instrumental Enhancement "Providing a service to people that helps to improve the quality of their lives" would be an Instrumental Enhancement. He offers several examples:

Public education when it values a student as a unique, intelligent, creative person with potential for growth and development;

Sending someone who needs it - a person who has been convicted of a crime, or a drug addict -- into rehab is another example of Instrumental Enhancement;

Medical treatment, including surgery, is meant to enhance the quality of life and provide a benefit.

The second value axiom applied to Ethics is what we shall designate as:

Ideological Enhancement. This is an idea that tends to encourage giving positive regard to people. The idea of Human Rights - such as the right to an opportunity to earn a living; or the right to be free from the fear of detention just for

expressing political views - the human rights concept is an Ideological Enhancement.

To comp value is to provide enhancement. Persons of good character do that. In the next section we aim to explain how this works a little more fully. The science indicates that morality is a component of moral health. Both, because they are values, are a matter of degree. In philosophy circles ‘morality’ is quite a vague and ambiguous concept. How do the Ethicists (the scientists of Ethics) nail it down? As the report continues we shall learn that they have a precise definition for morality, one that will prove useful.

Ethics has a systematic theory. It is divided into two major branches. They are Individual Ethics and Social Ethics. We shall first focus on Individual Ethics, on how one can be true to oneself. Soon we shall give attention to Social Ethics, though we have noted that the science has already something to offer with regard to Social Ethics when it alluded to composing value, which is a concept that includes creating value – or adding value to situations that involve human interaction.

At times, in the life of those who strive to be ethical, a moral dilemma may arise. If it is a choice between good and evil that is a relatively-easy choice to make; one who is ethical chooses the morally-good option. Often though it is a choice between goods, that is, between competing interests each of which result in benefits to various parties who are involved. What does an ethical person do then? What is the moral thing to do? The next two chapters examine these highly-relevant topics.

Chapter Six

WHEN ARE WE BEING MORAL?

"I try to use challenges as opportunities to grow. I have finally come to learn that if we are not continually growing "upwards" by trying to transform into better versions of ourselves, we are either standing still or going in a downward motion. All our moments are choices, and for today I choose the light over the dark and looking outside of myself instead of focusing in on 'me and my problems'."

- Carole Bayer Sager
(Composer and song-writer)

We are being moral when we're true to ourselves. It turns out that morality (in this new paradigm) is *being true to your own true self*. It means that our traits and observable **behavior**, in fact, actually **match** our self-chosen, continually-improving, view of what an **ideal self** should be.

[In other words, as we clarify and explain in the following paragraphs, "morality" and "value" have a similar structure. This is logical since, in common usage, *morality* means *moral value*.]

Just as a thing has value to you to the extent its properties match the image you have for things-of-that-sort -- the map fitting-the-territory idea -- morality, as the science of Ethics uses that term,

measures the degree a person lives up to his own standards of true personhood, or conforms to his own high, and evolving, ideals for what a person is, and could become.

Morality is Intrinsicly-valuing yourself and every other person.³ It implies having self-respect and finding a way to respect others. Here is how it is defined in scientific Ethics: "morality" is "one's observable conduct increasingly corresponding to one's self-ideal" – specifically, to "one's continuously-improving self-ideal."

What does "an improving self-ideal" mean? One's self-ideal – part of one's self-concept – is accurately described as improving if it is more inclusive, more responsible, and more adept at creating mutually-beneficial proposals. Also it is more-inclined to kindness than to asserting one's own rightness.

The highly moral individual would rather be kind than to be "right"; would rather perform an act of kindness or of beauty than to argue for the rightness of his/her position. Furthermore if one makes a habit of looking for the good in each situation and building on that, one will likely not go wrong.

There are four steps to being true to yourself. They are:
Know yourself; accept yourself; create yourself; and give yourself.

Let's speak of these as "The Four Keys." They unlock doors, or barriers, that keep us from living life to the fullest. Barriers -- such as lying to ourselves, making excuses, blaming, being a hypocrite -- keep us from getting the highest quality life we could have. Entire books have been written about each of these keys. The polymath genius, Robert S. Hartman, wrote

with some depth about them in his classic work, The Structure of Value.

About the year 470 BC the philosopher, Socrates, emphasized the importance of *self-knowledge* and recommended it to his students.

In general, many psychiatrists today regard it as advisable that each of us *accept* ourselves, warts and all; acknowledge our weaknesses and our defects – before proceeding to work on other concerns.

'Create yourself' means: develop your talents and gifts; bring out your inner artist; take full advantage of your moral strengths and your skills that are ethical, employing them at every opportunity. Become an expert or genius in some field, in your own unique niche.

Lastly, 'Give yourself' means: freely express your gifts publicly; make your contribution to society by "giving yourself away" so to speak. It confirms that old saying: Don't hide your light under a bushel. Let your light shine.

Keep in mind that morality is a matter of degree: some have more moral health than others, just as some people are physically healthier than others. Note well: If one ever flaunts his or her moral health, or attempts to 'score points' over others with regard to it, this shows a *lack of humility*, and as a result of this deficiency, one's moral health immediately sharply diminishes!

Investigators have found that to be moral is to have a good character, to have *moral courage*, to have good judgment. Having good judgment includes having a sense of values; it is to know one's **SEIs**, the moral dimensions and the spectrum they form. This includes knowing that **I**-Value, the super-special priceless value, *will* (when we apply it to our daily practical affairs) *get us more value in life*. You realize that this is true according to that hierarchy of values displayed in that formula shown in Chapter 3. It can be expressed as **I > E > S**. [For details, refer to the Appendix.]

What is meant by "moral courage"? Moral courage is the middle ground between fearfulness and foolhardiness. It is an Intrinsic value. Those who are whistle-blowers have this courage. They are taking a risk but hopefully they are wise enough to leak the facts about corruption in their institution or business to a journalist who has faithfully promised not to expose their name prematurely. They are avoiding cowardice while at the same time avoiding foolhardiness - two extremes. They are embracing Moral Courage, one of the marks of good character. {This topic will again arise when - by applying specific value dimensions - we derive the cluster of concepts named "Virtue Theory."}

Something is *good* if it has all the properties necessary to fulfill its purpose (its meaning.) It is good to have a moral purpose, to live a purposeful life. By the definition of 'good', it is good to fulfill that moral purpose. The *ultimate purpose*, for those who want to apply the science of Ethics (and thus gain the benefits) is to provide a quality life for one and all.

One thus may easily conclude that *an individual is good* if s/he

has ethical ideals and lives up to them ...practices what s/he preaches. "Talks the talk, and walks the walk." Such a self-image (consisting of ethical ideals) is the meaning which that individual is to fulfill. Ethical ideals are kindness, empathy, compassion, integrity, authenticity, genuineness, sincerity, honesty, etc. They all indicate much the same - a person who knows his ethics. Value knowledge is insurance against personal and social disorder.

Sometimes we have to make a decision where the choices are bad vs. good, bad vs. bad, or even good vs. good. What do we do then? Is Ethics equipped to give any guidance in such cases? Yes, we can cope; for the science provides us with some filters to use to help us make a sounder decision than we otherwise might have.

Chapter Seven

HOW ETHICS CAN COPE WITH DILEMMAS WHEN THEY ARISE

According to the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics in Santa Clara, California it is helpful to ask these questions before making a decision which involves an ethical dilemma in which some person might suffer harm or damage: Here, edited, is a quotation from their website:

"What are the relevant facts of the case? What individuals and groups have an important stake in the outcome? What is at stake for each?

Which option will produce the most good and do the least harm?

- Which option respects the rights and dignity of all stakeholders? Even if not everyone gets all they want, will everyone still be treated fairly?
- Which option would promote the common good and help all participate more fully in the goods we share as a society, as a community, as a company, as a family?
<http://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/decision/commongood.htm>
- Which option would enable the deepening or development of those virtues or character traits that we value as individuals? As a profession? As a society? "

This process of reflecting upon ambiguous questions is the traditional approach to ethics, also known as "moral philosophy." According to Ethics, the science, when confronted with a dilemma people can view it at least three ways:

Systemically – What are the relevant rules, procedures, norms, methods, codes? What would the authorities say?

Extrinsically – What is the cost-benefit analysis and what are the pragmatic considerations?

Or Intrinsically - What best builds community? What would a compassionate, caring person of good character be likely to do?

Once again the dimensions of value are seen to be relevant; and that is an example as to how everything in the science fits together. Scientific Ethics when applied will encourage the development of individuals who intuitively know the right way to choose in tough situations because of the **habits they have formed from early childhood**, due perhaps to their parents applying the findings of this new science; or due to teachers in the field of early education applying Ethical Science. These **habits** have been labeled by Dr. Daniel Goleman as Emotional and Social Intelligence.

Morality we understand is being true to your true self; but not all ethics is Individual Ethics. Dr. Paul Ricoeur, who did research with Dr. Edmund Husserl, points out that as human beings we have a *need* for harmonious and peaceful relations. That need, he notes, is not satisfied in today's world. Wouldn't a better understanding of the findings of Social Ethics help in this regard?

Chapter Eight

**"The first step in the evolution of ethics
is a sense of solidarity with other human beings"**
-- Albert Schweitzer

WHAT IS SOCIAL ETHICS?

It is unlikely that we will ever reach a "perfect" solution to anything so it is advisable that we work together to improve what we are doing, understanding that each improvement we make will require additional improvements. Can we agree that it is better to be constructive than destructive? If so, this implies an imperative: "**Make things better!**" If something isn't yet good, let's make it good. If something is good, let's make it even better. Let's have a constructive approach. Let's accept what we know about ourselves, with all our weaknesses and all our strengths, and use what we know to create a better world. What would this entail?

According to Dr. Thomas Hurka, of Canada, to truly actualize one's self is to work to insure that there is opportunity for all to better themselves. Those with a high degree of morality are aware that each of us will live a more fulfilling life when all of us live a more fulfilling life: Each does better if all do better.

Just as on the individual level we want to actualize -- bring out our talents and skills -- on the social level why not inventory the strengths of each culture, each tribe, and each nation and then use those advantages to reach certain common goals. Why not focus on what we can build together? Why not make each group feel more secure by entering into non-aggression treaties

with everyone? Why shouldn't our own nation initiate the 'peace race'? Let's get with it! If we can agree that violence is destructive, and that we want to be constructive, then we will do all in our power to avoid violence, hostility, abuse. We will take every opportunity to find alternatives to violence. We will no longer admire the mighty warrior. We will admire the heroes of peace ...Tolstoy, Gandhi, Martin Luther King and most of the winners of the Nobel Prize for Peace. We will let their lives inspire us.

We will be very careful not to have a double standard, one for ourselves and one for others: we will no longer say to ourselves that while violence done **to** us is certainly destructive, and bad, yet when we commit violence or heap abuse on others it is not so bad, for it is "justified." To think like this is to violate **The Principle of Moral Consistency**. That Principle tells us to avoid a double standard, and to be consistent. What else does the science indicate?

Start with your own family, then your block, then your township, then your state, and your nation. When we can achieve peace in our family we can achieve it in a wider circle. Whoever is most responsible provides leadership for the others.

Express mutual aid, respect for each other, and non-abuse. Instead of pointing out what is wrong with someone else, build them up. Compliment them on their strengths and good features. Demonstrate that your family can be nonviolent and that any disagreements can be peacefully resolved without recriminations nor anyone feeling bossed or ordered around. Show loving kindness to each other.

Let the peace radiate outward from there.

Now by applying the dimensions of value, we will see how these manage to delineate certain specific perspectives which are familiar to those who have studied the history of the field. These views are taught in the schools today, in Ethics courses. They are the best that tradition has to offer. They each have their good features which, as you will note, prove to be useful.

Chapter Nine

SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT IN ETHICS

There are certain questions which those who work to build an adequate and useful ethical theory often ask, namely: Should you think about your duty, or about the consequences of your actions? Or should you concentrate on becoming a good person?

How would a scientist of Ethics even approach a solution to these questions? S/he might well employ instruments from Value Science in order to define specific areas of inquiry and research. That would be a logical procedure. [Do not be put off by the jaw-breaking academic jargon ... for if you stick with it, you will be able to understand the following concepts.]

