THE STRUCTURE OF ETHICS:

ACHIEVING MORAL CLARITY

Marvin C. Katz, Ph.D.

2019

Contents

"Human evolution appears to be adaptations of Self to what is beneficial to self. Despite "man's inhumanity to man", evolution appears to be geared toward survival for humans. That humans can come to realize their interdependence with all that is *other* in ecosystems, is a hope to be desired as an antidote for the ravages of greed."
----**Anonymous**

Preface

According to Webster's II Dictionary, a definition of "ethics" is this:
"a system of moral values that guides conduct." A system of ethics deals with questions such as "What is the opposite of being ethical?" "How shall I live?" "What is a good life?" Do I have any obligations?"
New knowledge in human relations – as well as ancient insights in traditional ethics - informs us that some opposites of being ethical are being selfish, being corrupt, being inauthentic, being hypocritical; or any combination of these.

This book will address questions about morality, as well as about concepts like moral excellence, *viz*., character traits or qualities valued as being good, valued as promoting individual and social well-being. In addition it will operate on the premiss that an understanding of the concept "value" is logically prior to a comprehension of the concept "moral value." This discussion falls within the area known to philosophers as 'meta-ethics.'

The book will also address Normative Ethics, and will talk about the practical means of making good ethical decisions and determining a moral course of action. It will further address Applied Ethics, and indicate how moral outcomes can be achieved in specific situations.

The concepts in this essay are controversial but that should be no surprise since virtually every proposition in both philosophy and science is controversial. The author invites readers to be constructive and either to build upon this model for ethics, or offer a superior one and tell exactly why it is superior to the paradigm offered within these pages. In this work "morality" is a personal trait, and "Ethics" is the name of the entire discipline. That is how these terms are tentatively employed, an arrangement that will be justified by good reasons.

Introduction

The aim of this project is cooperatively with others to build a superior Ethical Theory, based upon sound scientific foundations, by synthesizing into one system the best we can learn from many other sources. When this theory is applied it will result in human development and moral health. Those who agree with this theory - put it into practice and live it - will likely achieve moral integration (which is also known as *moral engagement*.) The purpose of this project is to guide us toward a higher-quality life; as well as – agreeing with the aims of Dr. E. Yudkowsky – to guide people toward "beauty, happiness, fun, laughter, challenge and learning." Ethics, as higher human development, lends itself to being viewed under multiple lenses, as the reader will see in the pages that follow.

 A *framework* is a practice or design that can be repeatedly applied to solving problems. The Hartman/Katz Unified Theory of Ethics is such a framework: It is a theoretical frame-of-reference that orders and explains the relevant data. Hypocrisy and corruption, as well as helpfulness and responsibility are some of the data of Ethics. This framework is based upon Neurology, Cognitive Science, Behavioral Economics, Cybernetics, Moral Psychology, Complex System Theory, and Formal Axiology.

This Ethical Theory is highly tentative and subject to revision when better ideas come along. Complying with the guidelines for living ethically, suggested by the system offered in these pages, will not necessarily prevent grief, missed opportunities, humiliation, or heartbreak.   The understanding gained may however aid one in flourishing and having a keen sense of well-being.

> **"The aim of an argument or discussion**
>
> **should not be victory but progress"**
>
> — Joseph Joubert

CHAPTER ONE

WHAT IS STRUCTURE?

The title of this project – the structure of Ethics - calls our attention to the concept of *structure*. Structure may be defined as "an organization or system that is made up of many parts that work together and the way in which these parts are arranged into a whole;" Alternatively, at times, it may be understood as: "a complex system considered from the point of view of the whole rather than of any single part or element."

 Without structure we lose function. {On the quantum level, energy is transformed into matter. Matter is structured energy.}   On the human level, which is the concern of Ethics, we note that without *compatibility* we lose functionality.   Coherence of viewpoints provides the structure for ethical interaction. Narrow tribal concerns divide us and set us apart from one another. Human nature is very flexible and is continually changing, though there are some invariants. We are still evolving from tribalism. We are going in the direction of recognizing that we are all one family – the human species is our family. Eventually thinking people will become conscious that we are all citizens of the planet, Earth. We will cooperate on that basis. We will create new structures to stabilize the new relationships that will evolve.

In the early days of the human race structure existed within a family. There was a father, a mother, and children. This structure persisted for many, many generations, and it served as the basis for the extended family. These collections, of usually no more than 50 people, constituted **a tribe**. Later on, some of the tribes merged became ethnic groups. Today we may view these ethnicities as

subcultures. We will be better off if *we avoid the danger of sinking back into tribalism.* We will happily embrace our diversity within a strong feeling of unity.

Tribal structures dissolve in part due to dispersion of its members, to intermarriage with those from other tribes, or to intermingling with others who have differing perspectives and viewpoints.

Too many – or too severe - *differences* though are likely to cause *friction.* And friction causes trouble. As mentioned earlier, the less compatibility, the less functionality.

To avoid dysfunction, to avoid trouble, it helps if subcultures at least partially assimilate into one main planetary culture - since the more we can manage to have compatible viewpoints – or at least **to cohere** the ones we have – the better we will get along, and the more likely we will be to be considerate of one another. We will have less violent quarrels and be less viciously argumentative. This may sound utopian - but with the help of a super-computer showing us where we actually do agree - it can be done!

This computer will have as input big data; it will be **programmed to focus in on consensus viewpoints**. Thus it will show us how much we share common dreams and coherent beliefs. The technology to do this already exists: Pegasystems, Inc. is one of first businesses to offer a rule management system and the software to run it which is known as a 'rule engine.' Among other functions, this code provides the ability to, define, classify, and to verify consistency of consensus findings.

With the aid of social media this computer's noncontroversial output will be widely publicized by all sorts of media. If done right, these reported findings will come to feel rather authoritative. They may thus gain wide respect, at least by educated people. These findings could serve as guidelines for educators, policy-makers, and parents. It is predictable that the widespread sharing of the ethical policy agendas announced by this computer - and agreement that the consensus is eminently reasonable - will serve to facilitate the chances of our living

in an ethical world. These factors will help to speed the arrival of a better world.

Nature, we note, works by conservation of energy. Human nature though thrives by conservation of support networks.

 Note too that there is a logical reflective symmetry in certain traditional moral principles such as reciprocity, as well as in some forms of The Golden Rule. Also note that same structure in these maxims that through the years have aided people in making moral decisions:

"Live by the sword; die by the sword."

"We reap what we sow."

"If you want respect, treat others with respect."

These concepts suggest oscillation, cycles, *reciprocation* – all of which are phenomena that we see in nature.

Here are some further structural points to heed:
(1) If one has a good character, all else being equal, one will tend to perform worthwhile actions and will tend to "do the right thing."

 (2) Being morally good (by definition and observation) often results in doing good but not necessarily the other way around. Those with a criminal mind may at times do something good. However they do not often do so, nor do they consistently make ethical decisions

Right now in the field of e*thics* there are rigorous scientific studies being done under the rubric **Moral Psychology.** Some refer to it as the *Science of the Moral Sense*. These experimental studies deal with aspects traditionally studied as "ethics." In this sense**, ethics already is science**. Also it may be of interest - that in 2017 Prof. Bloom, a Yale University Moral Psychologist, has obtained over $1,000,000 in funding from a Swiss Foundation for further research into the development of morality in children. Details are given in this report: https://yaledailynews.com/blog/2017/10/12/bloom-awarded-prize-for-child-morality-research/   The results of his work are summed up in this book: Paul Bloom, Just Babies:The Origins of Good and Evil (NY: Random House-Crown, 2016)   For an insightful review of this book,

Caveat: Too rigid a system of ethical logic can crash and burn in the face of complex situations and thus we must be flexible enough to temper reason with other considerations like compassion. The currently-proposed Hartman/Katz paradigm allows for both reason and compassion. Let us be mindful of the diversity of human thought and that some situations are too ethically complex for anyone who is not in that situation to judge.   In those cases the individual simply has to make his own best choices about what he can best live with. In emergency situations, such as if you are in a burning building looking to see where you can exit, Ethics does not apply. If you are being shot at you seek to escape; Ethics is suspended in those circumstances. Note that Ethics theory implies that you need to survive, and to stay strong so that you are in a better position to be of help to others.

 We have to find a balance between competing ethical concerns. At times we are faced with a complex ethical choice for which there easily may be no right answer, but not every situation should be regarded as highly-complex as that is too absolutist a position to hold.

 A sound ethical theory will correlate highly with human nature. And human nature is a part of nature. Science helps us to understand nature. Thus as science informs us more extensively about human nature we will see the emergence of good ethical theory. Its parts will work together and be arranged into a logical whole. Its *structure* will be clearly revealed.

The idea of structure when applied to a theory would dictate that the theory define its key terms and make explicit its undefined assumptions. What we shall refer to here as the 'Axiom' is a fertile concept which can suggest or imply the entire project.   Our entire theory derives its motivation from that concept.   The Axiom is a generative idea. {For Physics the axiom is: the transformations of energy.} This current ethical theory thus has an Axiom and will define the central terms "Ethics" and "morality." Then, from these, the rest of

the theory may be derived. Let us turn to that task now.

> "**You cannot do a kindness too soon because you never know how soon it will be too late."**
> ---Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1843

CHAPTER TWO

WHAT IS ETHICS?

Recently news media carried a report about a homeless guy. He found a briefcase containing a lot of cash in a public place. He promptly went to the nearby police precinct and turned it in. When questioned, he simply said it was the "right thing to do."

In October, 2014 this column appeared in the online newswire magazine Runners World & Running Times:
***A North Dakota high school senior carried her injured competitor across the finish line of their conference championship** last Saturday.*

The Devils Lake Journal reports that Devils Lake High School's Melanie Bailey came upon Fargo South senior Danielle LeNoue just past the two-mile mark of the roughly 2.5-mile course. Other runners streamed past, but Bailey stopped and offered her assistance to LeNoue, who was limping and crying, and obviously in distress.

Despite LeNoue's insistence that Bailey continue on without her, Bailey declined to do so.   "She was just sobbing, I couldn't leave her," Bailey told the Devils Lake Journal.

LeNoue later found out she had torn her patella tendon and meniscus. Bailey tried at first to have LeNoue lean on her so the two could walk together, but they found that that wasn't enough. Bailey then picked LeNoue up and carried her approximately one quarter of a mile on her back to the finish line. Bailey crossed the line in 178th place, out of 180 runners in the field.

Bailey, an aspiring physical therapist, told the Devils Lake Journal, **"I feel like I was just doing the right thing."**

This system of Ethics is not – in contrast with many other purported ethical theories - oriented around the concept "action." Rather, it is concerned with the individual of good character. Such a person would tend to **'do the right thing'** most of the time either out of habit and/or out of devotion to being a moral person.   Acts and action eventually follow, but the intentions and motives of the individual are what is important, [as Kant realized way back when he wrote the *Grundlagen* -- the Metaphysics of Morals.]
Let me now paint for you a scenario in order to introduce one of the most basic principles of Ethics, as well as to define for you what is meant by "Ethics" in this modernized paradigm adapted for the 21st -Century.

If a person is alone on a desert island he is subject only to the laws of nature*: he wants to avoid hurting himself*. Now it turns out there is another individual on this island. The first fellow thought he was all alone but he was mistaken. Now, though, social interaction enters the picture. He is subject to the laws of human nature, as well as to what some may refer to as 'the moral law.'

Now we generalize the principle "avoid hurting yourself"; it becomes **Do no harm!** Now he doesn't want to hurt another, because if he did, he wouldn't get *the benefits of cooperation* **to build a better quality of life for the both of them.**

Once one knows his ethics he is okay with caring, sharing, and cooperating.

Note that there is a definition of "ethics" and a basic assumption of "ethics. Let's speak of the latter as an "axiom." All the rest of the theory and all the applications follow from these: the definition and the axiom!

The definition of ethics is a perspective we have, a way of regarding an individual, or a group of individuals. It is this: when you view an individual as of uncountably-high value, you are in the field of Ethics, you are being ethical.

The 'Axiom of Ethics' is this: **Make things morally better!**
It also can be stated: *An ethical individual tends to support, and approve of, making things morally better*. In this first principle (the Axiom) the word "morally" indicates that we are to make things better for people.

Being ethical often results in creating value in your encounters with another individual -- creating a win/win outcome.

One would likely do this if one cares; and one *will* care, once one regards that other person as highly-valuable. People will tend to value other individuals this way by becoming aware of, and comprehending, the very definition of "Ethics" itself. This very-basic concept may be understood as follows:

Ethics arises when one Intrinsically values an individual or a group of them. An explanation of this and what this entails will be taken up later when the concept "value" is discussed in some detail.

INSIGHT ON ETHICS

These **are facts** of Ethics:

A good moral decision depends upon the facts of the situation.

A moral person has authenticity to a large degree. (The meaning and structure of authenticity will be discussed in a future chapter.)

'Morality' is a personal trait; 'Ethics' is the name of the entire discipline. (That is how these terms are tentatively-employed in this essay.)

It is **ethical** to be considerate of others.