Thus we shall now apply the basic value dimensions to the topic “Traditional academic approaches to moral philosophy” to see what results. Three major schools of thought are then defined:

S: Deontology **E:** Consequentialism **I:** Virtue theory

Systemic Value, applied to this topic, results in **Deontology**, with its rules to live by,” its declarations of human rights, and lists of obligations. Keeping one’s promises, honoring one’s contracts, fulfilling one’s obligations, being responsible, and doing one’s duty is the sort of conduct that Deontologists advocate. Their main instrument is *systemic*; it’s a rule to follow. It consists in asking oneself a question before acting. That question is: “What if everyone in the world did as you are considering doing (or have already done)? Would you want to live in such a world?”

This set of Systemic tools is concerned with compliance with that test: Would you want to live in an environment or culture in which everyone acted in the way you are considering acting, or have already acted? *Can such conduct be consistently done without contradictions?* If not, don't do it. It is action-oriented. That test is its 'rule to live by.' (It may sound familiar, since many a parent has admonished a child: "What if everyone did that?")

Purportedly, if we all applied this test before everything we did no one would ever lie or deceive, express malice, belittle another, inflict harm or abuse. In summary, before pursuing a policy or performing an action, the Deontologists contend that it is imperative to universalize it, make it categorical in your mind; their one rule is to apply this test, to ask yourself that question. Their school of thought has been described as '*rules-based*'.

When **Extrinsic Value** is applied to schools of ethical thought, it yields **Consequentialism**. Adherents of this approach are concerned with the impact that specific actions and policies will have on human flourishing. They care about policies as they affect our well-being. [The advocates of this school – or perspective -- grant that "well-being" is a shifting and expanding concept – as more is learned about it.] Consequentialism is a modern adaptation of a school that traditionally recommended 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number.'; it thus gives us a sense of direction, a goal to aim for. It provides guidance for sound decision-making.

Consequentialists hold that some outcomes, such as the greatest happiness, or well-being for the most folks, are more desirable than others. They suggest we may want to abstain from certain activities because undesirable effects, or consequences, will result. That they say is the reason why we should not murder, rape, kidnap, steal, or cheat. The description of this school of

moral philosophy, the extrinsic school, is ‘*ends-based*.’ {“Ends” refers to goals, results, and objectives.}

We should do what is better for everyone involved – and that is what should means in this field of Ethics. If it is better for an individual to be a little more creative, compassionate, intelligent, and fulfilled - in such a way as to produce very few if any negative effects, now or in the future --- then he ought to do it. And that is the definition of ought here in this context. Even better, if possible, is to do it for everyone on earth. “After all” wondered Dr. Sam Harris, neurologist, lecturer, and author of *The Moral Landscape*, “what possible motive could a person have for declining to increase everyone’s well-being (including his own) at no cost?” This may here be an allusion by Dr. Harris to what we later will speak of as “The Ultimate Purpose of Ethics.”

John Stuart Mill would argue that it is not only the number of people who experience the happiness but also the duration of the happiness must be considered. Also the **quality** of it matters: was it derived by pursuing, and coming close to reaching, a worthwhile goal? Such a goal, one of high value, would contribute to the end of helping each individual flourish, would enhance individual well-being. I will have more to report about this in future chapters.

When Intrinsic Value is applied to academic ethical ideologies what emerges is modern **Virtue Theory** which teaches that we have a responsibility to care for our family as a first priority, and a responsibility to ourselves to strive to be of virtuous character.

It also teaches prudence (or moderation): as we go through life neither over-do nor under-do. Both excess and deficit are vices (the opposite of virtue.) [More (excess) or less (deficit) are mathematical notions, so Virtue Theory has logic to it.]

Those who apply the basic principle “Make things better” to themselves would strive to become even more ethical and moral than they already are, and they would devote themselves to achieving this goal. In the process of doing so they would develop to the point where others might with some accuracy describe them as having ‘**a good character**.’ Let’s examine this concept further in the next section as well as in future chapters.

Wide agreement can be seen on the claim that if one has a *good* character, all else being equal, one will tend to perform worthwhile actions; will tend to “do the right thing.” This set of ideas is an emphasis of that school of thought known as Virtue Ethics, an approach to understanding how to live which may be described as ‘*character-based*.’

I would argue that on some level there need not be any conflict between the actual outcomes, in practice, of the three most-dominant contemporary normative ethical theories. All of them deal with quality-of-life issues, and they all praise and encourage responsibility as a way to express one’s morality.

Being good (by definition and observation) often results in doing good but not necessarily the other way around: even criminals may sometimes do something good; but of course cannot accurately be described as having a good character.

These three schools-of-thought are each tools in a toolbox to be used when appropriate; each approach has its limitations, its weaknesses, and its strengths. They can be useful Ethical tools to use. Too much focus on any specific one of these tools may prevent a person from giving attention to the other implements in the tool-chest which have their good features as well. Let’s take a closer look at the benefits of employing these tools, of actually applying this knowledge in daily life.

HOW THE VARIOUS SCHOOLS OF ETHICS CAN HELP YOU

Making explicit the moral principles which the major academic schools express and imply will help you (and thus help us all) to have a better life, for what really helps you helps me; and what really helps me helps you. We are -- and this includes every individual on the face of the planet -- in a symbiotic relationship.

Virtue Theory seems to be the most morally-sensitive of the three approaches with its emphasis on individual moral courage. By listing ‘vices’ it spells out ways to be immoral, yet it shows how to avoid immorality and various specific forms of personal corruption. As mentioned, it recommends prudence and moderation. It reveals many subtleties as well as making clear how to live the good life by striving to acquire the characteristics that a good person would want to have.⁴

Consequentialism deals with the external everyday world, the socio-economic policy matters. It is concerned with practical decisions, with the effect of actions on human well-being and happiness. An action is right if it leads to more happiness in your life provided you take into consideration the welfare of others; and can sidestep “zero-sum games,” those where there must be a loser if there is a winner. Game theories which have finite rewards and penalties fit here. Also associated are concepts such as determinism; behavioral conditioning; political affairs; the common good; public policies. Common goods are public health measures, emergency-management agencies like F.E.M.A., the protection of the environment (clean air and water), peace-keeping and other police work, fire-prevention,etc.

Deontology, as we said, is concerned with promises, contracts, rights, duties, obligations and imperatives (which it claims are

universal and categorical.) Here systematically doing one's duty is the emphasis – staying within the boundaries of proper behavior. To its credit, it does demand that we treat others as ends, *not as mere means to an end*. Thus one who takes this imperative seriously eschews the manipulation of other people, one carefully avoids exploiting others.

The best answer, it turns out, to the questions posed at the outset of this chapter, is that if you concentrate on being a good person you WILL think about the effects your actions will have, and you will think about, and actually attend to, your responsibilities. Yet let us not neglect what other theories of ethics have to contribute; let's weave their best concepts into a synthesis, into a beautiful fabric. Switching metaphors, Ethicists point out that we need all three sets of tools in our toolbox, for as we have shown, there are strengths in all three schools of thought.

As one lives a good (virtuous) life one does not have to measure in advance each act as to its moral rightness or wrongness; instead, once a person has a good character, by the habits one has developed, a person usually spontaneously "does the right thing." This concept is central to ethics, worthy of a chapter of its own.

Chapter Ten

ON CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT

Let's examine what character is all about. Scientific Ethics is not based on rules that tell us the right action to do at any given moment; rather the answer to "How to be morally healthy" is that *one is to have a good character*. Many of the modern perspectives are derived from insights already well-known by the ancient Greeks. For example, the science confirms that on an individual basis we will seek the Golden Mean between

extremes, will seek to neither over-do nor under-do. On our interrelations with others, studies have found that if we realize that treating others with kindness is appropriate - and we feel positive feelings toward others - we are likely to in fact use kindness in our dealings with others.

The scientists in the field of ethics are interested in what kinds of persons will live the good life, the morally healthy life, and it turns out that character development plays a large role in this.

We all have natural inclinations that influence how we act within our environment and how we relate to others. Our innate personality traits are impacted by what we experienced in our upbringing and into adulthood. We learn what works for us and what doesn't, and when we function at a high level, we hold onto the behaviors that help us and let go of those that hold us back.

Training in empathic development - developing our empathy -- is a major part of Applied Ethics. One of the major applications of this science called Ethics is known as Education; and another is Life Coaching. Having positive role models early in one's life is usually essential to moral development. Through regularly engaging in kind, thoughtful actions, we can develop and increase the degree of our morality. The good person has acquired a sense of values and understands why a specific action - that you or I may say is "doing the right thing" -- is the appropriate response.

The living of a morally-good life transcends particular actions and the local social customs and cultural practices. Over time, choosing right over wrong requires less thought and is habitual.

Loving kindness is chosen knowingly for its own sake. The habits we form in life are critical to our having a high degree of morality.

The development of moral character used to take a whole life-time but now there are techniques for speeding up the process². Once someone has established his/her moral character, for the most part that person's behavior will keep in line with that character. The behavior will follow a pattern and typically be predictable. This hypothesis has been tested and found to be a reliable fact in a number of independent experiments.

FURTHER LIGHT ON CHARACTER

People of good character are *honest* individuals. Furthermore, if one has a good character, then due to his authenticity and honesty, one will be likely to keep one's promises, will honor one's contracts, fulfill one's obligations and be responsible. A person of good character, a morally healthy person, will adhere to ethical principles - as those, for example, offered in Chapter Fifteen. Such a person seems to subconsciously choose the right action most of the time. It is not accidental, but rather a deliberate decision to choose kindness, empathy,, generosity and honesty.

At first, before it becomes intuitive, a highly moral personality will consciously choose and affirm goodness. He or she may recite ethical affirmations as a way of ingraining the principles. Eventually the ethical precepts become a matter of habit. This Ethics is about an entire life. Instead of asking what is the right act here and now, Ethics asks what kind of person should I be in order to get it right all the time. "How can I dedicate myself to (moral) goodness?" The science of Ethics eventually came to

the conclusion that someone who is ethical consistently demonstrates integrity and respect for others.

It also found that to know the good is not necessarily to do the good. We must choose the good. There are three ways; let us here invoke the value dimensions:

(S) Choosing intellectually. (E) Choosing by practicing.

(I) Integrating the choice into one's self-concept. Practice is now a habit.

HOW IS GOOD CHARACTER DEVELOPED?

In order to develop good *character* we need to keep in mind our moral principles, make *sound judgments*, and put them into action in proper sequence.

It turns out that a major element is *the capacity for making good judgments*. What does this involve? It helps if we ask ourselves: 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? Do I seek excellence in everything I do? 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 talk', 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 can mean 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 while expecting the worst, hoping for the best, and working to make the best come to pass. Actually, that is how we define “realism.”

How do we develop *character*? There are practical stages one may undergo: First, decide what we want in our moral development. Then find out what we have by taking a personal inventory. Finally, take steps to close the gap.

Often one may overhear the expression “The end justified the means.” Does this make any sense ethically-speaking? The new science of Ethics has a response to this question.

Chapter Eleven

ENDS AND MEANS TO THE ENDS

Some advocates of the ‘ends-based’ school would argue that “the ends justify the means” although they rarely if ever explain what they mean by “justify” in this context. Is it ethical to believe in the idea “Any means to an end, as long as we win in the end.” When discussing what is fundamental in the Science of Ethics (both the theoretical and empirical study) we ought to keep in mind the relation of Means to Ends

In that regard I would make this observation: Ends are related to means used. If you want peace, use peaceful means. If love is your end (your goal), use loving means to get to it. If you want stability, then stable means are required to reach your end-in-view.

Is this so hard to understand? *Chaotic or destructive means will not result in a stable, sustainable state of affairs.* A state of *justice* is a state of balance; to be in balance we cannot use means that are out of balance. In a future chapter on Justice we will explore this in some depth.

This to me is the most basic point to learn about The Means/Ends relationship. **The means ought to be compatible with the ends desired.**

(For example, Woodrow Wilson said that World War I would be "a war to end all war.") You don't end war by waging it. Each war has resulted in a later war. If we were to wage “a peace race” the result would be different; then we would be competing with other

nations to see who is the more peaceful, or who wants peace the most.

We will not get to moral ends by the use of immoral means.

Once in a great while a weird accident may occur which provides an exception, but in general this relationship holds.

If we want peace in the world, we need to employ peaceful means to arrive at that end. **If we want an ethical world then only moral means will get us there.**

Ethics, the new paradigm on how to live well, indicates we are to minimize disvalue (confusion, destruction, and chaos) and maximize value (order, balance, what works and what fits). While we are actively engaged in minimizing disvalue for the Individual person, engaged in reducing human suffering, poverty, and misery, we ought to keep in mind that our noble Ends do not justify the Means, unless the Means we use to get to those fine-sounding Ends-in-view are thoroughly compatible.

Specifically how do we maximize value? Be aware that the individual (an Intrinsic value) is far more important than the State or the Society (which are Systemic values.) It is good to empower the Individual, and provide opportunities for advancement and success for the Individual - and avoid violating the Autonomy of the individual. Encourage self-management, self-leadership. All this will add value to situations, and even multiply value.

At the same time as we are minimizing disvalue we are optimizing positive value. Yet let us make sure our means are consonant with our ends. If we want love in our life, let's employ loving means; let's express love, and shower others with love. It's elementary, yet hard for folks to grasp.

Ethics teaches that If you love Peace, then be peaceful. Engage

in nonviolent direct action against injustice; exercise *truthforce*. There is no peace without justice. So work to establish Justice. And remember that Lives Matter! Each individual is to be Intrinsically valued.

Chapter Twelve

STRANDED ON AN ISLAND

Here is a fact about human nature – one that is so interesting that I shall return to it time and again: our brains are prewired to seek out what is in our self-interest. The problem is that we often don't know what actually is in our self-interest. For example, we fail to gain the benefits that cooperation would yield for us.

Science informs us that we survived as a species (instead of becoming extinct as so many, many other species have) because we learned to cooperate on projects that we could not handle alone. We set a goal to erect a bridge across a river or to build a residence and we realized that the project was too big to do by ourselves so we enlisted the cooperation of others and we got it done. There are benefits to cooperation. Many of us are not aware of these benefits; we thus often do things that are not in our true self-interest. It is a moral truth that today we need *more cooperation* on worthwhile goals that enhance the quality of human life.

Successful living is concerned with how to live a good life, how to be a good person, how to live the optimal life, how to live well and live happy, as we provide a *Quality Life* for all. When we engage in self-defeating and counter-productive behavior we are doing things that are not in our self-interest.¹¹

Examples of such conduct would be violence, exploitation (such as holding slaves, or murder, or rape, or even disregarding worker safety standards.) Cheating others, baiting and switching, engaging in angry quarrelling, polluting the planet which we all

inhabit – these are also forms of conduct that violates a happy life.

A life of real success would include harmonious human relationships, and this report shall explain how to achieve them. Logical deductions can be made from the basic principles which we shall soon present. These premises normal people usually find to be reasonable and acceptable. Most folks who try it out find that it all makes good sense.

What are the basic assumptions? Here is one more: Some values are more valuable than others. This fact leads to the question: How can we tell the better from the worse?

It has been shown by a logical demonstration, by a proof discovered by Dr. Hartman, that one *individual*, having individuality, seen as ‘unique,’ is worth more than all the things in this world, and that one material *thing* is worth more than all the babble, the theories and systems and ideologies. A person is worth more than a thing, and a thing is worth more than a number. As we know, a thing can rust out and be discarded as trash; and a number can be erased. Human life, though, is never trash; it is valuable, uncountably valuable. That’s why it is wrong to murder or rape, or to connive and exploit, to enslave and deceive.

Those who understand these relationships can be said to “know their values.” Once you know the theory and practice of successful living – once you know your values - you will put people first. Then far below you will rank materialism and ostentatious consumption. And you will also realize that systems, dogmas, opinions rather than facts and evidence, isms, labels, and stereotypes have the *lowest* positive value to us.

Indifference to one another has zero value, while cruelty, sadism, personal corruption, and sociopathy have negative value; they are dis-values. Sociopaths commit disvalues. *We don't need more sociopaths.* Selfishness is the opposite of living successfully, of living the quality life – the god life. *Selfishness* is worth less than zero. In this way *we can tell better from worse.*

The happy principles we offer in this report are, as noted, not rules or commands. Instead, they are guidelines to living a smooth balanced and harmonious life – an honest life, a life of humility and serenity, of peace of mind and peace in the world – a life of justice. *The world is not fair* but each of us can engage in fair-dealing: we can resolve not to cheat our fellow-man, not to cut corners, not to have fun at the expense of others, not to ‘put people down.’ It helps to know our Quality-Life values.

Therefore I shall soon, in a subsequent chapter, present a summary list of some of the moral principles that are derivations of this new paradigm. First, though, let me present a scenario.

Picture this: If you think you are alone on an island, then all you need to be concerned about are the laws of nature: you don’t want to hurt yourself.

If however it turns out that you encounter another individual on that island then the laws of human nature come into play.

If you have enough cognitive assets (enough sense) you will be respectful, show some consideration, and radiate good will seek the benefits of cooperation, encourage sharing. “I don’t want to hurt myself” becomes: “I won’t do to anyone what I

don't want them to do to me. I will strive to do no harm! For to do otherwise with this party I just encountered is to risk making an enemy who might fight me over the resources available on the island. I'd better show him that my attitude is that we're both better off if we work together."

If you want to live successfully, and thus have a Quality Life, then the next chapter will contain some useful suggestions to follow. It would be self-defeating for one to miss out on the benefits that will ensue when one dedicates himself or herself to this goal. This merits further discussion.

Chapter Thirteen

WHAT IS A QUALITY LIFE?

Due to your awareness of the principles of successful living, if you want to live a Quality Life then in as many ways as you can you will want to make everyone concerned, each party, a mutual winner. You will be careful to avoid selfishness. You will do random acts of kindness and express deliberate feelings of compassion and empathy.

If you want to live successfully and thus put Ethics into practice you will strive for clear, accurate, adult communication. You will neither act superior nor play the victim. Furthermore you'll be mindful that your **biases can become liabilities**. One has a liability when one confronts another and shows disrespect. This lessens the chances of your living a happy life, one of high quality.

You begin to build a quality life for yourself when you regard each individual, or a group of them, as deep, complex, as having a story to tell. And when a situation arises where there is interaction with another person, as a result of understanding these concepts, you seek to add value to that situation; you give that person your attention, you show that you care. For the fact is that successful living is about caring and sharing, and offering a helping hand to those less fortunate, or to those in need.

In every situation that comes up, you - as a morally healthy person - will seek to make things better. This implies that it is good sense to: "Make yourself better!" You will **work on self-improvement**. You'll be mindful that it is worthwhile to pursue

self-development. And in this way you will grow in self-understanding.

Did you know that we have a moral obligation to be good and to be happy. To be good, morally, is to have a good character. This is a big subject, and although we alluded to it earlier, more will be said about this because it is so vital.

How can we sum up in one short phrase the idea of being true to yourself? When you are true to your own true self you have authenticity, integrity, and honesty. Let's speak of it as "being real."

Being real implies living up to what you believe and not having double standards, one for yourself and one for others. It includes having high ideals (moral principles) and having your conduct correspond with those ideals. Some of us will do this consciously at first, until we make a habit of it, and some of us do it already intuitively.

Being real is a matter of degree and a person who knows how to live successfully will want to gain a high degree of this personal quality. Earlier we named this concept "morality." Let us here return to the topic and thus perhaps come to a deeper understanding of it. **Morality** is a very dynamic concept, for it can grow in at least two ways: One may add more moral principles to one's self-ideal; and one may more-and-more live up to those high ideals. Thus "morality" may be also understood as: "increasing correspondence with an improving self-ideal." As the actual self better approximates the ideal Self, morality is the measure. Morality is self-motivated - it is our guide to a better life, health, happiness. Moral principles are not rules; they are merely

guidelines to a more-comfortable, more-trouble-free life.

All components of a Quality Life fit together in a pattern, like the solution of a puzzle. Once you get on the right track your logical thinking will enable you to find the balanced pattern, the web of life and human relationships.

With this new knowledge put into practice by enough of us who learn these points, our **relations with one another will markedly improve**. There will be less heated quarrels, more anger management, more harmony, and more peace of mind.

Families will know how to be functional rather than dysfunctional. Members of the family will defer to one another, will show respect. **Our lives, due to this new insight on the principles of successful living, will be safer, more efficient, and more prosperous.**

Yes, we will prosper as a result. There are two ways this can happen: we can acquire more money, or we can arrange things so that the basics necessary for a quality life will cost us less.

Ethicists have connected the dots by reminding us that when Ethics is practiced, friction among humans is reduced - thus resulting in more-harmonious human relationships and interactions. They point out that an ethical world is a peaceful world, and a world of peace is a world of justice. As a result of their findings we clearly understand that peace implies justice. Without Justice there is no Peace.

Kindness, compassion and generosity enrich everyone, giver and receiver. Yet, for the human sharks, the selfish among us, the egoists, perhaps currently the best we can hope for is that they

regard others as sources of *potential value to satisfy their needs*, namely as cooperators, traders, or enhancers of their own life. They already are persuaded that this so. Hence it may not take much to convince them that they have a very good reason for treasuring, and being solicitous of, others. This is a testable hypothesis.

Since, due to our brain wiring, it is a fact of human nature that most everyone can sense injustice, once we know about the life of quality we will seek Justice. Hence we will want to achieve balance, we will want things to fit., If one wants peace, he or she will work for, or at least be an advocate for, Social Justice.

We, as a civil society, need to save ourselves from something that is dangerous to our well-being: namely, our propensity to resort to violence, either physical or psychological. Our first response often is to strike out. And many of us learn at a very early age: "If anyone bothers you, or annoys you, get even!" There will be no peace as long as we continue to think that violence solves anything. We are aware that peace without justice is no peace at all. Thus we need to have a clear understanding of justice. {And if we want to live in a civil society, we need civility.}

What is a definition of "justice"? Does Ethics have an analysis of the structure of justice? Many books have been written about this topic. As you are about to learn, scientific Ethics has a contribution to make also.

Chapter Fourteen

How to pursue justice

One of the sub-topics of Ethics is **justice**. Let's examine its opposite for a moment. An injustice is a *mismatch* (between someone's happiness and what we take to be their merit). For example, a crook must not live high while his victim suffers. In every injustice something is out of balance.

Justice requires giving others their due. ‘Reparation’ is a name for the obligation we have to compensate others for past wrongs or for a previous wrongful act. After analyzing the subject, researchers in scientific Ethics concluded that the highest forms of justice are reconciliation and rehabilitation. Vengeance is the lowest form. Let us explain, as we probe deeper into the matter.

UNDERSTANDING CLEARLY WHAT JUSTICE IS

Every person, from the most primitive to the most sophisticated, has a need for justice. “Justice” means “restoring the balance.” We innately sense when things are out of balance and we feel a need to set it right, to see the balance restored. However, the problem is that most every one of us have been settling for the lowest form of justice instead of aiming for the highest form as our goal; in that sense we have had a warped sense of justice. This calls for an analysis:

On the value spectrum, but below the value of those basic dimensions of value with which you are by now familiar, lie the values worth so little they are practically of zero worth. These are the Fragmentary values.

When these are applied to Justice, what do we find? The result is: Vengeance; Retribution; Payback; 'Getting even.' These are values worth a mere fraction. In contrast, let's see what results when the major dimensions are applied to the topic of justice:

The **S**-Value of justice is the notion of fairness, the idea that everyone is to be treated the same by the justice system; "everyone gets his day in court", everyone is entitled to legal counsel, etc.

The E-Value of justice is equity. Here belongs compensation; and also the consideration of individual circumstances, which (ideally) a judge takes into account.

The **I**-Value of justice provides us with the "three R's": Rehabilitation; Redemption; and Reconciliation. These are the highest forms of justice. These give us the most value in return for our efforts. These truly restore the balance.

The main point to keep in mind is that it is a distorted sense of justice to seek the fragmentary, fractional values of revenge and "getting even" rather than aiming for the best justice which means one or more of the three Rs.

To sum it all up, someone who cares, who has self-respect and enough sense to respect others, would focus upon facilitating and creating institutions and social arrangements so that human beings are not placed in situations where they will act badly.

For, as Dr. K. A. Appiah, of The Princeton University Center for Human Values, has written "It's good to feel compassion; it's better to have no cause to."

Let's all of us, pursuing our real self-interest, and avoiding selfishness, do what we can to arrange the circumstances in which our excellences can be elicited -- the conditions in which we can flourish.

That will be true justice.

The scientific conclusions are all tentative, dated, indexed and are in the “if” mode: IF one wants to live ethically, this is what could (and will likely) follow. Then they assign it a degree of probability; and give a correlation number. The entire enterprise is hypothetical – “**if** one wants happiness then....,” “**if** one wants success, then...” etc. Ethicists are *not* moralists. They do not pontificate. They teach by example.

A summarization of some of the highlights of this report may be helpful at this point. Also, what is it that those who live successfully know that others may not know?