It is ethical to help others without being a martyr.
It is ethical to be helpful, to be of service, to want to cooperate.

It is ethical to foster the well-being of others.

It is ethical to help others rise in the quality of their life.

"You can foster the well-being of others by enhancing life, health, knowledge, freedom, abundance, safety, beauty and peace. History shows that when we empathize with others and apply our ingenuity to improving the human condition, we can make progress in doing so, and you can help to continue that progress."
---Stephen Pinker

It is ethical to take on some responsibility and to be accountable for it. All this will add value to the situation. That, in fact, is what Ethics is about: namely, **adding value**. When an individual asks herself: "How can I add some value to this situation?" she is being creative. Creativity plays a role in Ethics

Hence Ethics is about _creating value in human relationships_.

Good human relations are harmonious human relations. They are non-judgmental, morally-speaking; they are merciful and forgiving. They are not selfish, nor self-centered. Yes, we are all self-serving, but to be _selfish_, or (_for a mature adult to be) merely self-centered_, is to be the opposite of _ethical_. To be selfish is to be unethical! Those who allow themselves to get corrupt are selfish. Ethical individuals will avoid corruption.

Ethical conduct makes for good human relations. Ethical conduct results in harmony in human affairs. It tends to result in one being more-likely to have a trouble-free life than if one cheats or 'cuts corners.'

Gravity works in the physical domain. **Harmony works** in the human domain.   As surely as cause leads to effect, both gravity and harmony work. Ethical individuals get the benefits of harmony.

Who can say with confidence that the social customs we have today will be prevalent in years to come? We can, though, predict that due to improved methods of communication, within the next twenty years people of good character, knowing what truly is in their self-interest will outnumber the selfish people. The good people will have more influence in the world and will more determine the shape of world culture than the selfish individuals will.

12

This is an essay about human relations. It is about how to win the game of life and avoid getting in one's own way. The phrase "human relations" suggests a concern with people.

What is a known fact about people? They want to survive. Yet they want more than mere survival. What do people really want? Is it money? Or is money merely a means to an end? To what end?

People want to flourish if possible. They want some well-being; they want to have a Quality Life. What is a Quality Life? It's a life rich in meaning, one full of 'mountain-top' experiences and warm memories. It is quality time with those we love. It includes leisure to pursue our hobbies and freely-chosen projects.

Since order, value, and balance are every bit as much natural law as is *entropy* (dissolution, falling apart, crumbling, destruction.), If we want to live in harmony with nature, we would encourage on the human level more <u>order</u>, <u>value</u>, and <u>balance</u>. (Let us speak of this process as "s*yntropy*.") We would strive to maximize value and to minimize *disvalue.* Some examples of disvalue are *chaos, misery, destitution and avoidable suffering*.   Also we would support practical policies that implement syntropy.

To Socrates the 'good life' is a personal code of conduct that allows individuals to have the best life possible while living in harmony with others. When one behaves **ethically** one is actually pursuing one's self-interest. *That is a fact* for all the reasons we will explain below. (There is one exception which we shall discuss when we give attention to Henry Sidgwick later in Chapter Four.)

An individual may feel under pressure to do something that is morally-questionable. The pressure might come from his peers, his bosses, or from his own desires and temptations to enrich himself. If a person is on the verge of *corrupting himself,* with regard to the conduct he is being pressured to perform, he should ask himself these questions: "Is it legal?" "Is it respectful?" "Is it honest?" "Is it responsible?" "Is it fair/' …All these questions amount to one question**:** *"Is it moral?"* In later chapters we will be explaining what is meant by that.

In this regard, see the video series "Ethics Unwrapped." Here is a link to it: https://ethicsunwrapped.utexas.edu/videos

Furthermore, 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 we are then happy too. We come to feel our life is making a difference when we make others happy; life seems more meaningful to us; it is a good feeling! It lifts us up. If we trust others, and treat them decently, they often tend to treat us the same way. It is a win/win situation, all around.

Lots of implied principles may be deduced from that rather-basic idea: Make things better!   At this point it would be appropriate to present a sample of the many principles that can easily be derived from this axiom of Ethics. We shall offer two of them now, and list a dozen or so more of them later, on pp. 26-27.

Ethics has two major principles that serve to make things better. They are The Inclusivity principle, and the Consistency Principle.

The Inclusivity principle suggests to us that we extend our 'ethical radius' as far as we possibly can; so that it sweeps in as many people as possible into what we consider to be our in-group. An expert in the work on the human genome stated that we are all, regardless of race, genetically 99.9 percent the same. Now, you may find that uncomfortable when you look around, but it is worth remembering.

Modern science has confirmed ancient wisdom which taught that the most important fact of life is our common humanity. Therefore, we should do more than just tolerate our diversity -- we should honor it and celebrate it.

The concept: "zone of concern" is unfamiliar to most people. Some explanation would help.   It starts with our own self. It extends to our inner circle of family, close friends and loved ones; then to our office mates, neighbors and acquaintances. Then we may extend it to strangers, if we have developed our character enough to be able to do that. A "great soul" will easily extend it to include the human family in its entirety. A narrow-minded constipated soul will have a small circle

as their zone of concern, a circle with a short, stunted and blunted diameter.

It starts with oneself in the center of the zone. Most of the work has to be done here. That is where moral development and moral integration comes in. [Moral concerns such as these are addressed in Chapter Three.] Only when we have a better understanding do we get to expand the Zone.

So to the question, "Who is our neighbor?" becomes: Who is in our zone of concern?"

The Consistency Principle warns us not to have a double standard. If one is to be ethical, one would be consistent: not having one standard for oneself and another different standard for others. Other principles will be listed in the next chapter, as well as throughout the book. To the extent we have double standards we are unethical. What then is it to be Ethical? There is a beautiful simplicity to Ethical concepts.

It is a fact of Ethics that *living morally has more advantages than disadvantages.* Living morally aids us in adapting to the environment, as John Dewey well understood.   In this essay we offer a glimpse into a Unified Theory of Ethics which aims to integrate and synthesize what is known about Ethics in order to provide reliable knowledge. **Moral value** is a species (a subset) of value-in-general. What is known about the concept "**value**"? Up until now it has been vague and intangible. Can we make it more specific?

ABOUT VALUE

Before we can have clarity about *moral value* we need to be clear about value.

Value is a function of **meaning**: the more meaning you find in something, the more value it has for you.

Something has **<u>value</u>** if it has the requirements (the properties or attributes) to fulfill its purpose or intention. The more attributes one employs to describe the thing, the more **value** one tends to find in it.

As one proceeds to describe it one is giving it attention and getting involved with it. {Robert S. Hartman defined the term in a rigorous way which assumes acquaintance with Formal Logic.}

The **value** of something is the degree to which it can enhance the quality of life.

If you see value in either:
(1) in the example set {the practice} by someone you consider to be highly-**ethical and/or moral,** due to the traits he or she possesses.

(2) If you like the case presented here - or in earlier works by this writer[1] then you may want to *make a personal commitment to be a decent human being*. Making such a commitment entails your living up to a higher moral standard, embracing even more of the Ethical Principles that can be deduced in the ethical system proposed in those references.

If you live by those Principles, you will then **practice**, more-often than you do now, ethical conduct, such as those traits suggested above. You will tend to ask yourself at most of the encounters you have with another individual: **"How can I create some value in this situation?"** You will do this consciously at first until it becomes a subconscious habit in your life.

Teachers and educators, if they care to, can with the help of the ideas in this book learn in more detail what Ethics is, and then as a result teach it better. Can the theory of ethics here proposed shed any light on administration or government? Chapter 4 will have something to say on this topic. And what does it mean to create value? What is "value"? Let us here define it informally.

1) {See :**THE BREAKTHROUGH - We Can Get Along After All (2018)** -
     http://myqol.com/wadeharvey/PDFs/BREAKT ... %20all.pdf
     LIVING WELL: how ethics helps us flourish (2016) http://www.myqol.com/wadeharvey/PDFs/LI ... ourish.pdf
     BASIC ETHICS: a systematic approach **(2014)** http://tinyurl.com/mfcgzfz

There are, as you know, different types of values. Earlier we spoke of the "degree" when referencing the idea of *value*. It is generally

understood that value is a matter of degree. With thanks to a suggestion by Peter Demerest, let us here illustrate value-theory by mentioning three concepts to consider. They are a paper clip, an automobile, a loving family.

A paper clip is simpler than an automobile, and an automobile is less complex than a loving family.

For a paper clip – which is found in many an office as part of the system - a *finite description* is appropriate: it is simply used to clip sheets of paper together.

An automobile has a countable number of properties – although a large number of them. No one would ever likely take the trouble to mention all these properties unless one thought it was significant to do so and was *worth* one's *valuable* time and effort.

In contrast, a loving family has an *uncountable* number of attributes or properties. [Attributes are defined as: names of properties.] These three examples may serve to introduce the concept of **value dimensions**. Let us now turn to this task.

VALUE DIMENSIONS

Robert S. Hartman (1910-1973) https://www.hartmaninstitute.org/about/about-robert-s-hartman/   See also https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_S._Hartman developed a discipline now known as Formal Axiology – also known as value science. He first noticed that there are these three major dimensions of value, which he defined and explored. They are basic. We may refer to them S, E, and I.   "It's as important to know your SEIs as it is to know your ABCs," according to the late Dr. Leon Pomeroy who applied these dimensions in his work as a psychotherapist. The letters S, E, and I are shorthand for Systemic Value, Extrinsic Value, and Intrinsic Value. Dr. Hartman informs us that the Intrinsic values include how we think and feel about others as well as about ourselves. Extrinsic values refer to what we experience with our five senses. Systemic values allude to how we

think about rules, plans and procedures.   Let us give some examples of each.

Here, thanks to David Mefford, Ph.D., is an illustration of the basic value types *Consider what is involved in the process of using a phone.* No one could make a telephone-call without the prior existence of networks, circuits, switchboards, etc.; and these could not exist without first having diagrams, software programs and blueprints for those circuits.

All these diagrams, codes, and networks have some *system* to them. They are "systemic." This kind of value is S-value; and here it was applied to telephoning. **S**-value is an abbreviation for **S**ystemic Value.

The E-value of a telephone would be the handset nto which you speak (in other words, the hardware, the receiver, the instrument, the phone itself.)   "**E**-value" stands for **E**xtrinsic Value.
.
The **I**ntrinsic Value (or I-value) of telephoning are the meanings intended and communicated in the conversation; to say it poetically, it is the "reaching out and touching someone."

All of this is involved in the act of telephoning - - all three dimensions come into play. Most significant is the final communication which takes place, the Intrinsic Value. Isn't that usually why a person makes a phone-call in the first place – to have that communication with the person at the other end of the line? That conversation or contact is what people usually value most.

As I said, there's now a *science of value* itself. ('Science' here is used in its original sense: 'a body of knowledge and analysis.') An evaluation was made earlier about telephoning. It claimed that the conversation or communication is **value**d by most callers **more** than the instrument employed to make the call, **and more** than the network behind it that arranges the transmission of the signals. The scientists of Value have logically proven and can statistically demonstrate that this valuation is truly the case:

The logic they employ deduces that I-value always is more relevant, more vital, than mere E-value or S-value. [Technical details and a proof may be found in the early pages of M.C. Katz - Basic Ethics.]   For now it suffices to note that the formula **I > E > S** is valid and sound. It constitutes what may be named, "The existential Hierarchy of Values."[This is abbreviated as the **HOV**].   [An implied derivative of that formula, namely,   { **I > S}**, can be reasonably interpreted as saying that *life is larger than logic* …something that seems almost self-evident.]

S, E, and **I** roughly correspond to the intellectual values (which are S); the functional values (which are E); and the spiritual values (the I-values.) Values such as Life, Liberty, and Happiness are I-values.

Mind, body, and character are three applications of **S, E**, and **I**. There are other common applications of these dimensions of value. Many are listed in Endnote 3 in the booklet, "A Unified Theory of Ethics" by this author.

Some further examples of each of these value types – the three value dimensions - may serve to fill in the picture: Intrinsic values are empathy and self-respect;   Extrinsic Values are practical judgment and role-awareness, career goal-setting, sense of timing; Systemic values are analytical or structured thinking, self-direction, self-disciple, organization and planning
.
To offer another illustration: think of a house. We can view it in at least three ways: An architect may call the blueprints "the house." On paper, the house can be said to be "perfect." [That is what a value scientist will speak of as "The S-Value" of this house. S stands for Systemic Value.]

Then there is the actual house (with timbers and bricks and walls and furniture) after it is built. It may be judged "good," Or "bad" if it has some flaws, if it is less than half a match with the properties of its 'ideal' picture, its standard. It may not have all the attributes necessary to fulfil its purpose or intention.   [This is Extrinsic Value: [E-Value for short.] But there comes a day perhaps when a "house" becomes a "home". {Picture a hanging on the wall that says: "Home Sweet Home."} That situation is what may be designated "The

Intrinsic Value", or I-Value, of that house.] Now it is "unique." It is "Our lovely home."