Chapter Fifteen

HOW TO LIVE SUCCESSFULLY

Let us review some of the main highlights and learnings: We now have the ability to prioritize values in their correct order from better to worse since we are aware that some values are of more value to us than others. Caring (if one wants to live a successful life) is better than indifference. We may have known that already, but now we are even more aware of it.

As everyone knows, positive values are better than negative values; but what is not commonly known is that what is richer in properties is ordinarily better than what lacks them. Value, it turns out, is a function of meaning: the more valuable something is, the more meaningful it is to us, and the more meaning we find in something the more we will regard it as having value.

In addition, we now realize, as a result of studying the new science, that when one views each individual as possessing indefinitely-high value, one is seeing things clearly and is on the road to living successfully. We also understand now that if someone is *that valuable*, one would no more want to harm him or her than one would want to desecrate a treasure.

And we are aware and *mindful* that harm or abuse can be both psychological and physical. When something is done to hurt others, whether it is ridicule, bullying, or what is called “collateral damage,” value is lost.

As we go toward zero-value we are going in the direction of inertness, apathy, and death. In contrast, as we go toward more

positive value (as we add more properties, as we enrich the concept) we are going in the direction of life, of life more abundant.

It follows that as one works for social justice, works for a quality life for all, one is careful to *avoid violence*, and instead *to employ nonviolent direct action*. This is action, not passivity. And it inflicts no violence, no harm on other people. Recall that *successful living* is about caring: Take care of yourself, and take care of someone else.

Those who live successfully know how to gain value: They want to empower people from the bottom up; to give them a road to social upward mobility; provide opportunity. Also, they foster community and take on responsibility. Harmony begins within the individual, begins at home, and spreads out ward from there..

A good motto is: “No rights without responsibility.” Falling into a state of dependency is not advisable. Yet, of course, we all depend on the wonders that were invented before we came along; and we depend on each other.

Another logical imperative of successful living for us is: Whenever you can – without being a martyr - work to alleviate and reduce human suffering. As you pursue this goal take care of yourself so that not only will you be strong enough to be of help to others, but also you won’t have a happy life unless you stay healthy. The next point is not only reasonable but also is important! Each of us has a moral obligation to dispel unhappiness whenever we can.

Note that ants, tigers, and anteaters have brains, albeit somewhat primitive. Normal human beings, however, have developed a functioning cerebral cortex in the frontal lobes of their brains. The primitive brain, the *amygdala*, tells us to over-eat, to have frequent and indiscriminate sex, to get hostile, while the *cerebral cortex* tells us it is not wise to over-indulge; or too look for a fight – all of which are not in our best interest. That cortex is our mind at work, working for us.

Depression and anxiety, according to recent neurological discoveries, are abnormalities in the frontal lobe of the cerebral cortex. Experiments have shown that these two conditions decrease creativity.[which itself is a form of giftedness.] Creativity – Intrinsic intelligence – is a capacity, a gift. Not everyone has it – although they may possess Systemic intelligence, i.e. analytic capacities (to “see the trees” if not the forest), to connect some dots, to perceive some problems and plot out some solutions. Or they are endowed with Extrinsic intelligence, also called “street smarts,” that is to say, they have practical skills for adaptation to the environments in which they find themselves.

It is worth re-emphasizing that another imperative for the happy, successful person is: Be mindful! Reviewing what is necessary for a life of quality, we need to care about each other; and we need to practice being happy. **Have you noticed that happy people do not become terrorists, or whiners, or those feeling like victims?**

We also realize that we need to find ways of facilitating upward social mobility and ways of providing folks with greater opportunities. This applies to all of us: Be a **doer** not just a talker. Get something worthwhile done. How can we tell that it is worthwhile? It will comply with basic moral principles.

Chapter Sixteen

Basic Principles of Ethics

Becoming the best possible person facilitates our living the best-possible life, and successful living enables us to become the best we can be. The findings of research in the science of Ethics conclude that living a healthy, flourishing life on an ongoing basis necessitates our possessing a good character.

If we want to live in harmony with nature, we would strive to maximize value and to minimize disvalue (chaos, misery, destitution and avoidable suffering.) *We would support practical policies that implement this.*

In addition, recall that research in Brain Neurology has shown that we are pre-wired to seek our own personal benefit. A question that arises is: **What is that benefit and how can we attain it?**

Research by Dr. Post at Case Western Reserve has revealed that if we ‘make someone else happy’ [i.e., when we arrange conditions as to make such happiness more likely] we are then happy too. We come to feel our life is making a difference when we act this way; life seems more meaningful to us. It is a good feeling! It lifts us up. If we trust others, treat them decently, they often tend to treat us the same way. It is a win/win situation, all around. Those who apply the basic principle “Make things better” to themselves would strive to become even more successful than they already are. They would devote themselves to achieving this goal. In the process of doing so they would develop to the point where others might with some accuracy describe them as having ‘a good character.’ Let’s delve into this further in the next section.

Then we can summarize what we have learned are the basic derivations of the new paradigm named Ethics.

We are about to offer a list of ethical principles. These principles are not to be confused with rules. In the case of a *rule*, you must xyz, or else. In contrast, a moral principle is an “iffy” proposition: It is a hypothetical. It is in the form of: “IF you want to live successfully, if you want a quality life, a life of optimal well-being, then it is suggested that you xyz.” Thus rules and principles are distinctly different. One is not forced to comply with a principle, for it is only a suggestion. There is no coercion involved.

A person of good character will strive to adhere to some principles – such as the following:

A SUMMARY OF SOME OF THE BASIC PRINCIPLES

- 1) Honor and respect every individual.**
- 2) Everyone is doing the best one knows how. If we knew any better we would do better. It's mainly due to Ignorance as to why we behave badly.**
- 3) We are all in this together. We're all just trying to make a life.**
- 4) Work for mutually-beneficial relationships. What really helps you, helps me; and vice versa.**
- 5) Strive for excellence in performance! Aim to be a good person, one who values deeply yourself and others.**

6) Be authentic! Don't be a phony; be true to your true self.

7) In every situation in life the central question to ask yourself is: What action can I take here and now to create the greatest all-around value?

8) Provide everyone the full opportunity to express their creativity.

9) Empower the individual to express more of his full potential.

10) Look to creative design to solve problems.

11) Be consistent: Do not have double standards, one for yourself, and another standard for other people.

12) Include as many as possible into your in-group – widen your moral compass – be inclusive.

13)) Help those in need.

14) Be honest.⁵ Don't deceive others or “put them on” just for fun. Don't toy with people.

15) Be lawful: Do not violate the law unless it is a bad law, one that violates human dignity by contradicting one of these principles.

- 16) Recognize the individual's right to be autonomous.
Acknowledge a person's freedom over his/her actions or physical body.**
- 17) Be aware of the justice principle: acknowledge a person's right to due process, fair compensation for harm done, and fair distribution of benefits.**
- 18) Acknowledge a person's rights – among which is a right to life, to information, privacy, free expression, and safety.**

Becoming an early adopter of these concepts will make you wise and will contribute to bringing everyone closer to living a happy, successful, quality-filled life. Thus we see that in many ways awareness of this new science will benefit you.

Chapter Seventeen

A GOLDEN PRINCIPLE

Let me present for you a simple moral principle, one that is not so new. By now you realize that it is derived as a result of a single assumption, the definition of Ethics, an assumption which is partly a construction of the mind and partly empirical.

Here is the simple principle which many have described as ‘golden.’

Treat others as you want them to treat you.⁶

It thus follows from the Golden Principle that if one lives by this guideline, it's then imperative that one does not murder, steal, cheat, defraud, abuse, or deliberately harm. Furthermore, since one would not want others to treat her that way, she would not engage in self-centered, selfish, or inconsiderate conduct. S/he would recognize and acknowledge merit and achievement as s/he would want others to recognize her merit and capabilities. This implies that it is not ethically healthy to substitute (or to give priority to) one's connections and one's influence [who you know] for one's merit [what you know.]

It logically follows from this that “crony capitalism” and influence peddling is to be avoided as a matter of policy. Another good policy is to provide customized opportunities for the needy and deprived so that they may advance their station in life. A governing motto could be: No rights without responsibility! Some ethicists hold that in order to receive benefits one is to be addiction-free; one must consent to going through the drug and alcohol rehabilitation process, and then one must follow through with it. Others say it is actually wiser to give a Universal Basic Income (UBI) to everyone without preconditions – a small stipend at first, and then larger as we get more prosperous as a society. It would amount to social security for everyone regardless of age.

They claim it would be cost-effective since so many other programs would be dispensed with. It would be simpler and less of an embarrassment to the recipient – thus more ethical.

Another guide, along with the Golden Rule is this: Don't do something you are tempted to do that is morally questionable, even if you think you can get away with it!

Ethics is concerned with harmonious human relations. When is harmony achieved? Harmony is seen when things fit, when they are in the right order, and when people can tell the better from the worse. They can do that when they put their values in the right order, when they prioritize them. When they know their values they are able to do that.

The ultimate aim for those who apply Ethics to daily life, as we have mentioned earlier, is to provide a Quality Life (well-being) for one and all. How will this be done? As we will explain in some depth in Chapter 23, this is to be accomplished through creative design, by devising more and more helpful apps, and improved technology, through social inventions such as the UBI, etc., thus making the world work for everyone while depriving no one.

Life in an ethical world has many benefits for everyone. And in that later chapter we will spell out how such a world can come about, and how the science of Ethics, as well as the physical sciences, will help to bring this about, will make it a reality.

This book presents a guideline, a suggestion for a better life, which defines a field of useful knowledge known as Ethics. As a bonus it was able, as shown above, to yield the Golden Principle as one of its results!

A very *basic* principle was offered in Chapter 4, as you may recall. It is this: **I-value the individual** – for when you do this you are being ethical. {This is true, not only by definition, but also by observation.}

This means: “If you are ethical then you will Intrinsically-value each conscious human individual that you encounter in life.” It also applies to a group of people, each of whom has individuality. If you want to be ethical you will see each one as unique, as having a story to tell, as special in some way, as a deep and complex organism.

It is ethical to have harmonious cooperation on a shared worthwhile goal. What makes a goal “worthwhile” is that it enhances quality of life (well-being) without violating the set of principles derived by deduction within the Science of Ethics, many of which were listed in previous chapters. Once we settle on such a goal the physical and social sciences can show us how best to provide the means to reach efficiently that end-in-view. This *science* (as we will relate in Chapter 21 and also in the Appendix) *has measuring tools* relevant to the data.

Do you know the difference between **efficiency** and **effectiveness**? You will learn about it soon, after this report sheds some light upon other *relevant concepts that are prior to it*.

Chapter Eighteen

HUMILITY, EFFICIENCY, AND EFFECTIVENESS

"In most educational institutions, there is a total lack of the concept of human development and nation-building in the education process. The emphasis instead is on moneymaking and materialism. This has resulted in the gradual erosion of values among people and the body politic. A sense of belongingness must be developed amongst every individual learner. Every individual human being is prominently significant and has the capacity to contribute immensely to society and humanity."

-- Dr. Noushad Husain

Individual Ethics and Social Ethics are compatible studies; both are equally important and get equal emphasis in the theory presented in this book, for it is a theory with its many implications for living a trouble-free, harmonious life. When taken seriously (that is, when we devote ourselves to its norms) Ethics enables both our living well and our having better relationships in life.

An ethical person would not have fun, nor 'get ahead,' at the expense of others. Furthermore, in an effort to make things better, an ethical person would have the attitude expressed in this self-statement: "I care about people and our planet; and I want to share my good fortune with those who need a helping hand. Also I will do whatever I can to foster policies that increase upward social mobility." Such a view could well be part of a moral self-image which a person of good character possesses.

Now we can display an early attempt to formally systematize the initial concepts of the moral theory - concepts with which you are already familiar - then the Appendix shall exhibit the formalization of the theory in more depth.

Definition 1: Ethics is the body of useful knowledge that arises when I-value is applied to the individual, or to a group of them.

Theorem 1. An ethical individual would take care to **do no harm**.

[Some of the greatest harm done is by pious, self-righteous people believing themselves to be both moral and ethical in their decisions. Hence it is good to keep in mind that an *ethical* individual has **humility**. Research shows that self-respect, respect for others, and humility are qualities possessed by individuals described by their peers as “ethical.”]

Theorem 1 follows from Definition 1, for if human life is valuable, if an individual is, as Ethics requires, uncountably valuable - then it is irrational and counterproductive to deliberately cause that person harm.

Some scientists of Ethics recommend that we seek to use the least amount of material, energy, and time, to fulfill a purpose. They see the benefits of efficiency. Others point out the difference between efficiency and effectiveness, a distinction of which most outside the discipline are not aware.