(Note that, in Value Theory, (S): Perfect, E: Good, and (I): Unique, are the three ideas which are defined when the dimensions are applied the concept: t*full* *value*.) Later chapters will offer yet more detail regarding value and will expand upon its meaning in theory and in action. At this point it would be logical to gain a clearer understanding of how Ethics correlates with what we know about values.

The author agrees that Ethics, as theory, is a system, and thus, according to the HOV formula, is worth the least**. Least value however does not mean: *no value*.** To be worth the most, there must also be intention to express the theory in action. Until one intends to be ethical, knowing Ethical theory alone will not fulfill the purpose of Ethics. We are obliged, by the way we live our lives, to set the right example.

WHAT DELINEATES THE FIELD OF ETHICS?

There are three basic ways of studying and talking about *an individual* (or a group of them.) Let's apply the dimensions of value that we already know. The first perspective we consider is Anatomy/Physiology. It is concerned with systems of the body, organ placement, the skeletal and muscle systems among others. This is the **S**ystemic view.

Next is the social/psychological perspective. This viewpoint regards the individual (or group) in a more meaningful way. Now we have beliefs, attitudes, motivations, and functions we perform, such as memory, perception, goal-directed behavior, capacity to align ourselves in cohort groups, associate with others of a specific category, to mobilize, to organize, etc. This view of individuals is the **E**xtrinsic. It is the everyday, socio-economic, role-playing, functional, worldly, pragmatic way of looking at us.

Another perspective, and the one on which we shall mainly focus during our project to gain moral clarity, is the **I**ntrinsic.

When we Intrinsically-value we give our undivided attention to whatever we are currently valuing. We often come to identify with it; and we may bond with it. We concentrate on it, and get involved with it or with them. We experience it fully. We find uncountable meaning either in the person - or in the event, activity, idea(s), process, hobby …no matter what it may be that we are Intrinsically-valuing. A continuum is formed: it is impossible to say where the valuer leaves off and where the item or person valued begins, so intense is the focus.

 For this current project, the new paradigm being offered, let us define **"Ethics"** as that discipline which arises **when we Intrinsically-value individuals**. We consider them as "having a story to tell." We see them as rich in meaning, as having some depth, as a variety-within-a-unity.

This perspective is distinctly different from the others: here a person is no longer a thing or a number, a stereotype, or an object of some prejudice we may have. Now a person is not just a label or member of some ideological group. The individual is viewed as unique, as a priceless treasure of value not to be defiled, as having some dignity. The following claims are worth noting; they reveal the structure of the paradigm for ethics that is being offered here.

WHAT IS SELFISHNESS?

Selfishness" means "you gain and the other person loses" If you push to the head-of-the-line at a checkout counter, getting in front of those who were in line ahead of you, or if you grab the biggest slice of cake at a party before others have had a chance to select a slice, you are being selfish. If you take what doesn't belong to you (theft), or deprive someone else of what they have a right to, you are being selfish. The opposite way of conducting yourself is to be considerate of others. That is the ethical way.

A third alternative is to give others a cold shoulder, to be indifferent to them, to ignore them. This will not 'grease the wheels' for human relations, for group living. We are a social species.

A review of some points deduced earlier would help here:

1) Let us assume you have made a **commitment to be ethical and moral**. One reason you will make that commitment is because you are aware of the reality that **living ethically is what is in your true self-interest.** And you want to be in touch with reality.

2) Being Ethical is creating value in your encounters with another individual–creating if one possibly can a win/win outcome.

3) You *would* create value in your encounters with others if you care to comply with the structure of Ethics as it is outlined here in this book. You are not compelled to do so; although you are, in a sense, "obliged" to, since we are all obliged to be morally good by the very meaning of the words.

You no more have to comply with Ethics, your moral health, than you need to do what is necessary for your physical health. (At present many neglect both.) [A later chapter will discuss how Ethics may spread around the planet and win wide acceptance.]

4) You more likely <u>will</u> <u>care</u> to comply with Ethics -- that body of useful knowledge -- if you regard **individuals [**who have individuality] as *highly-valuable.*

This means, in sum, that you conceive of persons as deep and complex; as having a story to tell. You may want to listen to their story, for you regard them as of uncountably-high value.   And, as you recall, *this is how the concept "Ethics" is defined within the structure of ethics.*

For many good reasons you may want to be true to your true self. *Being true to yourself* is the first approximation of what is meant here by the term "morality." The next chapter is devoted to clarifying this concept in further detail.

"Morality is less about the ends we seek to achieve and more about the means we use."   ---Thomas D. Cook, Professor of Ethics, and of Justice and Social Policy, Northwestern University

Chapter Three

WHAT IS MORALITY?

The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines "morality" as: conformity to ideals of right human conduct.

We note that https://www.dictionary.com/ offers this definition of "morality":

     • conformity to the rules of right conduct; conformity to moral or virtuous conduct.

     • moral quality or character.   A concern with the distinction between right and wrong rather than with custom or legalities.

Other dictionaries define "morality as: "a particular system of values and principles of conduct, especially one held by a specific person."

Agreeing with the emphasis on a specified person, the Unified Theory of Ethics – the new paradigm offered here - understands "morality" as a personal trait. Morality, though, has planet-wide applications. In the following sections of this book we will define the term more explicitly and spell out many of the implications of a moral life.

In this theory "morality" is a technical term, not to be confused with "morals." There are middle-class **morals** as distinct from lower-class morals; yet there is one morality which applies to all economic strata and to all classes, cultures, occupations and ethnicities. Morality is defined as one's self (one's conduct) correlating with ethical principles. And morality is a matter of degree; if there is a strong correlation then one has a high degree of morality.

Value itself is a match between meaning and reality; and *morality* [moral value] - as this system defines it, is *a match* between one's conduct - the person's actual moral behavior and ethical principles. We will soon list some Ethical Principles.

To explain it in more detail: If your observable self, (your conduct), matches, or corresponds with, your Ethical beliefs - **and if your personal beliefs are evolving in a more compassionate, more empathic, more inclusive direction**, to that degree you are moral. And, as you are aware, morality is a matter of degree.

In this system, the way it is structured, it seems quite reasonable to focus on *a specific relation that arises within the theory* and to name that relation "morality."

What is that relation? It is the relation between the observed self and the ideal self. The ideal self consists of the evolving and improving ethical self-ideals one has. The more moral principles your self-image complies with, the higher your degree of morality. The definition offered in this paradigm is thus not that different from what the dictionaries told us is the conventional meaning. This proposed definition of the term arose, as we said, as a relationship between other concepts in the system. The most appropriate name to put on that relationship seemed to me to be "Morality."   Soon we will discuss and explain the Ends-Means relationship which is also vital to understand.

You may have views regarding how to enhance the group(s) to which you belong, as well as how to conduct yourself when you think no one is watching; or, say, how you would behave if you were invisible. Those views comprise what the theory refers to as your 'evolving self-ideals.'

Wise persons agree that to *know the good* is not necessarily to *do the good*; yet it is more likely that with such knowledge, including know-how [having the skill] one may actually **do the right thing**, do that which is ethically good. Praise, shame, and conditioning play a part in habit-formation. Make a h*abit* of *morality*.

To sum up, in this theory of Ethics we define the concept "morality" as *a relationship, of correspondence between the self and the true Self:* Note that William Shakespeare, years ago, had sensed these ethical and moral implications when he had a character in one of his plays speak about this very topic. In the late 1580's, maybe in 1587, these lines were penned:

> **"To thine own self be true, and it must follow,**
> **as the night the day, thou canst not then be false**
> **to any man."**   --William Shakespeare

Our new (yet old) concept of "morality" is a very dynamic one. [It is an over-simplification to say that morality is merely "self being Self."]

Actually, and more accurately, it is "self being true to true Self. " More-precisely still, it is **"self increasingly corresponding to an improving, constructive** (in contrast to 'destructive') **Self-image."**

The notion is dynamic because the person is **to be growing or maturing in an ethical sense.** More and more his Self is to be absorbing the latest views as to what a human being could aspire. S/he is ideally to become all s/he is capable of being and becoming. That is the way for us to understand the concept.

Value - by definition - involves a match... to put it in plain language: a match between the ideal and the actual. When the actual fulfills the ideal, there is value. Ethical values thus also involve a match**. We have named this** "Morality." When, and if, one's self-ideal matches every Moral Principle that self-image could be understood as **the highest ideal for a human being that Ethical theory indicates**. Of course, it is the individual himself who determines his self-identity. It is you who defines yourself.

Some define themselves as con-artists. They say to themselves: "I'm a 'matchstick man.' I put people on." Others say: "I'm a hit-man and I'm good at what I do." These types have a criminal mind. Others like to insult and disparage people. They are unethical; they have low morality.

> **"The quality of our life is really just a reflection of the quality of our internal state of mind. Our internal state of mind is a reflection of where we are in our maturation process. Where most of us are in our maturation process is a reflection of where we are in the process of evolution."**   ---Toru Sato

If you define yourself as "an authentic and highly-moral person" then it is you who would live up to that self-image in order to fulfill your self-concept, and thus in practice actually be a highly-moral individual. You would teach and inspire others by your good example.

Here are some ethical principles that may serve as guidelines for living the good life. They are not rules, nor absolutes; they are merely suggested guidelines:

A SUMMARY OF SOME OF THE BASIC ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

1) Honor and respect every individual. If you can't respect them, at least be civil and courteous, for that is a reflection of your character.

2) Everyone is doing the best one knows how. If we knew any better we would do better. If we are not suffering from stupidity, or some form of brain damage, it is mainly due to **ignorance** as to why we behave badly. This includes ignorance of *how* to live ethically and the benefits that ensue.

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) What action can I take here and now to create the greatest all-around value?
.
7) Provide everyone the full opportunity to express their creativity.

8) Empower the individual to express more of his full potential. Help other to rise!

9) Look to creative design to solve problems.

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

11) Include as many as possible into your in-group – widen your moral compass – be inclusive.
The *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy* provides us with the following additional ethical principles:

• Principle of **benevolence**: help those in need.

• Principle of **honesty:** do not deceive others. Be truthful.

• Principle of **lawfulness**: do not violate the law.

• Principle of **autonomy:** acknowledge a person's freedom over his/her actions or physical body.

• Principle of **justice:** acknowledge a person's right to due process, fair compensation for harm done, and fair distribution of benefits.

• **Rights**: acknowledge a person's rights to life, information, privacy, free expression, and safety.   This implies we are to, as soon as possible, pass the Equal Rights Amendment recognizing women's rights.

With regard to the Principle of lawfulness this upgrade needs to be added: Do not violate the law unless it is an unjust law, a law that can be shown to violate one or more principles of Ethics. The Moral Law is to be the foundation of statute law. And it will be, once legislators understand their ethics.

The Principle of Justice - within the subdivision of Ethics known as Individual Ethics - directs individuals to lead a balanced life. Within Social Ethics, though, it directs folks to uphold *social justice* and to elect for public office only those who will work for social justice and for the common good.

The Principle of Honesty allows for some rare exceptions: one may deceive to save a life; or if one is a magician deceiving for purposes of entertainment. Bluffing **in a game** such as Poker is also morally permissible.

There are at least three kinds of Self-concept to consider, and we shall generate them by use of the basic Dimensions of Value.

S: The Self-importance (Neurosis).

E: Self-esteem.

I: Self-respect.

To be self-important is to lack humility. Granted, it is nice to have self-confidence, to have some self-esteem. Far greater in value, far more important, is to have self-respect. It is fine to know your rights and to assert them and claim them. Just as vital is to believe justifiably that you are becoming a fully-ethical person, one who practices morality and lives it.

"True nobility is in being superior to your previous self."
<div align="right">---W, K, Sheldon</div>

AN ANALYSIS OF THE SELF AS IT MOVES THROUGH STAGES
.
Let us now examine the evolution within an individual as s/he develops from self-centered to morally-integrated (or as Dr. Albert Bandura phrases it, morally engaged.)

We shall, in our analysis, go from the 'bad' to 'okay' to 'better' to 'best!' -- [We shall once again use the S, E and I.]

We start with the concept "selfishness." This – from an Ethical perspective – is 'the bad.' [Technically speaking, in the discipline of Formal Axiology, selfishness is a Transposition of Values: it is a mix-up of , an incongruity.] Selfish individuals do not think about anyone else. They just want what they want, and take it. It is inconsideration. Hence we may define it as: "Taking what I want without consideration for others."
Perhaps selfish people say to themselves: "I'm better than you." They think they are superior to the rest of us. They lack humility. These people may believe they are a member of an aristocracy, elite, looking down their noses at others. {They OVER-VALUE themselves.}

Yet some selfish individuals UNDER-VALUE themselves. Cognitively, they may be telling themselves: "I'm not worthy of being given anything. If I don't grab my share, someone else is going to take it." Their transposing of values results in their "selfishness."

"We have to learn over and over

29

again what it means to be human."

--- Mark Twain

ON MORALITY AND MORAL GROWTH IN MORE DEPTH

Let's move up a notch. **Systemically valuing self** we arrive at another concept: Self-centered. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with having self-interest and being self-centered. Babies, children, adolescents, all display this in a big way – until maturity is reached ...which could occur at any age.