The distinction is this: Systems exist for making the most efficient and effective use of our extrinsic resources. “Efficiency” means employing just the right amount of energy and material for a project to gain maximum **output**. It is doing the most with the least. [For example, it is far more efficient to use tidal power or solar power as a source of energy than it is to use coal, because the hidden costs of using coal (or oil, or nuclear) are too high.]

"Effectiveness" though is using that output for the greatest-good effect while *getting something done*. That effect is ultimately defined as quality of life. **There is no point in producing anything if it doesn't enhance the quality of life**, if it doesn't somehow make for the well-being of the human species, for the well-being of the individuals who are the members of that family. Do systems have any positive value? Ethicists argue that yes - they do. Here is the case they make:

A side-benefit of systems, such as norms, rules, the good laws, traffic lights, and the other common goods that we share, is that they create trust; they provide a certain amount of dependability. Human social structures flourish when there is a climate of trust. The opposite would be the worst-society imaginable, one in which nobody trusts anybody else. The more we trust each other the happier we are.

A society with a higher level of happiness is also one with a higher quality of life. The best leaders and executives will arrange it so that more citizens or more of the employees are happy persons. There are ways it can be done; and there are more than a few examples one can find on the internet of businesses and of countries where it already is being done.

The essence of the theory is that "Ethics" is a perspective ...a perspective on a human individual, or group of them. It arises when we view the human being as highly valuable. Also, the theory indicates that - if we are ethical - we will (and this is a basic idea) make things better, morally better. We are to *add value* if we want to be ethical. Lots of practical policy implications may be deduced from that definition (of the concept "Ethics") and from that basic idea: The scientific research results indicate that those who have a high degree of moral health are individuals who renounce all attempts at dehumanization.

Also to be avoided are greed; and a lack of humility. **Greed** in an individual may easily become what psychiatrists classify as 'an obsessive-compulsive disorder.' It has been observed: "If someone compulsively piles up old newspapers, people feel sorry for him or her, but if someone compulsively piles up money, people admire that individual. Yet it is the same condition!"

As an integral part of the theory of scientific Ethics, techniques and methods are proffered which enable us to make things better. In addition, that imperative in the science to constantly improve and upgrade encourages us to develop new 'moral technologies', that is, technologies which tend to make our lives easier, simpler, and more secure.

Such innovations are how we "get from here to there" - how we are more likely to live in a more-civilized world, in an ethical world - one that has less incentives for trouble-making, for crime and maliciousness. Predictably, in an ethical world there will be less needless stress of an anxious sort. [Chapter 23 below will offer more details and some examples.]

Becoming the best possible person facilitates our living the best-possible life, and living an ethical life enables us to become the best we can be. Living a healthy, flourishing life on an ongoing basis necessitates that we become ethical role-models, and that we practice being happy.

As the theory of a Science of Ethics is developed and expanded,⁷ the set (of related, interacting, axioms and definitions) offers a frame-of-reference to which other concepts from the history of ethics can be meaningfully attached. The previous chapter brought out, for example, that an implication of Theorem 1 - when

it is phrased in an imperative form - is this: Don't do to someone else what you wouldn't want them to do to you. Here you note another formulation of a very ancient and virtually-universal guide. It is described as "universal" since nearly every culture has a version of it, You recognize it, of course, as the precept known as "The Golden Rule."

Thus this radically-new paradigm has within it the potential, in more ways than one, to generate a traditional concept from the history of ideas in Moral Philosophy. The concepts are at once both new and old.

For most normal people moral goodness is their default position, yet we are by nature very fallible creatures prone to error.

Chapter Nineteen

Right, wrong, and happiness

It is worth reviewing a few other important points of Ethical science: Ethics is about evaluating moral values and principles, and to *comply with the moral principles, is ethically "right."* *Not to, is ethically "wrong."* That is how those terms are defined in the science.

Compassionate acts occur frequently all over the world, and they are evidence of an objective moral order.

That we need the entire human species as our support-group is a basic fact of empirical ethics. We are interdependent. Hence, let us seek harmonious cooperation; and we will be "*doing the right thing.*"

Research in Brain Neurology has shown that – as stated above - we seek our own personal benefit. A question that arises is: *What is that benefit* and how can we attain it? Recall the research being done on **happiness** at Case Western Reserve. Other schools such as Harvard University also have explored this concept and have enlarged our understanding of it. If “happiness” is entered into a search tool window on the internet, a rich lode of results will be obtained; it will reveal the latest research on the topic.

Moral laws are not imposed. This they have in common with natural law. People can attempt to violate them but there is a price to be paid. In the case of disregarding the logical order of the value priorities [recall the formula, **I > E > S**], the price is a values-confused, more-chaotic society, needing more-expensive repairs than is necessary. If, (since one’s *conscience is presently*

desensitized - either because it is asleep, or due to its being uneducated) , one personally does not experience any of the tension, stress, social dysfunction or aggravation that results from the values confusion, one's children [that one may care about] will experience the social chaos.

Ethical science, as you know by now, in common with other sciences, does not deal in absolutes. However it does deal with joy; with how to extract the most value out of life, and thus how to *live successfully*. [Later on, in the Appendix to this book an experiment in Ethics designed to increase the enjoyment in life will be offered, one in which the reader can voluntarily choose to take part.] Note that the Ethicists are not interested in, and have no use for, moralism. They emphasized for this report that just as everyone is free to listen to a medical doctor's diagnosis and prescription and then either to accept and act upon it or to ignore it, so also is everyone free to ignore the findings of Ethics.

Chapter Twenty

IMPULSE-CONTROL AND MORAL HEALTH

It is a common human predicament that we often choose an action other than the one we perceive to be best. Moral Philosophers spoke of this problem as *akrasia*. When we are able to choose what is good for us, when we know, and act upon, our own best interest, we have moral health.⁹ Let us here differentiate the concepts “desire” and “impulse.” Let’s explore what they have in common as well as the difference between them.

Desire is defined in an internet dictionary as “a longing, an urge, or a craving, as for something that brings satisfaction or enjoyment.” Some examples would be a desire for fame, or a sexual appetite.

An Impulse may be understood as: A sudden, involuntary inclination prompting to action: This inclination is often due to the influence of a particular mental state. [One may, for example, act from a generous impulse, or strike out at someone from an angry impulse.] *cf.*, [dictionary.com](#).

The two concepts may be related to one another; one may be swayed by an impulse to feed one’s appetites due to harboring a desire.

Acting rational is defined as: acting in what will actually be in your long term self-interest, not merely your short term self-interest – granted that we have an imperfect prediction capability about what will actually be in one’s long-term best interest.

Hence we conclude that moral health is often enhanced by impulse-control, that is, by considering long-term as well as short-term effects. To live an ethical life is to enjoy a high degree of moral health. What is a mark of low moral health? To find fault with others is not the ethical way to live. Neither is it ethical to blame, to name-call, to play the victim, to deride, or to defraud. To

overgeneralize is another cognitive error that reduces one's moral health. To believe oneself morally superior to another human being is an ethical fallacy, often involving cognition, such as: "I'm somebody, and you are a nobody." To hold on to a thought like that would be a cognitive liability, an ethical mistake.

A critic may react to the recommendation that one control his impulses by claiming that "for moral health there are many impulses that are best not controlled - such as impulses to love, compassion, and kindness."

if one wants to be highly morally-healthy it is preferable that one forms the habit of being loving and compassionate, and makes it a part of one's character. It can thus be a continuous feature of one's integrity rather than just occurring impulsively. It is also preferable that before giving in to an impulse to be kind one attempts to learn if the recipient of the kindness will receive it graciously rather than find it to be an embarrassment or an inconvenience. Will the recipient mind? Say, for example, you are planning to visit someone in a hospital or rehab facility [usually an act of kindness]; would that party object to a visit at this time? That is something to consider if one wants to be loving and considerate.

At times impulse-control is the right way to go. Long-term studies [of kindergarten kids who, in order to get more of them later, deferred eating immediately some marshmallows offered them by Psychologists] concluded that those kids were more successful in later life than those who could not control their urge to grab the available treats and scarf them down. Good parenting includes admonishing your child who, for example, gives in to an impulse to swipe something desired – or to help themselves to some money out of a lady's purse, even if the lady is their own loving mother.

If and when one has committed what one considers to be a ‘moral wrong’, one is to admit it, face up to it, make some appropriate reparations, and work out a program so as **not to do it again**. To feel *self-punishing guilt* over it would be a mistake. That would be counterproductive. And in the long-run corruption is also counterproductive. How does all this apply to the business person?

Hardly anyone in business sets out to be corrupt; they just take a morally-questionable first little step. Then one step leads to another. Eventually the corrupt practice becomes a habit. Rationalization and compartmentalization of the mind does the rest. The situation in which one finds himself, or the local culture in which one is immersed, seems to him to be applying pressure; one comes to believe: “Everyone’s doing it! I might as well also.” In this way a business person can gradually corrupt himself. He becomes seriously morally-unhealthy. He has not yet devoted himself to the ethical life.

To violate Ethics is to lack moral health, or have it but to a low degree. To rate "Excellent" on the H.V. P. (the Hartman Value Profile); or [the way Axiogenics consultants score it] to have it reveal that you neither over-value yourself and the world, nor do you under-value them, is to display (at that moment in time) a high degree of Moral Health.¹⁰

When one applies moral knowledge, within existing constraints, toward the goal of making life more optimal for one and all, let us speak of this as moral wisdom.

Ethical theory is a jewel of many facets. Is measurement included in the theory? And how important is trust in living successfully?

MEASUREMENT IN ETHICS, DIVERSITY, TRUST, AUTONOMY

Science measures everything; and ideas are to be measured by what philosophers have named “The Correspondence Theory of Truth,” not merely by the Coherence Theory. The latter theory requires only that the ideas fit together well and make sense. The test for the former theory is: Do our beliefs about ethics *correspond with* facts and with evidence?

The project, to make a science out of Ethics, is making progress. Both Moral Psychology and Applied Formal Axiology are the experimental branches of this new science.

Also we have seen the advent of several versions of a Happiness Index, and a 'Best Company to work for' Index. Note the fine work of the Ethisphere Institute which compiles a list of “the world’s most ethical companies.” Now, in four countries, there are many practitioners, coaches, and therapists who employ the Hartman Value Profile (the H.V.P.) in their work. The existence of such measuring instruments is an encouraging development. In one study of 5000 cases by Schoof and Demerest it was revealed that the majority of those tested believe that they should be living up to their highest potentials and ideals more than they now do. This is a source of tension for them. Life Coaches and therapists, with the aid of this research finding are thus aware of an area in which the counselee needs work; it gives them a clear direction on which to focus.

If you are sincere, kind, friendly and generous you have *morality*. If you are not a phony, or some kind of pretender, or imposter, but instead are honest and transparent, you have, by definition, authenticity. According to field research performed by Dr. R. Ringel, if you have both authenticity and morality you are cool. In the form of an equation, it looks like this: **C = f(a,m).**

The formula expresses that coolness is a function of authenticity and morality.

If anyone starts to feel superior to another who has a lower moral-health score - or even believes they are superior, in some moral sense, to anyone else - then *their moral-health score automatically drops far lower at the moment such a feeling or belief occurs!!* This is so because **Humility** is a vital component of Ethical-health. What are some other aspects of having Ethical health? Does it make for a unity of diversity? There is so much diversity among human beings. They are all different.

“While strife divides the one into many, love unites the many into one.”
--Empedocles (494-434 B.C.)

Strife {transposition of value} is divisive; Love {Intrinsic valuation} is unifying and makes for closeness. Ethics as science finds that life is most successful when there is diversity-within-unity. Social policy ought to be designed to further that goal.

Fundamental in Ethics is trust. Trust ...but with enough skepticism to avoid being gullible. Practical Ethics teaches us to avoid excessive suspicion of the motives of others. There is good reason for this. Too much skepticism leads to missed opportunities. If you are cynical, or overly-suspicious, you likely will later regret that you missed a good opportunity.

It is also the case that autonomy¹³ - one of the Moral Principles derived by the application of I-value - does not mean giving free reign to appetites. It does not mean going your own way without observing any of the norms, procedures, systems that bind a society together.

With regard to the majority of human beings I would make these observations: Our capacity to reason can help us control our inclinations to fall for the ethical fallacy that "anything goes!"

Some emotional states are in fact better than others. Self-discipline sets us free!! Let us cultivate excellence of character in ourselves. Avoid unnecessary strife. Emphasize constructiveness. Seek and find common ground and ask: What can we unite around? What shared goals can we work on? How can we foster more cooperation?

When something *fits together* we assign it some positive value. Hence let us work for policies which enhance the most people, policies which result in a multiplier effect (as it is known in Economics.) Such effects make everyone richer -- not just a tiny percentage of the population. Such policies fit things together well.

Living well means having a **quality life**, one which enables individuals to flourish and blossom. They are then most likely to be creative since they have the means and the leisure to indulge in the pursuit of a worthwhile project.

A virtue-theorist may point out that one's vices may interfere or even prevent one's adherence to the imperatives, that is, to those basic moral principles. So first and foremost, they would say, cultivate the virtues. They are the good-making features of a moral individual. If one wants to be good, one now knows how to do it: form good, moral habits, using every technique known to Psychology for habit formation – such as affirming daily, and personalizing, the vision of the ideal human you would like to become and to be.

Richard J. Davidson, in his new book, THE EMOTIONAL LIFE OF YOUR BRAIN, based upon different activity scans of the brain done by his neurological team, highlights six moral qualities it would be desirable to have, and gives exercises that enable an individual to acquire them: resilience; social intuition; self-

awareness; sensitivity to context; and sharp focus and attention. These can all be measured with precision by modern technology.

Is it not the case that one's actions are a reflection of one's inner morality? One's actions and conduct are very closely related to one's character and may be the behavioral expression of one's self-image, one's self-identity. Experimentation is now being conducted to verify this hypothesis. And as we noted earlier, a recent study has revealed that most people do not think they are as morally good as they should be; they are hard on themselves.

The contemporary Ethics Theory offered within these pages, this new paradigm for ethics, is a subsection or department of the vast and comprehensive science of Ethics which includes theory, practice, and empirical evidence. Above we have shown that the three dominant normative ethical theories familiar to students of Moral Philosophy are generated by an application of more basic analytical tools, *i.e.*, the primary value dimensions discovered and named by Dr. R. S. Hartman (1910-1973.)

<https://www.hartmaninstitute.org/about/about-robert-s-hartman/> Is it reasonable to claim that a theory that can accomplish this is superior to, and more-acceptable, than one which cannot? For once "Intrinsic Value" was defined, "Ethics" was then able to be defined as: the application of Intrinsic Value to the individual. All the rest follows from that. If one I-values himself or herself, is that enough to attain inner peace, or does one need an additional skill? The latter turns out to be the case.

Chapter Twenty-two

ON ACHIEVING EMOTIONAL PEACE

We can, thanks to the research of the late Dr. Albert Ellis, a world-class psychotherapist, teach an intelligent child at an early age the basics, the ABCs so to speak, of emotional stability. They are:

- A) Something happens in your life.
- B) You (the child – or **anyone** -- since this works for adults too) interpret it; you form an interpretation.
- C) You feel good or you feel bad. (Those are the ABCs.)

You don't have to feel bad. You can spare yourself this emotional pain. You can begin to experience, or keep, your state of serenity or joy. You can maintain your exuberance, your optimism, your curiosity, your hope. How? You merely change your interpretation of the activating event A: you work on step B. "B" stands for your beliefs about what occurred at A. You challenge those beliefs. You dispute that interpretation to see if it was silly; or to see if it's logical, to see if you have evidence for believing it. This is step D – for Dispute. The idea is to challenge or dispute erroneous or mistaken beliefs. Find a positive and friendly interpretation for A. Figure out a new way of understanding A that is not threatening. Find the love in it. Remember that love triumphs over fear.

The best way to do this is to look at your original B - the one that triggered your painful or uncomfortable emotion – look at that belief through a new lens. What is that lens? It is to view the matter from your strengths, what Psychologists speak of as your “cognitive assets.” The lens is your correct understanding of the value priorities along with your self-awareness.

This awareness you may have acquired by taking a values inventory, such as the Hartman test [the HVP described in the Appendix.] After it was scored you learned whether your assets were I-values: your capacity to work with people, form relationships and networks, express keen empathy, be guided by your internal moral compass, etc. Or your strength may be E-values: getting things done, setting noble goals and artfully filling in the steps that lead to those goals, *on schedule*; knowing your life mission and your unique path to success, strong determination to succeed, having *savoir faire*, that is, practical wisdom, know-how, etc. Or your best asset may be your S-values: your logical mind, your math skill, your financial timing, your scientific imagination and ability to manipulate abstract symbols and form mental maps, your accounting expertise, etc. The scientific research in this area of Ethics reveals that most people do not know their own cognitive assets; until they get a values profile they have mistaken ideas about their personal value strengths. They guess at it, and usually get it wrong.

Once you do reinterpret event A successfully, you will have a new feeling, and this is step **E**: a new peaceful emotion, one that you can enjoy. Those are the ABCDEs of emotional peace. Persons of any age and location who understand the method can utilize it to gain the resulting advantages.

GETTING TO AN ETHICAL WORLD

All of what was written earlier in this book may sound like something for the far future - until one is keenly aware as to "how to get from here to there." It would therefore be helpful in what follows to discuss some possible steps that could be taken, and actually are at present being taken, to make ethics a living reality.

Chapter Twenty-three

"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." -- Wayne Dyer

HOW ETHICS PREVAILS AND SPREADS OVER THE WORLD

For those who have been wondering how we arrive at an ethical world I would ask them to consider this: Ethics, the science, will progress by inspiring the development of workable technologies. These technologies are those that will have obvious benefits that will make life easier and more comfortable, thus reducing some of the stress that leads to conflicts.

Another example of the way technology does this is by facilitating harmonious human relations. One way this occurs is by the devising of improved personal coaching and counseling services which, due to their efficiency and low cost, will also likely help to reduce some of the stress and friction that aggravates people and prematurely ages them.

Some historical examples of ethical technologies are the jury system, the printing press, the telephone, television, and more-recently the internet, the iPhone. The new ethical technologies will also facilitate and provide more leisure, thus releasing people to fulfill their needs for adventure and romance. Adventure, among other ways, allows for excitement; and people need some

in their lives. There is no danger that in an ethical world life will be intolerably boring. Of this we can be confident.

“Grads of Life” <http://gradsoflife.org/> is such a technology which helps the unemployed get the training they need in a field that interests them, so that they can succeed. {“Success,” as explained in Ethics: A College Course, is an ethical concept.¹²}

Wikipedia is such a technology, and so is the Mozilla Firefox browser – both open-source collaborative endeavors. Among other ethical developments are federations such as this one: <https://www.usworker.coop/>. Also there are many organizations devoted to doing good-cause work that you may learn about on the internet. There are currently numerous nonprofit organizations devoted to social justice and/or to the common good.

The way it would work is this. Ethics becomes a disciplined body of reliable knowledge. It uses scientific methods and evidence to reach its conclusions. The experimental branch of the Science of Ethics is known today as the science of Moral Psychology. It manages to come up with a startling result you wouldn’t have likely expected. The mass media then broadcast these facts as (interesting) news. It gets on CNN, and even on some of the major networks. It seeps into the popular magazines and e-zines of the day. People might Twitter about it. Face-Book spreads the news about this interesting finding. Some creative person figures out a way to make it entertaining and even to perform it; it gets portrayed on You-Tube. Folks start to have some respect for the science of Ethics – just as many do now for the science of Physics. {Although the latter is 400 years older and its data are more regular -- they both are sciences. The data of Physics have less individuality than the data of Ethics, but (when the

physical material is radio-active) both have some spontaneity.}

Why does Physics have some prestige in the eyes of the laymen, the so-called “people in the street”? Because they are aware of, and use in their daily life, some of the technologies that the application of Physics generates.

You might ask what would be the analogy for Ethics? Could it have its own technologies? Why sure it could. And it does. They are, among others, techniques of self-improvement. Such techniques are more-effective ways of living so that one gains a sense of well-being, one flourishes, one feels that s/he has many “Ah Hah” and “Ta da!” moments during the day. When someone asks you how you feel, you respond “Awesome,” “Dazzling,” “Wonderful,” “Fantastic,” “Terrific,” or some such exuberant response. And you sincerely mean it. And you live with efficacy. You have more confidence. Dr. Bandura describes in some detail the concept “efficacy.”¹⁰ If one has efficacy, he informs us, one feels more like an outright success; and one knows how to reach the noble goals one sets for oneself.

The Internet is now brimming over with methodologies for becoming a more-effective individual, in mind (which is S-value); in body and in the material world (which is E-value); and in spirit - that is, inspiration, enthusiasm - (which is I-value.) Ethics will help in getting people to want to avail themselves of all these ways to further continuous self-improvement. Yes, Ethics can – and does – have its technologies, increasing in number at an exponential rate! And – such as the Universal Basic Income experiments now being tested in Finland, India, and Canada -- they exist here and now.

Today people have, and appreciate having, what no one had a

hundred years ago: washing machines, autos, air conditioners, portable phones, clean streets, flush toilets and other measures of public sanitation. These are the fruits of physical science and its applications. In years to come people will live in environments that are more humane, behave toward each other more decently, will be glad that they speak so honestly to one another, and yet diplomatically. They will have these skills for living that now we only dream about.

They will appreciate how everyone all around seeks to maximize the net value in each situation, while avoiding disvalue. The way they will do that is to know their values: they will know that one Life (an I-value) is worth more than all the material things in the world (E-values), and that one thing is worth more than all the theories, systems, ideologies and dogmas put together! An individual's life and dignity is worth more than a thing; and a thing is worth more than a number. They will see this clearly – as a result of basic Ethics being taught in kindergarten.¹³ It will be taught there *because some adults placed it into the curriculum for that age group, thereby setting a good example for the rest of the world to do likewise.* And just as Western Civilization's fashions, fads, convenience-foods, and music today spread rapidly around the world, even to countries and cultures you never would have predicted they would, so it will be with Ethical memes and ideas. In addition, there are other signs of hope.

Chapter Twenty-four

SIGNS OF HOPE

This writer does not agree with the pessimistic view that it is already too late for the human race. If there is a massive shift to the use of alternative energies we may survive global climate change. We may yet manage to live through the severe weather conditions that result directly from the melting of the polar ice caps.

We may, though, have to undergo a bankruptcy and reorganization of a sort, and/or suffer through a bout of excessive inflation, or stagflation. There is another option: we may support leaders who are willing, ready, and able to close tax loopholes. Those who can well afford to contribute to the common good, the super-rich, today do not always pay their fair share; instead they take advantage of existing loopholes and they evade making an adequate contribution. After the reforms, in order for the ethical administration to raise revenue, the evaders would be taxed perhaps to the level of the taxation rate that prevailed during the Eisenhower administration, a time when the USA was thriving and people were flourishing compared with today. With that revenue the government would rebuild the crumbling infrastructure; while those doing the work would have safe and secure working conditions.

If we do elect such leaders, who want to go ahead with all deliberate speed in developing clean, green, decentralized energy, and who create incentives to encourage profit-sharing businesses, there is still hope for us. For these are policies that democratically empower people, and thus are ethical policies.

You know from Chapter Three why Intrinsic value takes priority over Extrinsic value which in turn is more vital than Systemic value – though we need in our personal lives a balance of all of them. The references in the Bibliography will aid the reader to know exactly why it is the case, as the old saying has it “Life is larger than logic.”

You don't need to determine your highest Self-ideal immediately, as long as each month you are determining more of what it takes to Know Yourself. And how to Accept yourself. And acquiring smooth ways to Create yourself, i.e., to bring out your inner artist, your gifts and talents, to learn how best to express them. At that point you will very likely want to Give Yourself (namely, to take on responsibility, or, to perform before the public as you express your gifts, your value strengths, *i.e.*, your cognitive assets.) As each individual does this, “humanity” will take care of itself. Thus Ethics will help us flourish, and we will be living well.

Once you attain a high degree of moral health, you will be a conscientious objector to any behavior that violates persons, such as psychological or physical abuse, tyranny, war, forced conformity, or any impingements upon autonomy and authenticity.

When people, who today are unaware of it, hear about “the good life”, the morally-healthy life, you won't have to nudge them: they'll run toward it. Nearly all immorality is based on ignorance. If we knew better, if we really truly knew how, we would do better. A coherent, logical theory of Ethics dispels ignorance. Of course, there might always be a few exceptions, but they will be such a tiny minority, relative to the prevailing planetary ethos. This rapid transmission of information about how to live successfully and

flourish will be due, in part, to improvements coming along in communication.