At maturity, one feels some responsibility for others, along with pursuing one's individual needs; one starts to care beyond the narrow self.

{Many who have self-interest have found a balance in life where they neither overvalue nor undervalue themselves ....but they still have not yet found this balance for the world outside themselves.} In contrast, the **Extrinsic value of self** is: Self-development. This is a form of self-interest – a more-evolved form; yet better than mere self-interest. Now one may seek out teachers, coaches, therapists in the quest for self-improvement, or one engages in self-study to learn how it may be done. Let's go to a higher stage: The **Intrinsic value of the self** (what we may speak of technically as the "axiogenic" awareness) is: Self-transcendence to Enlightenment – along with humility. Of all the stages mentioned, this is the best !

[Note: If you *ruin your health*, or also by *a lack of due caution* injure yourself, you are less strong, and thus less in a position to be of help to another individual. I would NOT label this "immoral."

Instead I would say (in the role of a coach): Ask yourself: How is this working for you? Is it getting you to your goals? ...If it isn't, isn't it time for a change?   Get back into balance! Be true to your own true self. What does that amount to" What are some of the high ideals of which we spoke earlier?

Once a person has enlightened-self-interest she knows these points. She is aware that: "What helps you, if it really does help you, helps me. What affects you directly, affects me indirectly." She will believe and live by these views: "We rise or fall together. ...and this applies to

all the people on Earth. What we are trying to accomplish is: a high quality of life for all."

This entails that we minimize suffering whenever we can, for when people are hurting they tend to be self-centered. Social injustice causes people to hurt, so it follows that we ought to pursue Social Justice.

Once a person is enlightened he or she knows that we are all just trying to make a life, that cooperation helps, that civic responsibility is important. He knows that transparency, and authenticity, and integrity, are great values to have. He wants to be of service. He wants to uplift and boost others toward achieving a better life.. He wants to create value. He consciously observes Ethical principles and has made a habit of living by them.

He is now mindful of doing every act in the most efficient manner possible with a view to encouraging a higher quality of life for one and all. He sees the human species as all one family. He has, so to speak, extended his ethical compass, he has swept in, as his in-group, a larger amount of people. He embraces **a variety within a unity.**   He knows there are separate cultures that differentiate themselves from one another; yet he also knows **that they would be so much better-off if they cooperated more and more with each other.**[*]
The framework offered here will eventually, in the hands of future students of the subject, serve adequately to order and explain the data **of** ethics**.**

_____

[*] Think of the collaboration and the cooperation - behind the scenes as well as out front - that went into making the movie "My Fair Lady." Note the value that was generated by such cooperation. There was further cooperation in restoring and preserving the movie's film for the archive. This cooperation can serve as a model for the world. This is what life is like in an ethical world, each citizen of it knowing that he helped to produce an ethical value by cooperating with others!

Let's be practical and relevant to daily life. Wherever one may live, sooner or later one will encounter other people and thus have the opportunity then to **create** moral value (or to **destroy** moral value).

UNDERSTANDING THE CONCEPT "VALUE"

As Dr. R. S. Hartman taught us, When something exemplifies its concept, when to your mind it is as it is supposed to be, you are likely to judge it as valuable or to speak of it as "a value ." Then your mental picture of it (your conception) **corresponds** with your perception of it and its properties.[*]

Just as "value" in general involves a correspondence between two sets, "moral value" does also. Morality and *moral value* mean the same in this system. The two sets for morality are the set of one's behaviors and the set of one's ever-evolving ideals. Morality means "walking the walk, not just talking the talk." It means avoiding hypocrisy and corruption; it means authenticity: being real (rather than a pretender or a phony.)

_____

*) Robert S. Hartman, a true polymath, a philosophical genius, in his book The Structure of Value, defined and explained what it means to say of something that it has value. He showed how an understanding of value gives us insight about moral value. He assigned a measure to "Intrinsic value" and he showed us that there exists a hierarchy of value in the universe. His contribution is known as Formal Axiology. He concluded that Ethics has Axiology as its meta-language. He managed to define he term "good" employing formal Logic. No one else had ever done this. It was a momentous breakthrough.

WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM THE MORAL ARC BOOK

Michael Shermer, who wrote a book entitled "The Moral Arc: How Science Makes Us Better People," stated the case this way:

 "Humanity outgrew human sacrifice when we learned more about how the world actually worked and thought harder about human rights. As such, it became harder to defend human sacrifice rationally and have that argument accepted by others."

"The same process undermined the burning of "witches," slavery, and the subjugation of women." The latter includes sex slavery, spousal abuse, and employer-duress and intimidation. We could add to this list: the tearing apart of limbs of prisoners, public hangings,

waterboarding and other forms of torture, dueling, cremation of a religious group, lynchings, genocide, etc. [Unfortunately we still have wars, though, so far, not as many as in the previous 100 years. And we note that forced labor camps still exist along with jihadism, school shootings and other mass murders.]

Yet these examples mentioned by **Michael** Shermer showcase that **moral progress is possible.** He goes on to say:

> "The underlying process of moral progress depends on four things:
>
> 1. Increasing our scientific knowledge regarding how the world works and how we can reduce human suffering and promote human flourishing.
>
> 2. Promoting our biological predispositions for cooperation, empathy, and reciprocation.
>
> 3. Using rationality as the foundation to match what we know about the world and ourselves with the acts most beneficial and consistent with those facts.
>
> 4. Maintaining an open society to freely discuss and debate moral issues."*

Sam Harris, a brain neurologist who authored the book, The Moral Landscape, would seem to agree with Shermer when he argues this point:

> **"Once scientists begin proposing moral norms in papers, supernatural moral systems will join "astrology, witchcraft and Greek mythology on the scrapheap."**   --Sam Harris
> in his article "Morality", in *The New Scientist,* October 2010

Understanding well-being

Once we have had a taste of it we prefer **to live** in a condition of **well-being**. What is meant here by "well-being"? Let us spell it out.

Martin Seligman, who pioneered in Positive Psychology, explains that we have **well-being** when we can get into the flow, losing track of time because we are so involved in a project we volunteered to do. And doing it gives us pleasure and a sense of accomplishment. We also need, for full ell-being, some warm human relationships; some sense that we are doing something meaningful to fulfill a worthwhile purpose. Also it helps if we believe that we have some accomplishments to our

credit. Feeling positive emotions, such as joy, bliss, gratitude, delight, satisfaction, happiness, etc. are further marks of well-being.

When we (1) possess well-being, and (2) we are less argumentative, (3) are less disagreeable, and (4) are more considerate of one another, we then will be living a Quality Life, a richer life.

After 56 years of research in this area the author has concluded that the <u>character</u> or an individual determines the policies he or s/he will work for, and the actions s/he will take.

WHAT IS "A GOOD CHARACTER"?

A person with a good character has a well-developed moral sense. That individual has an intuition that can readily discern right from wrong. S/he has a sensitive conscience, one that functions, and one that is inclined to get us to do the right thing.

Character is not merely my expression of who I am but it is my expression that my moral compass is aligned with the science of value, with the other sciences, and with my having a good grasp of Ethics. The more I am aware of the costs and benefits, the better my moral choices will be. I want to make ethical choices that are not based upon superstition but upon fact. Facts are aligned with nature. My aim is to create the maximum net value for all concerned.

What else is true of those who possess a good character? They are authentic. They have integrity. They want to be helpful. They want to take on some responsibility, and be accountable for it. They are forgiving; they show mercy. They avoid judging others. They are not moralists. They do want to leave the world a better place for their having passed through it; they want to help people feel better about themselves; they want to spread happiness and well-being. They know that morally we are responsible for each other. We are each other's support group. We have to look out for each other.

And if we disagree we can disagree in an agreeable way. Disagreement does not have to be conflict; it can be courteous and

respectful. It can arise in a context wherein one intrinsically-values the party with whom one is in disagreement. Those with good character may disagree with one another but they know how to disagree agreeably. They can remain civil and respectful while disagreeing with someone's position.

A critical point to understand is that *criminals* are unethical because they *are selfish*. Yes, most murderers are selfish. As you know, *selfishness* is the opposite of morality and living ethically   Many normal individuals, who are not criminals, are rigidly attached to their belief system, including their set of moral principles. They   have an emotional bias concerning their own views, bordering on dogmatism. Many have a need to be right ...and they think this means they have to make the other guy wrong if he has a different view of the matter. They can't allow for multiple perspectives; it seems to threaten their self-esteem. So they get defensive.

Above we spoke of criminals and of the criminal mind. In that connection here are some relevant observations. A parent may say to their child: "I love you but I don't like what you did; and I can punish you based on what you did. That I do punish you does not mean that I love you less. I'll make the punishment *as humane as I possibly can* though it will be *fitting to the wrongness of your action*." In the same way, a society, through its legal system, may be obliged to lock away a killer, getting the killer out of circulation. There are however different sentences for different degrees of murder. There is murder in the first degree (with malicious intent) and there is manslaughter. Our jails should be humanely run, oriented toward re-education, skill acquisition, and rehabilitation. Let's work to make this our standard policy.

There are grades of crimes and degrees of punishment. Morality likewise is a matter of degree in this system; it depends upon how many ethical principles an individual subscribes to and lives by …the more principles, the higher the degree of morality. As this theory conceives it, one is not **either** moral **or** immoral. Either-or thinking is

S-valuing. No. It is instead a matter of degree. Morality is an Extrinsic value. Choices have costs. It is all about weighing costs versus benefits.

When a lawbreaker is jailed, that is a practical matter, an Extrinsic valuation. Considerations of functionality go into the decision to incarcerate that person. That is E-value. Yet, no matter how heinous the crime, according to Ethics, we are to I-value that individual. It is important to be mindful of that. **Respect**, in this system, is Extrinsic, it is often based on merit. Often we ask before granting respect, "Did the party earn our respect based upon his character and conduct?"

It is worth keeping in mind that there is a distinction between _being judgmental_ – which is not advisable – and _making good judgments_ – which **are** encouraged by this current paradigm. Moralists are morally judgmental. This theory would have us avoiding moralism. Rather, we are encouraged to I-value each person, regardless of the mistakes they have made, and the Ethical fallacies they have committed. **I-valuing someone does not mean you approve of their behavio**r! Torture is immoral if anything is immoral. So is slavery. So is murder. War-making is mass murder. The ones who commit these acts are weak, fallible, erroneous human beings, just as we are ourselves. It is preferable that we I-value them, we are obliged by ethics to I-value them.

If someone is extremely out of balance, due perhaps to confused-thinking or due to a brain defect, they often will admit that they are struggling, or that they feel distressed. When appropriate we may, according to Ethics, make a suggestion. We may say to such a party, "It seems that you are having some difficulties. Are you? Maybe I can be of some help."

To reiterate, the more ethical principles one lives by, the more morality one has. It is imperative to I-value everyone, giving them credit that they can improve, can grow out of whatever faulty thinking they now engage in. Be a 'virtue-finder' rather than a fault-finder.

ON ACHIEVING EMOTIONAL PEACE

The late Dr. Albert Ellis was a world-class psychotherapist. He was influenced by the writings of Epictetus, the renowned Stoic philosopher. Thanks to the research of Dr. Ellis, we now know that we can 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, (something short of the death of a beloved person, in which case *grief* would be understandable.)

B) You (the child – or anyone -- since this works for adults too) interpret it; you form an interpretation, a way of viewing what happened.

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 B*eliefs* 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 Value Profile. 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*, 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 research done in this area of Ethics reveals that most people do not know their own cognitive assets. Until they get a personalized values profile done by a coach who utilizes the Hartman Value Inventory, 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 ho understand the method can utilize it to gain the resulting advantages.

"Hardly anyone can simply read about ethics and become ethical. It's not that easy. People have to make many decisions under economic, professional and social pressure. Rationalization is a constant temptation."   ---Wes Hanson

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

The professor responds to the student, saying: They are all right. I believe Aristotle, Kant, and Mill, if they were alive today, would all concur that our most pressing issues today are:
    (1) How to clean up and nurture the environment, our habitat.
    (2) How to move those in extreme poverty up into the middle class.

(3) How to put a stop to human-rights abuses.

Regarding point 1, the human-caused attacks on our habitat, the planet Earth, euphemistically spoken of as "climate change," Peter Singer, Professor of Bioethics - Princeton University agrees that attending to this issue is most urgent.   Nick Bostrom also agrees. See: http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html

See in connection with this point 3: http://msass.cwru.edu/begun/ and see too: http://www.peoplesinitiativefordepartmentsofpeace.org/

The moral thing to do is always the compassionate thing to do, We can certainly consider the rules and formalities, with a nod to Kant; we can work continuously on developing our character, acknowledging the contributions of Aristotle; and we can figure out that a more stable, a more peaceful world to live in, with a more beautiful environment without the eyesores caused by toxic dumps and pollution, will definitely make us happier.

J. S. Mill would agree that if we work on what makes us happier we are going in the right direction.   I don't see any conflict among the advice of the three wise men. Just do the loving thing in each situation, and you will be expressing the highest morality. Aim to think and act constructively, and to look for what is good in every situation that arises. Build on that, and you can't go wrong. Students, whatever the question, love is the answer. We can now say what "an improving Self-image" means. One's self-image is improving if it is **more inclusive, more responsible, and more adept at creating mutually-beneficial proposals, more inclined to kindness than to asserting one's own rightness**. The highly moral individual would rather be kind than to be "right"; rather perform an act of kindness or of beauty than to argue for the rightness of his/her position.

UNDERSTANDING ENDS AND MEANS

It is in our self-interest to employ means compatible with our ends-in-view. If we want love in our life, we are to use loving means to attain

39

that end. If we have a noble goal in view it is essential that we use noble (i.e., ethical) means to get there.

If we *want peace*, use peaceful means, that is, live peaceably. Harm no one intentionally. On a personal level, maintain serenity; on a social level "sign non-aggression pacts," so to speak, with everyone. Call no one your "enemy." Regard every stranger as a friend – until you develop an awareness that there are no strangers. Seek to understand the other person. Consider each individual as highly-valuable. That is how to be ethical.

> Those who believe that "the end justifies the means" (and the means they will use are morally-questionable) are just deceiving themselves. They will inhabit a world that they cannot fully admire. Their progeny will not be proud of the mess their forebears left them.

The next chapter will discuss applications of the theory, and will offer some confirmations of its soundness and reasonableness. It will discuss Ethics applied to social policy; it will also offer some guidance when it comes to making moral decisions. It will also, as a bonus, delve into additional elated matters related to the structure of ethics.

"We do not turn aside from what we know about astronomy at any time because there is still a great deal we do not know, or because so much of what we once thought we knew is no longer recognized as true. May not the same argument be accepted in our thinking about ethical judgements?" Leonard Carmichael -- Secretary to the Smithsonian Institution, 1953-1973.

Chapter Four

LAW, POLICY, AND ETHICAL DECISIONS

Corruption usually, but not always, entails money, or the things that money buys, including power, and sex. If one is tempted to corrupt oneself, it would be good to have a set of questions designed for self-inquiry. Such a tool for moral analysis is already available now.

HOW TO OVERCOME CORRUPTION

In his column bearing the caption "Stumbling Blocks on the Path of Righteousness", Benedict Carey writes, in a N. Y. Times article published May 4, 2009:
http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/05/health/05mind.html?scp=1&sq=Mind+-+Stumbling+Blocks&st=nyt
"

Most people are adamant: They would never do it.
Ever. Never deliberately inflict pain on another person, just to obtain information. Never artificially inflate the value of some financial product, just to take advantage of others' ignorance."

This raises the issue of personal corruption and whether that serves to block all attempts at applying he theories of Ethics to the real world. I shall excerpt one more quote from Mr. Carey which summarizes some recent research findings from Behavioral Ethics and from the Science of Cognitive Psychology. They reveal that people tend to be overly optimistic about their own abilities and fortunes. They tend to over-estimate their standing in class, or in their discipline, as well as their own sincerity. "But this self-inflating bias may be even stronger when it comes to moral judgment. And it can greatly influence how people judge others' actions, and ultimately their own.

Culture, religious belief and experience all help shape a person's sense of moral standing in relation to others, psychologists say, and new research is helping to clarify when such feelings of superiority are helpful and when they are self-defeating."

A tool for moral self-analysis

A person of good character will make the following moral analysis with respect to his or her conduct. He or she will say to himself or herself:

 "With regard to the action I am about to take,

Would it cause harm to anyone? And

Would it withstand public scrutiny?

Is there an alternative action I may pursue that would not give pain to anyone?

How can I create a win/win transaction in this situation?" --with thanks to Robert A. Prentice, to Demi Elliott, to Robert S. Hartman, and to Harvey Schoof.

Professor David Dunning of Cornel University, based on empirical studies which he has done, informs us that people give in to social pressure, and then rationalize their corruption. He writes: "*many types of behavior are driven* far more *by the situation* than by the force of personality. What someone else did in that situation is a very strong warning about what you yourself would do." *It may be* what they actually did - or *what you believe they did* based on what you heard.

Hypocrisy is rampant today, no question about it. Dr. N. Epley, a psychologist at The University of Chicago, designs experiments to test that gap between **how we think we'll behave a**nd **how we actually behave**. He tells us it is a function of both our intentions and of "how well we simulate the situation. People often say to themselves sentences such as this: "If we just fire all the immoral Wall Street bankers and replace them with moral ones, we'll solve the problem." Is it possible they may be wrong about this? Perhaps **it also takes strong regulations on the part of government agencies, as well as strong enforcement of those good laws**."

To be enlightened is to put people first, things next, and dogmatic ideas last. It is to live by the Hierarchy of Value discovered by Robert S. Hartman, the wise philosopher-scientist.

Having enlightened self-interest raises the likelihood that one will tend **to be ethical** and to have smooth human relations. Such an individual will have good manners and will be friendly. **The harmony one feels** then is an indication that one is winning the game of life. Then s/he will gain all *the benefits that come with **cooperation** on shared goals*. Benefits will result when one creates value in his interactions with others. Soon we will offer some examples as to how it is done in practice.

On the emergence of cooperation

Speaking of cooperation**, it turns out** that Richard Dawkins, a social-biologist, collaborated with philosophers, Robert Axelrod, Martin A. Nowak, Peter Singer, and others, to do research on how cooperation evolved.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Evolution_of_Cooperation

They concluded that the human species is no exception to what other animals learned: namely, that it is better to cooperate than not to. Axelrod's experimentation with Game Theory resulted in his arriving at some moral principles: As we compete or interact with others in 'the game of life,

Be nice. Be willing and ready to cooperate. *Be the first to cooperat*e. Improve the quality of communication if possible.

- **Don't** focus on maximizing your own 'score', as opposed to your 'partner's' score in this game. *Never aim to benefit more than the other player* (or players) in a game structured as 'Iterated Prisoners Dilemma,' for if you do, the result eventually will be that *you both benefit less.*

- **Don't be too clever:** or, don't try to be tricky. <u>Clarity</u> is essential for others to cooperate with you.

Dr. Stephen Pinker discusses cooperation and sharing this way: "In many areas of life two parties are o**bjectively** better off if they both act in a non-selfish way than if each of them acts selfishly. You and I are both better off if we share our surpluses, rescue each other's children in danger, and refrain from shooting at each other, compared with hoarding our surpluses while they rot, letting the other's child drown while we file our nails, or feuding like the Hatfields and McCoys."

"Granted, I might be a bit better off if I acted selfishly at your expense and you played the sucker, but *the same is true for you with me*, so if each of us tried for these advantages, we'd both end up worse off. Any neutral observer, and you and I if we could talk it over rationally,

would have to conclude that *the state we should aim for is the one in which we both are unselfish.*" (*emphasis added*.) It's in the nature of things **that *if we educate ourselves enough* we come to develop this insight** about our *true self-interest*. **We reach this understanding**." Does that make sense?

We humans are all distant cousins, (or we are even more-closely-related) since we are descended from a population on Earth that years ago was drastically smaller than it is today. So when we are altruistic, or share, or cooperate on a common goal, we are interrelating with **our kin.** We are literally one human family - although many of us lack awareness of this.

How can one <u>create</u> <u>value</u>? Some examples as to how it is done follow:

Boosting someone up is one way to create value. Make someone feel good about themselves. Another way is handing out sincere compliments. And be ready to be of service. Help others become aware of opportunities. Help others to rise.

To review some of the major structural ideas offered earlier:

"Ethics" is a concept which I define as: Intrinsically-valuing individuals. More exactly, it is the discipline arising when conscious individuals {having individuality} are *Intrinsically valued* = seen as uncountably-high in value.

As noted earlier, it is important to differentiate between the two concepts, *<u>self-interes</u>t*, and s*<u>elfishness</u>*, noting clearly the difference between them.   Those ideas are <u>not</u> the same, and should not be confused with one another! To live ethically and educate others to do the same is in our self-interest.

REGARDING SIDGWICK'S "GREATEST PROBLEM OF ETHICS"

Henry Sidgwick tells his readers that he cannot find a way to square two principles to which he is confident that many people subscribe. He claims that on the one hand, their intuition tells people to *pursue your*

own greatest happiness; on the other hand their conscience tells them to *promote* the general happiness – *the happiness of others*. To him, both are "self-evident." Wikipedia informs us that "Like many previous moralists, he argues that self-interest and morality coincide in the great majority of cases. But can it be demonstrated that they always coincide? Sidgwick argues that it cannot. There are times, for example, when the general good might require the sacrifice of self-interest (e.g., giving up one's life to save a fellow soldier)." ""Sidgwick claims that there is a 'fundamental contradiction' in our moral consciousness." [See the entire discussion in Wikipedia here: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Methods_of_Ethics#Aim_and_central_argument]

According to Henry Sidgwick [in the final pages of his book *The Methods of Ethics* (Macmillan, 1874)] this is "the greatest problem of ethics." He wants the major theories of traditional ethics to harmonize and reconcile with each other.   (I also want to synthesize and harmonize ethical theories. Yet, as the reader has noted earlier, I do not agree that a contradiction necessarily exists between self-interest and caring for others). It is preferable to keep in mind the following points:

Heroes voluntarily engage in self-sacrifice for the good of other people. As a result often t**hey earn honor**. And **they get honor** from many people who are aware of the heroic activity.   For example, if someone pushes a child out of the path of an oncoming bus at the expense of his or her own life, this is unquestionably heroic. We recognize the heroism and appreciate it.

In contrast, those who *enhance them*selves usually do ***not get honored for that alone;*** but their moral status *is no*t in conflict with the notion of others receiving benefits; or (to – to quote from Sidgwick (in his 1874 manner of speaking) "others having **benevolence** bestowed upon them."

Yes, this purported conflict was *a profound concern* of Henry Sidgwick's, as expressed in his magnum opus; but isn't it true that when one benefits himself one may possibly be in a better position to

be of aid to others. Does not benevolence, in the form of philanthropy, come from those who financially have enhanced themselves? Those who set up foundations have made enough money to make such a step possible. When that is the case, there may not be such a profound p*roblem*-of-this-nature for Ethical theory *to resolve*. It could be argued that every moral choice we make in which *we decide to enhance someone's life at what we perceive to be a cost to ourselves* is, in some sense, "heroic."

Those who give their life or suffer great damage or discomfort are justifiably designated as **heroes**. See especially this site for numerous examples of those who "put themselves out," devoted their lives, for the sake of others: https://www.cnn.com/specials/cnn-heroes

 Heroes are often honored; and charitable giving to the heroes' cause is likely to occur, donated both by individuals and by philanthropic foundations. [This philanthropic generosity though is "Systemic love," and it is more- likely to occur in times of prosperity than when we are living through "hard times."]

Societies comprised of ethical individuals may aim toward a goal of structuring institutions and making arrangements so that hard times and economic busts are avoided or at least cushioned. Since the 17th-Century the alternation of boom-times with hard times has been witnessed as the historical experience.

Going forward, new ethical technologies will alleviate the effect of an economic bust, an economic depression or recession. An example of such a technology is perhaps the UBI (**U**niversal Basic Income) concept – as practiced today in Finland and in Switzerland. [For further details see the references offered in the Bibliography.] Also note The Sovereign Wealth Fund that was introduced in Alaska for citizens of that state.   As a result there will be less social injustice, and we as a society will approach closer to achieving Social Justice.

"Those who sacrifice liberty for security wind up with neither." --Ben Franklin

APPLICATIONS TO POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT

According to Political Science, where it overlaps with Ethics, **an administration (or government) is good if it makes the lives of the vast majority of its citizens better than before; that is to say,** if it provides opportunity for advancement in life-quality. People don't just want to "make a living"; they want to make a life ....a **Quality Life**.

Everyone wants to feel needed and relevant (useful and competent), but if they feel emasculated and fearful, or feel that their government is going in the wrong direction, they may vote in a "strong" leader who will make himself more powerful ...until he becomes a despot. He will do this by violating ethical principles and norms. He will live by such moral fallacies as: "The end justifies the means": "Might makes right"; or "Anything goes!"

{Franklin Delano Roosevelt was an exception. He was an exceptional leader who - although he was a member of an elite class - could identify with, and actually care about the downtrodden, the commoner, and the person who was hurting. He was so respected and admired that he was elected President of the U.S.A., and then he **was re-elected three more times!**

Although as a fallible human being he was flawed in many ways, he proposed and implemented policies that actually helped the working person, and gave relief to those unable to obtain meaningful work. He managed to sign into law many useful regulations.} **Regulations** are designed to **protect** the majority of citizens; and usually they do provide this result for a period of time.