Today we have something we didn't have a mere 57 years ago – the World Brain – the internet. I cannot even imagine what the human species will be like once knowledge of Ethics spreads around. Boosting up one another will replace put-downs. Practical realism (which includes optimism) will replace pessimism. The spirit of “Yes we can” will replace views such as: “It's impossible; it can't be done; forget it, there is no way.”

What Lincoln referred to as “the angels of our better nature” are emerging. Each generation is becoming smarter and has better values, on the whole, than the previous one.¹⁴

I predict that as an individual devotes himself or herself to being ethical, that individual will be more willing and ready to cooperate. This when practiced will in turn contribute to that individual's happiness. In the future, experimenters will design experiments to confirm this, and will either verify this prediction or disverify it.

With regard to the goal of becoming a more-ideal person, note that we have to first want that goal with firm determination. But if we know keenly before our minds the benefits that ensue, we will be glad to set a specific goal of moral self-improvement for ourselves, we will go after it, we will pursue the goal. The ultimate goal for most people once they have attained sufficient understanding, and want to improve the probabilities that they will live well themselves, will be to do what they can to help provide a Quality Life for one and all.

Afterword

In many respects human nature hasn't changed in 3000 years. We still operate out of self-interest. So the question then becomes: What is truly in our self-interest? In a song, Alphie is asked: "What's it all about?" Wise men say: To have health is in our self-interest. To have some wealth is also – at least enough to sustain us and to fulfill some of our basic needs. Happiness has been held up as a goal for which to aim. No one can deny that it is well to have money, health and happiness. But there is an even higher goal, one that gives us even greater fulfilment: it is to have a meaningful life. Our most basic need is the need for meaning. We want life to make sense. It turns out, the scientists of Ethics tell us, that value is itself based upon meaning. Thus the most valuable life is the most meaningful life. ...And that's what it's all about. We get the most value out of life if we aim to close the gap between the actual and the ideal, if we aim to make things better.

How is a meaningful life achieved? One way is to get involved in a project that many would agree is extremely worthwhile. For example, answering the two questions: What does it take to make peace? And will we do what it takes to make peace? Another way is to help make social ethics a living reality. To implement in concrete ways the motto, "Each for all and all for each" is to bring social ethics to life. It is an awareness that we each will flourish best when all others have the opportunity to bring out their talents and develop their unique gifts. A recommended affirmation is "I'm aware that I'll do better when everyone does better."

#*****#

APPENDIX

Human relations and ethics are about value – moral value. Thus the report began by clarifying the notion of “value.” Then it proceeded to define what the new science means by the term “Ethics.” The field of ethics is quite gradually being ushered out of its traditional setting, which is Moral Philosophy, and into a science – which is something rather new for this field. Perhaps one day Ethics (as science) will take its rightful place alongside Physics, each providing a balance for the other. Physics has been around for 400 years; Ethics is just getting started as a useful body of reliable knowledge that provides clarity in human relations.

Science deals with such questions as “What?,” “Which?,” and “How?” more than it does with the “Why?” Yet, in this report, when a definition for “Ethics” was given, the question was addressed as to whether there is even a need for Ethics: *Why* bother to study this topic? Natural Science reporters occasionally respond to that sort of question too.

To lead an ethical life and to build an ethical society is to live successfully. As the report continued, the benefits of clear thinking in these value areas became apparent to the reader.

It is wise to prioritize values, putting them in the proper order. This priority of values was discovered – not invented – by Robert S. Hartman, a philosopher/scientist, and a genius. He wrote about it in the now-classic book, The Structure of Value. A more-detailed, albeit somewhat technical review of some of the fundamentals of the theory of Ethics is appropriate here.

Value itself, as explained earlier, may be defined as a match, or correspondence, between the ideal and the actual. This language is too vague, so let's, in what follows, sharpen it up.

One's ideal of something is a picture in one's mind. The actual thing in the world possesses properties – perceived by the five major senses. As one describes the thing, one mentions its features, its qualities. These are its "attributes" (property-names); and if the attributes in mind match up with the actual properties of the thing – as a map may match its territory – then one is justified in claiming that this thing has "**value**." A good map is one that does match its territory, point for point. So a good x is an x that has all the properties it is supposed to have; in other words it's full value. As you are aware, both value and goodness are functions of properties: the more properties the valuer (or judge) bothers to find in the thing, the more valuable it is to him or her. If I were to go on and on talking about a rug on the floor you would be correct to infer that that rug has value to me. The more someone tells you about her new car, (or gives attention to any other item), the more that car (or other item) is becoming a "value" - at least to her.

Wherever she (the judge of the value) chooses to break off the description of that car, then if the actual car has all those features, she (the appraiser) will tend to call that car "a good one." You may have an entirely different set of qualities in mind when you speak of something you treasure than she would have, but the fact remains that if the thing "has them all" you are likely to find the thing to be "good." And that is what goodness-in-general, axiological "good" means.

Both 'value' and 'good' are what logicians speak of as *quantifiers* of the degree of one-to-one-correspondence between attributes

(which are conceived) and properties (which are perceived). These value terms are quantifiers of qualities.

As you will recall, the three basic value dimensions can be symbolized by the letters **S**, **E**, and **I**. They each have a measure: S-value is finite but elastic. E-values are countable (like the integers are countable.) I-value is uncountable (like the non-repeating decimal fractions are uncountable.) When the dimensions are put in order, ranked, prioritized, *the formula that results is this: **I > E > S**.* This formula displays the ordering of the values when they are prioritized,

I-value is better than E-value by a 'quantum leap', and E-value is far, far better than S-value, not only by their definitions, but also by observation and experience. As explained in the early chapters, an interpretation of the formula, relevant to Ethics, is this: One conscious human life is worth more than all the things in the world; and one material thing is worth more than all the dogmas, opinions, creeds, isms, and ideologies. Here are some other interpretations of the symbols: **E > S** says: evidence or fact is worth more than opinion. **I > E** says: empathy, authenticity, and/or caring are worth more than materialism. Let us now present the theory in an a somewhat more formalized or axiomatic form.

Definition One: When an individual is Intrinsically-valued one has entered the field of Ethics, since Ethics - as you recall - is defined as: the Intrinsic valuation of an individual, or a group of them.

For **x** to be better than **y**, is for **x** to have more of the concept's properties than **y** does, provided that both **x** and **y** are instances of the same class-concept, and both are on the same level of

abstraction. That is how the relation, *better than*, is defined in this science.

As pointed out earlier, an ethical person, having a good sense of values, knows better from worse, and knows higher quality from lower quality.

Axiom (I): An ethical individual wants to **make things morally better** and approves of, and endorses it when conditions are made better.

Implied imperatives: Make yourself better! - Make things better!
These are neither commands nor rules, merely guidelines.

Axiom (II): The ultimate goal for those who want to apply Ethics to life is eventually to provide a quality life for all.

Implied imperative: Work for Social Justice.

Optimal living, well-being, is enhanced by peace both within the individual and in the world in which s/he lives. Be aware that, as we explained earlier, without justice there is no peace. By their nature most human beings have a capacity to detect, and to disapprove of, injustice.

At every opportunity the individual who knows Ethics will ask himself, or herself, How can I add value to the situation?

Axiom (III): The more the individual improves, the more to that extent the world which he or she inhabits becomes a better place in which to live; and the more the world improves (becomes more peaceful, cooperative, and full of people feeling good will toward each other) the better off is the individual who lives in that world.

Let's here clarify a topic first raised in Chapter Six.

As we go toward zero-value we are going in the direction of inertness, apathy, and death. In contrast, as we go toward more positive value (as we add more properties, enrich the concept) we are going in the direction of life ...of life more abundant.

Axiom (IV): Each of us has a moral obligation to be morally good, to be happy, and *to dispel unhappiness*.

Implied imperative: Work to alleviate and reduce human suffering.

There are more-numerous and/or wider implications, than those mentioned here, which follow from the above postulates. One may visualize the kind of world we would have if this ethical system were taught in classrooms located wherever on this planet there is literacy, or there are people of intelligence.

Definition Two: "Morality" in this paradigm will mean: self being true to true self. It implies authenticity, honesty, and transparency. When the self-image (the self-ideal) of an individual contains some moral principles and it matches, to some measurable degree, the conduct of that individual (the actual observable self), then to that degree we may accurately speak of that person as moral.¹⁵

The claim has been made, by Anthony Appiah among others, that Ethics can employ scientific methods. Among these is experimentation. Moral Psychologists are devising and performing such experiments today. We can be confident that there will be more experiments adding to the body of reliable knowledge which is Ethics.

Since *syntropy* (order, value) is every bit as much natural law as is *entropy* (dissolution, destruction) if we want to live in harmony with nature, we would encourage more syntropy: we would strive to *maximize value* and to *minimize disvalue* (chaos, misery, destitution and avoidable suffering.) We would support practical policies that implement this.

You may, along the way take tests such as the Hartman Value Profile - which will efficiently enable you to learn what your strengths are in the least amount of time. You may take Preference Tests to clarify to yourself what your major interests are, the better for you to define yourself, and thus get in the groove. Once you have done that, and arranged your life accordingly, then your work, your activity, will ideally then be your play. You will come to love life. You will in effect be shouting out - silently to yourself - how great it is to be alive. You will feel a deep serenity: will know that you are at peace. In the next section an informal experiment is proposed, one you can do yourself.

On the internet there are toolkits for self-development for those who care to use them. If you want to know yourself better, these sites will help: See, for example: <http://www.axiometrics.net/>

TECHNICAL THEORY AND A FUN EXPERIMENT

You or I may live a quality life, just live, without thinking consciously about the following, but a scientist of Ethics may find this theoretical formulation and the resulting statistics to be useful since the procedure to score it is suggested by Integral Calculus:

Let's say there are x waking hours in a day; and that **joy** (which in this case may mean enjoyment, happiness, pleasure, satisfaction, delight, entertainment, amusement, sublimity, ecstasy, etc.) - **joy** ranges from 1 to 5 - - with 5 being the most.

And it is often so that every opportunity for service to others is a potential source of joy. Ethics, the science, does not recommend that one be a martyr. Yet *there is a satisfaction in knowing that you have been really helpful to someone, and thus have made a difference. You did not live in vain.*

Now, at the end of the day, as a fun experiment, after x hours have elapsed, sum up the total joy-score you experienced so far, from the beginning of the day, as you rated each hour from 1 to 5. Divide that number by x in order to find your joy score. Then sum up the scores achieved in the course of a year to find your **max-joy** score. Did you attain your maximum possible joy-per-day – or per year?

And are you aware that if you have more days and years in your life your cumulative max-joy score can get larger? And if you deliberately aim for health, and for what makes us healthy, your chances of living longer are increased. Isn't that true?

And if you share, your score goes up. If you work to find common ground with others you raise your score. If one does not **maintain a harmony with one's surroundings**, one is constantly threatened and thus not achieving the highest hope-fulfillment that would be attained if one lived in harmony; and thus one could not then experience the highest degree of joy.

When health is lost, much is lost; we value health **Intrinsically** if we know our values. The Ethicists conclude that it is self-defeating and thus stupid to sacrifice one's health to make money: this is to proceed as if **S** (money) is greater than **I** (health) when actually, from the values-priority formula **I > S**. Thus to believe **S > I** is a tran, a value-transposition ...a confusion in one's thinking with regard to values. Because it is a tran, when

applied to Ethics it is a moral fallacy. Ironically, if one does value money more than health, one then often has to sacrifice one's money in an attempt to recuperate one's health.

It also is a mistake to be so anxious about the future or the past that one does not enjoy the present. Those with wisdom, having moral health, regard each day as a present.

Of course, a vast field - such as ethics or physics - cannot be summed up in a sentence. Only a fool would even try. The **ethical theory reported on here, is** - as any intelligent reader can discern - **expandable** by applying the analytic tools it offers to other aspects of ethical data besides those mentioned in the essay. Let us now define some key terms.

Ethical actions are actions that are morally right. What is morally right betters the situation of parties affected by the action. In sum, a morally-right action is an act that betters society - as measured by the level of society's prosperity for each of its citizens. Such a society increases the happiness of its citizens as measured by a national happiness index. Several such indices have already been constructed as an internet search will reveal. Also available on the web are lists of the best places to work.

"Compassion" means a desire to alleviate or reduce the suffering of another, and when appropriate to show kindness.

Science presents us with empirical value. As we know from the history of science, philosophy is prior to science both logically and time-wise. There was Natural Philosophy before there was physical science. Philosophy correctly is known as the 'mother of sciences.' Philosophy asks the right questions. It is indispensable.