In the present, and going forward into the future, let us arrange things so that either the government serves as employer of last resort, or alternatively, that everyone in society gets a Basic Income Grant from a trust fund that has been set aside exclusively for that purpose. This trust fund is likely to grow in size from year to year just as other pension funds or endowment funds that are invested wisely tend to do. The cash grant (that the fund makes possible) would be designed to replace eventually nearly all other "safety-net" programs. This grant will provide complete liberty and autonomy for individuals to "do their thing," and to bring out their "inner artist," their capacities and talents. As of this writing, Basic

47

Income experiments are going on in Estonia, in Switzerland, and in Canada. {See the Bibliography for links to a more in-depth discussion on the implications of the current experimentation.}

What people value they care about. What they care about they give attention to. Thinking along these lines, an insight occurred to this author: How high people value a thing depends upon how many minutes of attention they give it when they describe it, and how many properties of it they list. This is a measure of how meaningful it is to them. Value, as explained earlier, is a function of meaning. Experiments may be devised employing the notion of time-units of attention. In this way, is it possible that Ethics can be ushered into empirical **science?** [#]

The question arises: Would it be progress if Ethics became more systematic in its theoretical aspects, or even more scientific (in a sense)? Are people today confused in their values? Do they know how to go about living a moral life? Do they want to? Is ethical theory a mere intellectual exercise, or should it be applied to life? Shall we human beings become more efficient, and have more know-how, when it comes to being ethical? What would it take to accomplish this? "Ethics" is a concept which I defined as: the discipline arising when conscious individuals {having individuality} are Intrinsically-valued = seen as uncountably-high in value. Every human individual is to be given respect to some degree just for being human. {If, though, the individual is a blatant hypocrite, or has a criminal mind, then the degree of respect may be close to zero.}

We can build further on this foundation. A beginning has been made in this project as noted in the content of the above references to empirical studies. Thus researchers will, by creative scientific and experimental design, make ethics a quite-useful body of knowledge - practical, effective, and efficient.

We have in this essay **defined** the key term in a concise and precise manner, as follows: **Ethics** = the field of study that arises when examining the Intrinsic-valuing of individuals. *When one Intrinsically-values another, one is being ethical*.

In contrast, there are philosophers who cannot or won't define how they use the word "Ethics." It is for the readers to decide whether they want an ethical theory that is precise or one which deliberately stays

vague and thus slippery and untouchable. When communication is vague no one can be sure what is really meant.

Note that on pp. 79-82 of the Living Successfully booklet - http://myqol.com/wadeharvey/PDFs/HOW%20 ... SFULLY.pdf the author offers some studies that were carefully recorded and done with a high degree of correlation, employing the most- respected scientific method available to them at the time.   In order to do even more, and to do it better, we need your cooperation as you take up careers in this new field.

_____

#) What can be said with confidence is that one person's intension of a thing (or of an individual) may be larger in attributes [descriptors] than another person's is on the same item (or subject.) Then it is safe to conclude that the former individual values that item (or subject) more-highly than the latter individual does. This is true both by definition and by observation.

ON THE ETHICS OF TRUST

Some Sociologists, Economists, Moral Psychologists, as well as others working in the field of Ethics, are currently exploring the idea of how trusting societies are. They have found a way to rate states and nations ranking them on a scale. There has been extensive work done on this branch of Ethics known as The Ethics of Trust. Their analysis and research reveals that a lack of trust is expensive since it often causes a society to invest money and time in courts and lawyers. This rating enables them to assess which societies are comprised of individuals who trust each other, and to what degree they do. Scandinavian societies, as well as Finland, rank high on the list. Further down are the USA, Canada and Great Britain. Near the bottom of the list of ranking are those nations where perhaps nobody trusts anyone at all. (Colombia, Peru, and Russia – with its extensive network of secret police -- are among them.)[*]   These researchers in this branch of Ethics cannot yet actually measure trust itself, so they collect indices of other things that correlate with trust.

There are rankings one may find on the internet of - for some examples - "Best places in a nation to work;" "The best locales in which to live;" comparative international "Happiness" scales; or

49

"Degrees of corruption," scales. These rankings are very useful and helpful in the study of Applied Ethics, as well as in other efforts to understand, and to increase our comprehension of the field of Ethics.

Reviewing, it helps to recall that there are today rigorous scientific studies under the rubric **Moral Psychology.** The latter work may eventually be known **as The Science of the Moral Sense.** It does not matter what name it is called by; it is the results of its technologies that matter, and how these improve the quality of our lives. And as the reader is by now also aware, the sensible *order of priorities* is to have a high regard for each member of our species, to value yourself and others. Then, in the ideal order of priorities, comes stuff; and lastly in the order of priorities fall into place: theories, ideas, opinions and numbers.

To have enlightened self-interest is to know that <u>what helps you, if it really helps you, helps me. We go up or down together</u>.   It also is wise to realize that we can **create** value or **destroy** it when we encounter another individual. Creating value is better since we thereby gain more value in life. Doing this brings us closer to a Quality Life, a life of well-of being; a life in which we thrive ...a life which Aristotle spoke as having *eudaimonia* and *arête:* happiness and high standards of excellence.

The moral values held by an individual give us information about that person. This information is a fact about that individual. Moral values are facts about conscious human beings. Facts are objective. Thus moral values are objective. They are also subjective at the same time.

Ethics, it has been argued, is the same as good human relations. And if one regards the people he or she (ordinarily) encounters as "a treasure", with a story to tell - from which one can learn something - one will perform a service just by listening to them. If one then asks, "Can I be of service in some way?" this often has a multiplier effect, like ripples in a stream. The individuals involved may want to do each other favors. If they possess a sensitive conscience, they may want to

match the blessing bestowed on them. Soon it becomes evident that, in a sense, giving and receiving are the same.

Your goodness, your kind act, may initiate a chain reaction of "paying it forward."

As a result of understanding the moral sense, we may conclude that everyone is to be regarded as if they are of limitless value! Try to imagine what implications follow from that understanding. One such deduction is to _do no harm_. Furthermore, if one holds a moral perspective, one will strive to have good manners, and to be courteous. One will avoid using words that hurt. Instead we will use words that heal, words that serve to boost people up.

_____

Auxiliary resources: This video is well worth seeing again, even if one has seen it before: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l7AWnfFRc7g - **"The Empathic Civilization**." The script is by Jeremy Rifkin, who authored a book by the same name. The book has many Ethical implications between its pages.

The song in the following video merits one's listening to it. It is relevant to the topic of how to spread the word about an aspect of ethics, namely, putting materialism in its place. It also suggests to whom _especially_ to spread the word, namely, little kids. Click on this link to B. J. Thomas – "Using Things and Loving People.":
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J_K9NtiLi_E

Also of interest is a presentation of a sub-branch of Ethics known as Behavioral Ethics. See these videos and case studies to learn more about it   https://ethicsunwrapped.utexas.edu/videos

BASIC QUESTIONS OF THE MORAL LIFE

Here are some questions upon which people may work together in an effort to find some solutions:

How can we maximize human fun and minimize human suffering?

How can we attain widespread prosperity?

How can we – perhaps with the help of Artificial Intelligence programmed machines – converge on answers to the major problems holding back human progress?

Will it take a super-intelligent machine to teach is
that each human can only get by if that individual helps
make it possible for others to get by.

What are our goals as individuals and as a society?

How can we best align our shared goals with the goals programmed into AI "learning" machines?

The era of artificial intelligence, AI, is underway; it is best that we adapt to it. With regard to AI, we learn from an entry in Wikipedia that "all current "artificial intelligence" research focuses on creating algorithms that "optimize", in an empirical way, the achievement of an arbitrary goal." These machines are not really "intelligent" in any other sense. It is highly unlikely that they will on their own choose a moral or ethical goal to pursue; such an aim would first have to be programmed in. Then the machine may seek to reach the goal in an optimal fashion. It can perhaps, in a sense, "memorize" what is in this Structure of Ethics book, and use the tools in it to make a moral decision, but it will not on its own conceive of an ethical goal that was not preprogrammed into it. See the argument here:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Existential_risk_from_artificial_general_intelligence#Orthogonality:_Does_intelligence_inevitably_result_in_moral_wisdom?

TOWARD A DEEPER UNDERSTANDING

As you recall, from the point-of-view of this new paradigm,   **Ethics begins with the perspective that every individual is of uncountably-high value, (_i.e._, of Intrinsic value.)**

Here is the rational argument for the claim: If one takes the trouble to look for these properties, one notes that any single individual has more features than you or I can count, since each of his/her myriad properties has its own (long list of) properties. **The amount of value**,

by definition and by observation, is based on **the amount of properties** *that one finds* **as one concentrates on, identifies with, and gets involved with that which one is valuing.** Experimental studies show that normal people tend to identify with and get involved with other persons. They do not do this as much with regard to things and stuff (unless one is a fetishist; or is a hoarder with an obsessive-compulsive disorder.) Greedy people – those who suffer from a condition known as **greed** – do have this disorder. Normal folks recognize that human life is valuable and priceless. Our moral sense tells us that what is priceless is worth a lot and is not for sale.

One consideration that may come up in Ethics is the notion - which shall remain undefined for now - of respect: respect for other individuals and respect for oneself. Every human individual is to be given respect to some degree just for being human.

While this proposition may seem to some as counter-intuitive, so also are many physical science concepts. This fact has not deterred technological progress. Isn't it time we observed such progress in the moral field?

If, as a result of good education in Ethical theory people believed strongly the idea (that each individual is worth many mega-trillions in value and thus deserve a basic modicum of respect) imagine what sort of world would result.

_____

Of course it is good to be aware that the *psychopath* is a special case, one with brain damage, and do not expect that respect will prevent a violent psychopath from committing a crime; but even this individual ought to get our compassion. And if one has none to give, one possibly is bordering on psychopathy or sociopathy oneself.}

Let's take that perspective as our assumption - our hypothesis to be fulfilled - and see what would happen.

The concept "respect, of course, means different things to different people. Yet if you can't manage to respect certain individuals, you can at least show some politeness and courtesy just because you possess a good character. The more ethical principles one subscribes to and lives by, the more moral one is. Be sure, however, to avoid being

moralistic, that is, making negative moral judgments about an individual you are interacting with – for that may destroy value, when the goal of Ethics is to create value. We are to I-value each individual, give them credit that they can improve and grow out of whatever faulty thinking in which they now engage.

If one does I-value another person one will not want to do anything that will cause him harm. One will then use words that heal rather than words that hurt. One will avoid any actions that could be considered abuse of that person.

Those who know their Ethics likely will do all they can to provide opportunity for others to flourish. They will perform acts of kindness. They will be courteous and civil. And they will extend their ethical radius, and become more inclusive.

People who have **self-respec**t will strive to avoid hypocrisy, corruption, and selfishness. They will have some self-discipline. They will not easily yield to temptations, and they will avoid self-abuse (such as drug-addiction.) They will watch their health, eat healthily, exercise, make sure they get plenty of sleep, etc. They will ask to take on some responsibility and be accountable for it. They will observe the Principle of Moral Consistency: they won't have one standard for others and another standard for themselves. They will seek *nonviolent* solutions to any human relations problem. Such an individual will not be a phony; and will avoid double standards.

One who knows his ethics will seek to create value in each situation in which he finds himself. (He will want to be a creator. Furthermore he may intuitively-understand how to interpret that logical, existential, Hierarchy- of-Value formula (which R. S. Hartman discovered**.)**

One of the interpretations of **t**his formula, the HOV, informs us that Life and Love are worth infinitely-more than Materialism and worldly matters. In turn, worldly concerns and practical considerations are worth far, far more than ideologies, dogmas and systems not backed by evidence. (All the opinions, creeds, and dogmas in the world are not worth one material thing; and all the things in the world are not worth one human life.)

To review the salient applications, the HOV formula directs us to place in our priorities people above things; and things above dogmatic ideas or unsubstantiated opinions.

What would happen if as a result of education people lived by the Ethical perspective? There are many social implications that would follow. Let us list a few:

It would likely ensure that we would treasure people more, and thus, as a way of applying ethics to life, would have active campaigns **to feed the hungry, defend the children, get rid of spousal abuse**. Also we likely would teach kids in elementary school how to live nonviolently, **how not to have violent arguments, how to cope with antagonism, and what to do if picked on by a bully**. We would do these things because we care, and if we care enough our priorities would be straight. For example, we would urge the entire Congress in the U.S.A. to pass the Youth Promise Act. We would also likely encourage the immediate passage of that bill which in lingering in Congress to set up a Peace Department to counterbalance the War Department (what today is known as "the Defense Department.")

We would sign as-air-tight-as-possible Mutual Nonaggression Pacts with every nation on earth. We would unilaterally scrap all our mass-destruction weapons (except one teeny one) to set a good example for the world - and advertise widely that we had done so - thus reducing drastically the threat level of an unintended accident. We would study the arts of peace as actively as we now study war. In these ways we would get closer to the objective of living in an ethical world.

At this point a critic may raise a question:
Q: In Colorado, a man raped and strangled to death a girl of 12 who was mentally handicapped. He then dumped her body out in a field, in a garbage bag. Is that man is someone who I should respect?

A: No, you don't have to respect him. You are correct to see his deeds as "Transpositions of Value" [value confusions.]. His behavior is to be condemned; [though for one's own well-being it is not recommended that one be morally judgmental. Avoid being a moralist. Surely it is wise to get a rapist, or a murderer, out of circulation.[#]   He

doesn't belong in society, mingling with people who know their Ethics, that is, people who have formed a habit of living ethically. No one is obliged to give respect, nor to comply with any other of the ethical principles. They are suggested guidelines – not rules.

There are those who fault Ethics for not showing respect enough for victims of crime. The science of Ethics does not show respect any more than the science of Botany smells. Roses smell. Botany analyzes and classifies roses and other fragrant plants - as Dr. Hartman reminds us.

Analogously, Ethics analyzes self-images and then compares them with the actual behavior of the self that possesses them to see if there is a good match. If there is, that is the degree of morality shown at that moment.   To learn of this data, this helpful self-knowledge, an individual may take a value inventory when his or her life-coach offers this opportunity as a way to to 'Know yourself!'   Education is a branch of Ethics, as is also both Life-Coaching and Psychotherapy.

Professionals in the field of Ethics do in fact respect victims, yet they do what they can to arrange that there are fewer victims in this world. When something goes wrong, is it moral to blame an individual to his face?

_____

#) There will be less crime if we detect and intercept early those who are more prone to violence than most are, noticing it by the age of 4, and redirecting these special-needs children to institutions where they may get some rehabilitation. There already exist tests that can detect such anti-social tendencies. Yet the concern of parents, who are worried that the results will have unpleasant feedback, must be considered. {When parents are reluctant to give permission, all that teachers and therapists have to go by is the behavior of the child -- such as when, for example, a kid grabs the toy held by another kid, and is indifferent to the crying of the child thus deprived. Or, as another example, a child is noticed to be mean to an animal.}

Blaming or fault-finding is not a good way to go through life; it is a sign of immaturity according to the latest research in psychiatry and therapeutic counseling. Readiness to blame does not rate as Emotional Intelligence. It violates inner peace. Serenity is a good quality to have; it adds value to life.

"**Achieving a big worthwhile goal is always impossible — until it's done."**
--Nelson Mandela

HOW ETHICS SPREADS AROUND THE WORLD AND GAINS RESPECT

Technological advances continue to integrate cultures and ideas. Those which make life easier, such as the printing press, the jury system, the postal system, washing machines, air-conditioners, libraries, telephones, television, mobile-phones, compact electronic calculators, the internet, spreadsheets, search tools and other apps, workers' co-ops, smart-phones, gain-sharing systems in businesses, etc., are referred to in the field of Ethics as "**ethical technologies**." Improved methods of communication make the world seem smaller, more like a global village.

An example of an ethical technology would be that computer, mentioned earlier, programmed so that would find out what the consensus views are among the Earth's people; and then via media enabling the news of it to go viral, our learning of this consensus. We then may insist on – and lobby for - **the implementation of this agreement** by the governments of nations, or by corporate leaders. Perhaps then foundations funding this will help make it possible and probable. In programming this intelligent (AI) learning machine to find areas of agreement and synchronization among groups we would want *to avoid systemic collapse through eradication of diversity.*

 As cultures integrate and cohere, and as the quality of life improves, Ethics has a better environment in which to flourish. Then as life gets to be more comfortable, we are likely to see more non-greedy individuals, maybe even generous individuals, who will have a sense of well-being and a sense of moral health. Their lives will be more in balance. Biologists explain that we die eventually because we get out of balance.

"'Systems' are begun for the purpose of unifying, organizing and expediting processes; but they quickly take on a life of their own, and unless they are closely watched and regularly revised, all systems end

in retarding and clogging the very processes they were designed to aid."   -Sydney Harris

This concurs with, and tends to confirm, the Hierarchy of Value discovered by R. S. Hartman. As the reader may recall, Dr. Hartman placed Systemic Value at the low end of the HOV.

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.

For those who have been wondering how Ethics spreads around the World, 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 ae 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 field that interests them, so that they can succeed. {"Success ," as explained in Ethics: A

58

College Course, is an ethical concept.   Wikipedia is such a technology, and so is the Mozilla Firefox browser – both open-source collaborative endeavors. Greenforall.org is such a technology working on alternative solutions to the most urgent problem facing humankind, namely, human caused climate collapse (known euphemistically as 'climate change.')

Among other ethical developments are federations such as this one: https://www.usworker.coop/ There are, in addition, 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.* {Refer to the new book by Dr.Robert Reich, The Common Good, for a more in-depth comprehension as to the wider meanings this concept implies.}

Techniques of self-improvement are Ethical technologies. 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. And you live with efficacy.   You have more confidence. Dr. Bandura describes in some detail the concept "efficacy." 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!

One such example is the 'Universal Basic Income.' Experiments with it are 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 o 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, (one 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.
.
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.

SIGNS OF HOPE

This writer does not agree with the pessimistic view w 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.

After budgeting revenue for this purpose, the government would encourage people and companies to go to work rebuilding the crumbling infrastructure; while those doing the work would have safe and secure working conditions.   Thus wealth is created to turn the government budget from fiction into a reality. If we do elect such leaders, who want to go ahead with all deliberate speed in developing clean, green energy, there is still hope for us. For these are policies that democratically empower people, and thus they are Ethical policies. See in this regard this website:
http://www.greenforall.org/about_us

In Chapter Three the formula was offered which displayed that 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 these dimensions of value. The references in the Bibliography to works by this writer will aid the reader to know exactly why it is the case that the formula is sound, logically speaking. The proof employs the Transfinite Mathematics of Georg Cantor. For details see the first 20 pages of Basic Ethics -   **http://www.myqol.com/wadeharvey/PDFs/BASIC %20ETHICS.pdf**

As each individual works on knowing herself, accepting herself, creating herself, and giving herself by expressing talents and skills that the world needs, "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. 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 becomes the 'conventional wisdom.'

ETHICAL DILEMMAS AND MORAL DECISION-MAKING The solution to an *ethical dilemma* involves choosing the greater good and lesser evil. Intrinsic Value is greater in value than either Extrinsic Value or Systemic Value. This is explained in the early pages of Katz – Basic Ethics. Many times we are presented with a so-called ethical dilemma that is highly-unlikely to occur in real life; it was merely an

imagined mental construction. It was not really a moral paradox at all. Often, the whole framing of the problem omits consideration of creative alternatives.

With regard to moral decision making as it has historically, and is currently still practiced, Jonathan Haidt argues that moral reasoning does not cause moral judgment; but rather, moral reasoning is usually a post hoc construction, generated after a judgment has been intuitively reached. He puts the emphasis on emotion rather than reason. In effect he is claiming that all the reasons we give for our action are all rationalizations.

This current ethical system gives a larger role to reason; and it allows for tradeoffs as well as our having clear priorities in making decisions; it is not absolutist.

Some ethicists tell us to look merely at the consequences that result from a policy once it is implemented. It is <u>not</u> simply the results which determine whether an action is right or wrong. It is necessary to consider what the actions themselves say about the person doing them.

For example, let's imagine that one is becoming aware that he is now in a burning building. If he at this point hears the voice of a crying child, and h*e calculates that the odds are that we might be able to save the child as well as one's self,* we ask what kind of person ignores the desperate cries of the child with only concern about their own well-being, and what kind of person makes an effort to respond to the need of the child? The result of our choices is rarely something we can control -- it is only our choice of actions itself which has a bearing on their ethical value.

> "**To decide what to do**, we can respectively either (1) apply rules or laws to judge whether our actions are moral, (2) evaluate which action achieves the best consequences, or (3) consider how our character, with its attending virtues and vices, shapes our understanding of actions and

consequences. Or ... we can try to mix these three components together into a hybrid, seeking to incorporate a little insight from each."
----Chandler Brett

Is the person who spares no thought for the child validated when the child is rescued by someone else? No …not any more than the person who makes the choice to help is ethically wrong just because their efforts fail to save the child.

MORAL DILEMMAS: AN ANALYSIS

When confronted with a dilemma people can view it a t least three ways:

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

E**xtrinsically** – What is the cost-benefit analysis? What are the pragmatic considerations?

Or **Intrinsically** - What best builds community? What would a compassionate, caring person of good character do? How would a concern for the Common Good best be expressed? What is the loving thing to do in this case? Have all the stakeholders been shown some respect? Has everyone concerned been given sincere consideration? Has anyone involved in this matter attempted to create value that would likely make everyone feel like a winner?

"Do no harm!" Is a maxim derived from The Axiom of Ethics
(which was explained earlier**.)** Do no harm! is a fundamental principle throughout the world. It is one of the principal precepts of bioethics that all medical students are taught in school. If you think that some action you are considering will do more harm than good, you are to avoid it according to this theory.

Then, once one has made a commitment to oneself to live ethically, one will not cheat, cut corners, deceive in order to profit, nor manipulate others strictly for personal advantage. One will be less

likely to behave badly, to do what is wrong, or to commit evils. One will be more likely 'to do the right thing.' This in turn implies a **renunciation** of violence, cruelty, ruthless exploitation, greed, a lack of humility, etc.

Often computer hackers are pranksters wanting to have fun. In the process, they do harm; they cause frustration, expense and pain. This confronts society with a moral dilemma: what to do about these hackers?

As they mature, learn Ethics, and practice becoming ethical people they contribute their knowledge to organizations such as The Free Software Foundation and to open-source institutions. Or they go to work as consultants for computer security companies or for the national government. Those with a criminal mind need to be apprehended and pay some penalty to society for the damage they do.

WHAT SERVES AS MORAL SANCTIONS?

There are at least three dimensions of moral sanctions. They are:
.
Systemic:
The body of ethically-sound and consistently-enforced law. Statute law.
.
[Those with psychopathic tendencies, those who lack empathy – due perhaps to genetics, due to brain damage, or due to an extremely-poor upbringing -- are restrained chiefly by this.]

Extrinsic: Public opinion. Common Law, Conventional thinking and the resulting social pressure. Striving to avoid embarrassment.
Intrinsic::
Pangs of a sensitive, educated conscience. These are pangs which vibrate at the very thought of wrongdoing.

Those aware of the logical Hierarchy of Value know that for living the good life, living as an ethical person, the Intrinsic sanctions are the best.

Societal values do NOT overrule individual values, according to the Unified Theory of Ethics.   The theory agrees with Kierkegaard's conclusions that the individual must receive top emphasis!!

APPLYING MORAL SENSE TO SITUATIONS

The following examples are offered to us by the renowned moral-philosopher, Peter Singer https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peter_Singer - *a man not afraid of controversy.* He took a stand on these and other moral issues. This writer, for one, appreciates his thoughtful views and the reasons that support them as expressed in in his book, How Are We to Live? : Ethics in an Age of Self-Interest: (1993).

A principle that emerges time and again in life, he tells us, is "Do no harm." Here are some examples of harm being done: Forcing a woman to carry to term the baby of a man who raped her; or to bring into the world a baby she cannot financially afford to feed. This is likely to be psychologically harmful to the woman.
Another instance would occur when a dying patient is on hospital life support even though that individual would prefer to die in the course of nature without artificial intervention. That imposition, many would argue, is doing harm to the individual.

Another example of doing harm is forcing a parent o keep alive an extremely-deformed infant who has brain damage.   Another example is labeling a physician "unethical" (if he or she declines to prescribe an antibiotic to a patient who has severe advanced Alzheimer's disease.) Careless labeling which costs a physician his reputation may well be harmful to the best interests of society and its members.

As to what Dr. Singer, in 2007, argued is the most important problem in Applied Ethics - as yet unresolved in 2019 - see this site:

hhttps://web.archive.org/web/20110714194546/http://www.normativeethics.com/interviews/singer.html

Dr. Kwame Anthony Appiah - In his book Becoming Cosmopolitan, NY. W. W. Norton & Company (2009) - challenges the *separative thinking* that is so common today by resurrecting the ancient philosophy of "cosmopolitanism." This school of thought that dates back almost 2500

years to the Cynics of Ancient Greece. They first articulated the cosmopolitan ideal that all human beings were citizens of the world. Later on, these ideas were elaborated by another group of philosophers: the Stoics, who prevailed from 301BC to 200 AD. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stoicism#History

   Dr. Appiah criticizes our faulty thinking seen when we harbor he myth that we are necessarily separated and segregated into groups that are defined by criteria like gender, language, race, religion, nationalism, or some other kind of boundary. Such thinking is a major source of conflict. These are self-identities people have, which if we use them to separate ourselves we are confused in our thinking. Ethics teaches inclusivity. Is all this merely utopian?