Philosophy discovered that every value is fact-laden and that every fact is value-laden ...i.e., persons select which facts to give attention to, and thus to value, selecting these out of the myriad of other facts available. This gives a new perspective to the distinctions made by Hume, in 1739, in his *Treatise*. [Often Hume is interpreted as believing that there is a rigid gap between fact and value.] R. S. Hartman, in 1967, taught us that value arises out of a novel recombination of facts. (Creativity is a rearrangement of existing properties.

Continuing to delve into matters of pure theory in Ethics, let me set forth an idea to stimulate further research: Motion is a function of Time. This is shown in the formulas $v = s/t$ or $D = rt$. Just as motion varies as per the amount of time consumed by that motion, in the same sense Ethics varies as the degree of harmonious cooperation. Ethics is a function of HC, harmonious cooperation. HC includes sharing, kindness, altruism, having a generous nature, courtesy, respect, reliability, integrity, honesty, etc.

What are some implications of this ethical system for Political Science? Let us strive to achieve **transparency** in administration at all levels of government all the time, for, as it has been written: "*As long as the authority is secretive, the population will be subjugated.*" Let open meetings be the rule rather than the exception. In a democracy what is there to hide. See this relevant link <http://anticorruptionact.org/> which discusses the plan to criminalize corruption and reward transparency. Should a nation supplement the GNP index with a Happiness Index? If yes, would you advocate for that? Would you work to make it happen?

Do we need to look upon others as our "enemy"? Can we instead define each of them as a fellow vulnerable human being, capable of suffering, no doubt misguided in some ways? We are all

prone to exaggeration, conclusion-leaping, fumbling, making stupid mistakes - perhaps a touch of paranoia. Until we kill the ego, we are defensive of it. Once we gain true humility we are no longer defensive/offensive....we see no need "to go to war." We don't want to commit harm. We renounce violence. We want to arrange our lives so that others are happy to see us and ourselves happy to see other people. Thus, in this way, we set an example that others most likely will want to copy. So let us be a role-model for the rest of the world.

In pursuit of this goal we shall strive to take other people's interests seriously, take them into account, learn about other people's situations, and then use our imaginations to walk a while in their moccasins. It's not easy but it's worth the effort.

Once we become wise, we will then agree with this proposition: "The wise gather together to help one another in every aspect of living." This profound insight conveys the thought that considerate helpful **cooperation is central** to ethical living, to having good human relationships. Let us seek, and find, the common ground, the shared concerns, on which we can cooperate. It can be done; and it also is well worthwhile doing.

The Start of Something Better

“A flash of enlightenment offers a preview of coming attractions, but when it fades,
you will see more clearly what separates you from that state --
your compulsive habits, outmoded beliefs, false associations, and other mental structures.
Just when our lives are starting to get better, we may feel
like things are getting worse - because for the first time
we see clearly what needs to be done.”

--- Dan Millman in No Ordinary Moments

END NOTES

- 1) It's a perspective on individuals which was explained at some length in Katz – **BASIC ETHICS: a systematic approach** (2014) <http://tinyurl.com/mfcgzfz>
- 2) From the book *Progressive Logic*, (Los Angeles, Empathic Science Institute, 2005) pp. 10-14. For more information see: <http://www.empathicscience.org/proglog.html> And see - <http://www.valueinsights.com/axiology.html>
- 3) See, for the analysis, pages 30-35 of **Basic Ethics: a systematic approach**.
- 4) For more details, see pages 9-12 of **BASIC ETHICS: a systematic approach**.
- 5) The Principle of Honesty allows for some rare exceptions: one may deceive to save a life if there is a high probability that lying will actually save life; or if one is a magician, an illusionist doing it for purposes of entertainment, deception is allowed; or bluffing in a game such as poker is also morally permissible.
- 6) It applies to an individual unless he or she is into sadism, masochism, or some other mental disturbance or extreme social deviance.
- 7) One way for educators and teachers who care enough to contribute to the enterprise is to rephrase the academic jargon into language which will be acceptable in classrooms of many grade levels. Better yet, get a friend who has the talent for it, to put the moral principles into Children's-book stories, and illustrate

the stories with attractive graphics. And don't forget the illustrated comic-book forms of presentation; and power-point slides. For example, see: B. J. Thomas – “Using Things and Loving People” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J_K9NtiLi_E

- 8) If you wish to create yourself, develop your talents and strengths, there are companies – a couple of which are cited in the Appendix as examples – which can be of service by means of their life-coaching facilities. If your aim is to improve yourself there are dozens and dozens of websites devoted to teaching self-improvement. For example, [valueinsights.com](http://www.valueinsights.com) or <http://www.zoemckey.com/>
- 9) See for details: Daniel P. Thero - Understanding Moral Weakness.
- 10) See Aspects of Ethics: Views through a new lens, pages 11-14, or a more-detailed explanation of this concept ‘efficacy’: <http://wadeharvey.myqol.com/wadeharvey/PDFs/Aspects%20of%20Ethics%20.pdf>
- 11) Self-defeating behavior may be described as conduct that rates a low degree on the QL measuring scale: *i.e.*, a low Value Quotient on the Hartman Value Profile; or a low rank on a social happiness index.
- 12) For details, see pp. 57-59 of M. C. Katz - **ETHICS: A College Course.** <http://www.hartmaninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Katz-ETHICS-A-college-course.pdf> It is suggested that if readers study the references offered in the Bibliography they will acquire more of the full picture as to what is intended in this axiomatic treatment of Ethics, and as to where the

model might take us with regard to political behavior, to family relationships, to societal justice, etc.

13) See the last chapter of **Basic Ethics**.

14) There is more volunteering, more altruism, more acts of kindness - as reported in Yes Magazine <http://www.yesmagazine.org/> and in The Optimist Magazine <http://www.theoptimist.com/> Ethics is catching on! This is happening now.

15) For more details see pages 29-35 of **Basic Ethics**.
<http://tinyurl.com/mfcgzfz>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For further insight into the topics of Ethics, as well as to add value, check out these links and references. Thus you may enhance your reading enjoyment:

Albert Bandura, (1991). Self-regulation of motivation through anticipatory and self-regulatory mechanisms. In R. A. Dienstbier (Ed.), Perspectives on motivation: Nebraska symposium on motivation (Vol. 38, pp. 69-164). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Roger Blair - "A cognitive developmental approach to morality: investigating the psychopath," *Cognition* 57 1995): 1-29

Derek Bok - **The Politics of Happiness:** What Government Can Learn from the New Research on Well-Being (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010.)

Richard Davidson, Sharon Begley - **The Emotional Life of Your Brain: How Its Unique Patterns Affect the Way You Think, Feel,**

and Live--and How You Can Change Them (Penguin Group, Hudson Street Press, 2012) <http://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/emotional-life-of-your-brain-richard-i-davidson/1102246573?ean=9781594630897&itm=1&usri=the%2bemotional%2blife%2bof%2byour%2bbrain>

Ed Diener and Robert Biswas-Diener - **Happiness: Unlocking the Mysteries of Psychological Wealth**, (Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2008)

Albert Ellis & Robert A .Harper - **A Guide to Rational Living in an Irrational World** (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, 1975)
<http://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/a-new-guide-to-rational-living-albert-ellis/1003835847?ean=9780136149095>

Robert Emmons - **Thanks! How the New Science of Gratitude Can Make You Happier** (Houghton Mifflin Company, 2007)

Richard Florida - **The Rise of the Creative Class** (NY: Basic Books, 2004)

Moral Sentiments and Material Interests: The Foundations of Cooperation in Economic Life by Herbert Gintis, Samuel Bowles, Robert T. Boyd, and Ernst Fehr (Editors). (The M.I.T. Press, 2005)

Mary Gordon - **Roots of Empathy** (Toronto: Thomas Allen Publishers, 2005.) - See: Roots of Empathy.- Research Results at this site: <http://www.rootsofempathy.org/research/>

Bruce Hamstra - **Why Good People Do Bad Things: How to make moral choices in an immoral world** (New Jersey, Carol Publishing, 1996)

Dan Harris - **10% Happier**: How I Tamed the Voice in My Head, Reduced Stress (William Morrow Publishers, 2016)

Robert S. Hartman - **The Structure of Value** (Southern Illinois University Press, 1967)

Robert S. Hartman - , “**Axiology As A Science.**”

<http://www.hartmaninstitute.org/html/AxiologyAsAScience.html>

Hazel Henderson - **Politics of the Solar Age**

(Indianapolis, IN: Knowledge Systems, 1988)

Hazel Henderson - **Ethical Markets**: Growing the Green Economy (White River, VT: Chelsea Green Publishers, 2006.)

Hazel Henderson - **Building a Win-Win Economy** (1996)

M. C. Katz - **ETHICS FOR THE 21st CENTURY** (2015)

<http://www.myqol.com/wadeharvey/PDFs/ETHICS%20FOR%20THE%2021ST%20CENTURY.pdf>

M. C. Katz - **BASIC ETHICS: a systematic approach** (2014)

<http://tinyurl.com/mfcgzfz>

M. C. Katz& Wade Harvey - **LIVING THE GOOD LIFE**: Recent answers to tough questions (2007)

http://wadeharvey.myqol.com/wadeharvey/Living_The_Good_Life.pdf

M. C. Katz - **A UNIFIED THEORY OF ETHICS** (January 2010)

<http://www.myqol.com/wadeharvey/A%20UNIFIED%20THEORY%20OF%20ETHICS.pdf>

This booklet, written in dialogue form, is the first of four parts. The other three parts are :

Part II - ETHICAL ADVENTURES

<http://wadeharvey.myqol.com/wadeharvey/PDFs/ETHICAL%20ADVENTURES.pdf>

Part III - ETHICAL EXPLORATIONS

<http://wadeharvey.myqol.com/wadeharvey/PDFs/ETHICAL%20EXPLORATIONS%20.pdf>

Part IV - ASPECTS OF ETHICS

<http://wadeharvey.myqol.com/wadeharvey/PDFs/Aspects%20of%20Ethics%20.pdf>

M. C. Katz - **ETHICS: A College Course.**

<http://www.hartmaninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Katz-ETHICS-A-college-course.pdf>

M. C. Katz - **ETHICS AS SCIENCE** (2000)

<https://www.scribd.com/doc/310236379/Ethics-as-Science-A-Bookletpdf>

M. C. Katz - **Sciences of Man and Social Ethics** (Boston, Branden Press, 1969) <http://philpapers.org/rec/KATSOM>

George Lynn & Cynthia Johnson – **Breaking the Trance: A Practical Guide for Parenting the Screen-Dependent Child** (Las Vegas, NV: Central Recovery Press, 2016)

Sonja Lyubomirsky - **The How of Happiness**: A Scientific Approach to Getting the Life You Want (NY: Penguin Press, 2008)

Zoe McKey – **Find What You Were Born For**: Discover your inborn *skills* (Kalash Media) <http://www.zoemckey.com/>

Martha C. Nussbaum - **Frontiers of Justice** (Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press, 2007)

Martha C. Nussbaum, **Upheavals of Thought**: the intelligence of the emotions (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Daniel H. Pink, **The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us** (NY: Penguin - Riverhead Books, 2009)

Jeremy Rifkin - **The Empathic Civilization**
(NY: Tarcher/Penguin, 2009.)

Jeremy Rifkin - **The Empathic Civilization** – a video.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l7AWnfFRc7g>

Jeanne Segal - **Raising Your Emotional Intelligence: A Practical Guide** (NY: Holt, 1997).

Tal Ben-Shahar - **Happier: Learn the Secrets to Daily Joy and Lasting Fulfillment** (NY: McGraw-Hill, 2007)

Eugene Soltes, **Why They Do It**: Inside the mind of the white-collar criminal (NY, Philadelphia: Pereus Books, 2016)

Robert Wright, **NONZERO: The Logic of Human Destiny**
(NY: Pantheon Books, 2001)

The Five States of Moral Growth in Children - from infancy to late teens [A very good explanation of moral health and the parents' role in furthering it.]
<http://www.askdrsears.com/topics/parenting/discipline-behavior/morals-manners/5-stages-moral-growth-children>

Living in a more peaceful world <http://worldwithoutwar.com/>

The Ethisphere Institute
<http://worldsmostethicalcompanies.ethisphere.com/>

World Happiness Report
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Happiness_Report

On Corruption – three websites to view:
<http://blog.transparency.org/2011/07/18/corruption-a-crime-against-society/>

<https://www.google.com/webhp?ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8#q=the+crime+of+corruption>