The proposal to change this faulty thinking, for us to grow out of it, is **not** utopian since today our world is more interconnected than ever; and as the history of technology has shown, better, more-effective means of communication are coming soon in the future. These will make our globe even more interconnected, thus enabling us easily to have conversations with others from every locale on the planet. Let us proceed on the premiss that gulfs in understanding can be bridged. That can then become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

It may be of interest to note this review by Chandler Brett, who (on a personal blog) wrote this in order to acquaint his readers with a book on ethical theory**:**

> One recently popular source for a hybrid view in determining whether certain decisions and behaviors are morally right is Iain King's *How To Make Good Decisions and Be Right All the Time* (2008). …There have been many critics who have lampooned King's book title and his approach. Still, King's revision of the utilitarian tradition, and his modifications of additional insights from Pascal, Rawls, Kant, Aristotle and others, does hold promise. His definitions of "right and wrong" hinge *on two central claims: (1) that empathy and obligation are the basic virtues of*

the moral life and (2) that reflection based off these virtues leads to a guiding moral principle: 'Help someone if your help is worth more to them than it is to you'"   For a more-thorough and detailed review, see:

ON RANKISM VS. HUMILITY

Here is an explanation by Dr. Robert W. Fuller as to what is meant by the concept "rankism."] This comes up in the overlap between Moral Psychology and Moral Philosophy. Dr. Fuller elucidates it in this quotation, as follows:

> '**Rankism** is the degradation of those with less power or lower rank. It's somebodies using the power of their rank to humiliate or disadvantage those they see as nobodies. Rankism is no more defensible than racism, sexism, homophobia, etc. In fact, rankism—putting people down and keeping them there—is the mother of all the ignoble isms.
>
> Eradicating rankism doesn't require eliminating rank any more than overcoming racism means getting rid of race or delegitimizing sexism means eliminating gender. Rank can be a useful organizational tool that, used respectfully, helps facilitate cooperation.
>
> The abuse of rank, however, is invariably an affront to human dignity. Rankism stifles initiative, taxes productivity, harms health, and stokes revenge. By giving rankism a face President Trump has unmasked it.
>
> Once you have a name for it, you realize that rankism is everywhere in plain sight. Bullying, belittling, derision, corruption, harassment, and self-aggrandizement—these are all manifestations of rankism. The sooner we pin a generic name on them, the sooner we'll be able to show them all the door.
>
> Successful movements require two things: they must know what they're for and what they're against. A Dignity Movement is for dignity and it's against rankism."

The inverse of rankism is **humility**; they vary inversely. Humility is a great quality to have; those who are of good character possess humility.

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.

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.

If one wants a more meaningful life he or she will use the systematic understanding of Ethics one now has rather than turning to Machiavelli for guidance. The choice is up to the individual.

The living of a 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 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.

Up to this point our focus has been on the individual. Now we turn our attention to a group of people who organize themselves into a business or a corporation. A business can be ethical if it meets certain requirements. What are they? This calls for a new chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

WHAT IS AN ETHICAL BUSINESS

Many employers mistakenly believe that they should treat each employee alike. This is not the ethical thing to do: It is preferable that each employee be treated as unique, and be given a project and the responsibility for completing it successfully, with the authority to recruit the necessary means. This will help them grow, and make their work more meaningful and interesting to them. This may sound naïve but it is what some very successful businessmen are already doing. Each C.E.O., as well as each owner of a small-business, might be asked by those who know their Ethics: "Wouldn't it be ideal to develop every member of your staff capable of it?" That way, if s/he shows some managerial capacity or entrepreneurial capacity you would learn about it. And if, by chance they do launch a start-up, due to your counsel and the contribution of some of your capital, you would own a percentage of it by prior arrangement.

Check out the interesting details at these inks:

http://www.dennisbakke.com/joy-at-work and http://www.dennisbakke.com/summary

The experience of tDennis Bakke, CEO, suggests that work can be a

joy for some workers. Learn how he managed to achieve it for so many of his employees as well as for himself.

> Any business is not being fully ethical. If it does not give equal emphasis and attention to its **customers**, to its p**rofit** (the shareholders), to its **employees**, and to *its* c**ommunity** – including its culture, its support of fine arts, and its environment.

If a business wants to live up to the standards of ethics, this is what it must do; give equal attention to each of those aspects mentioned above. If business owners and/or corporate top management were clear about this and put it into practice, they would find that maximum value would result.

When some customers who have an educated and sensitive conscience go shopping they not only want to get the best value"; they also are concerned as to whether the folks engaged in producing what they buy have been paid a fair wage. So if they reside in the United Kingdom (Britain, Australia, Canada, etc.) they make sure to buy goods labelled Fair Trade....not out of self-interest alone, but also out of altruism- which may be mild, but which is there nevertheless.

When an organization acts in accordance with Principles it is likely to succeed in fulfilling its ethical purpose. Thus it will be *good* – for that is what "goodness" means. Just as with an individual, a business, or any organization, is **good** if it has all the properties, and the intentions, necessary to fulfill its purpose. It is fine to make a profit, but not at the expense of the Quality of Life of any of its stakeholders …its staff, its customers, its shareholders, or its community.

H. Annison, "Organizing For Good" Journal of Formal Axiology: Theory and Practice , Vol. 1, (2008), pp. 59-80. This article discusses the challenges organizations face as well as the essentials of effective management. He draws a distinction between efficiency and effectiveness and explains why effectiveness is a higher value. Something is "**effective**" if it goes in the direction of providing a quality life for one and all. It is "**efficien**t" if it accomplishes the most with the

least – the least time, effort, and materials. Effectiveness is Intrinsic Value. Efficiency is Extrinsic Value. You know which is worth more!

Caring and sharing go together in ethical businesses. The ethical path for businesses is to share gains with its staff. Robert L. Masternak, a business consultant, workd out a system in 2009 that teaches that companies who decide to share their gains with their workers (including managers, executives, and all the staff) are best advised "to utilize narrow operational **measures of true gains**, such as **productivity, quality, customer service, on-time delivery, and spending.** Typically Gainsharing plans have multiple measures. *In order for a gain to occur,* ***the performance pie must improve****.*

As the pie expands, the greater the improvement (the gain), and the more financial benefit for the company and employees is then possible. The key point is that there must be an improvement before any Gainsharing occurs. A critical point is that since gains are typically measured in relationship to a historical baseline, employees and the organization must change in order to generate a gain.

The most common goals used as measures are in the areas of **Quality, Productivity, Cost-reductions; and Service** (reducing customer complaints and/or increasing service satisfaction.).

Although there are always outside factors that will influence the result, it is the case that employees have more control of operational measures than they have of profitability. Continuing in the words of Masternak: "However, unlike Profit Sharing and depending on the Gainsharing plan's design, employee payouts can potentially occur even during periods of profitability decline. Companies with this type of Gainsharing model argue that even though profits may be down, profits would have further declined if not for the savings generated from the Gainsharing measures. In this example the company is sharing "savings" and not necessarily "profits." [All] employees at a site are generally [eligible for] the plan, including hourly, salaried, and managers. [T]he plan IS TO BE applied to employees "housed under the same roof."] The plan should be clearly explained to all employees.

In contrast with profit-sharing plans, Gainsharing plans "are designed to distribute gains based on an equal percentage of pay or cents per hour worked." *Bonuses are not to be paid out on a hierarchical basis.*

Another Gainsharing enhancement is that Gainsharing is always paid in the form of **a cash bonus**, based on the "pay-for-performance" concept as compared to a "benefit plan" or a "deferred compensation plan." Frequency of payout is greater for Gainsharing than Profit Sharing.
:
The Gainsharing plan payout is not restricted to an annual arrangement. "Unlike group incentives, Gainsharing typically measures across apartment/units/functions. The concept is to build cooperation and communications between departments instead of building silos.

"The development of a Gainsharing plan often involves employees in many aspects of the plan's design and implementation. Often a cross-functional Design Team is assembled that mirrors the makeup of the total organization. ...After upper management's approval, the Design Team is responsible for conducting all employee kick-off and promotional meetings. The objective is a sense of employee ownership for the plan. ...

If the objective is to drive organizational change by influencing attitudes and behaviors, then Gainsharing may be the right answer." Under this new plan it is often advisable to ask the design-team members where they see the company's main vulnerabilities, and to present it to the body of workers as a plan to reduce largely, or even to eliminate if possible, what are sources of vulnerability. If they contribute toward that end, the gain will be shared. The managers' task then becomes to continually remind the workers as to the goal or goals in view, and to celebrate with the workers when the goal is achieved.

The Axiogenics people also show businesses how to improve, how to synchronize their workforce, how to upgrade all aspects of the organization. See their webpage here: https://www.axiogenics.com/ They fully comprehend what makes a business a success. They know their values.

Some businesses who know their Ethics stagger their employees' hours so as to lessen the pain that comes from commuting to or from work in a traffic jam. Then their workers when they commute to work are not part of the problem we note when drivers all converge at the same time and sit there wasting gasoline.

Most of the selections in the following list are to be found on rankings of Best Places to Work, or they made the list for their customer-service policies, or their contributions to the enhancement of their community. Due to limitations of space far more companies had to be eliminated from the list than were mentioned.

Honorable mention   –   U.S.A. businesses –

Sales Force Mark Benioff, C.E.O. **https://www.salesforce.com/company/about-us/**
https://www.salesforce.com/company/leadership/bios/bio-benioff/

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marc_Benioff

See the above three links for evidence as to why this company is selected as an example of an ethical company in 2019. It practices what it preaches, **and** it has high ideals.

Clark Construction Co. of Lansing, Michigan is another shining example of a company that knows its values and attempts to live them. It puts people first, and then things before ideas. In addition, their Mission statement and Code of Ethics serve as an ideal example for other firms to emulate. Here is a link to one of their websites: https://www.clarkcc.com/careers/

LinkedIn   **https://careers.linkedin.com/culture-and-values**

 Also **meriting mention and recognition** are the following companies:

Amsted Industries, Chicago, Illinois.

 Amsted is employee owned; this allows their employees to share in the success in the company and provides employees with significant retirement savings.

Intuit, Inc., Mountain View, California

Parsons, Pasadena, California

Cadence Design Systems, Inc., San Jose, California

HDR, Inc., Omaha, Nebraska

National Instruments Corp., Austin, Texas

Paul Dumas Cabinetmakers, Inc., Bridgeport, Pennsylvania

The Burnett Companies, Houston, Texas

Resendin Electric, Inc., San Jose, California

[Evergreen Cooperatives](), Cleveland, Ohio

Austin Industries, Dallas, Texas

Cisco Systems, San Jose, California

Abercrombie & Fitch   [http://corporate.abercrombie.com/af-cares/af-gives-back/our-goals-progress]()

Isthmus Engineering and Manufacturing, Madison, Wisconsin
[http://www.isthmuseng.com/company/]()

Pegasystems, Inc. [https://www.pega.com/about]() This global corporation has won more than 30 awards and accolades. They are widely recognized for their creative alliances and ability to grow and prosper. This company can further advance the progress of Ethics by using their tools and capacities to find common ground, and build consensus in the nation and the world.

S. C. Johnson Co., Racine, Wisconsin. This global corporation is notable for its pioneering profit-sharing plan, and for the sustainability of it over many years.

As reported in this column in *The Houston Chronicle*, a good discussion on Ethical dilemmas and moral issues that arise in the world of business is seen here. These interesting workplace-related pointers reflect a Behavioral Ethics perspective:

 Ethical Behavior in Business situations – The Houston Chronicle[https://smallbusiness.chron.com/examples-ethical-behavior-business-meetings-21680.html]()

And see these links also to understand better the structure of ethics in the business setting:
About Business Ethics - The Institute of Business Ethics
[https://www.ibe.org.uk/about-the-ibe/77/54]()

Institute for Global Ethics has many very-useful business services to offer. They have a wealth of ideas that work to make a business a success as a shining example of ethical practice. See their website:

Ethical competition

With regard to the concept of *competition* it may help to consider the following perspectives. A critic may ask: "The theory implies that shared responsibility and cooperation to reach common goals is a high value. **What shared goals can competitors have**?" One may respond to this query in at least two ways:

1) In a neighborhood (or town-wide) corn-shucking bee, or a pea-shelling bee, *the goal* for the competing contestants may well be *to provide the most food for the community*. Contests are competitions.

2) The story is told of two Chinese restaurant owners in the same neighborhood who were engaged in such a ruthless rivalry that it was causing both places to lose business.

One day, one of the owners had a bright idea. He approached his competitor with this concept. He proposed that each manage the other's restaurant for one month, and compete as to who could bring in the most business, and make the best profit margin. The "loser" would gain profit and be more prosperous as a result. The "winner" would gain prestige as the best manager. In truth, there would be no loser, for they would both win: one wins money, the other wins honor.

> They agreed to the deal. And when the month was over, they became good friends, and they had learned a lot. …Of course, this is not practical for every business, yet the spirit of it, the creativity of it, is transferable to many other competitive situations.

Leaders, managers, foundations, and corporation officials might well ask themselves:
How can we design competitions that have a positive effect on the evolution of excellence?

<div align="center">

~~~~~~~~~~~~

BIBLIOGRAPHY

</div>

Information regarding the **Ethics of Trust** is available at these sites:

*) See https://ourworldindata.org/trust

https://blogs.imf.org/2017/05/10/the-economics-of-trust/

https://www.google.com/search?
source=hp&ei=ES2GW5WtK4qb5gLl657QBg&q=the+ethics+of+trust&oq=the+ethics+of+trust&gs

To learn more about Joshua Greene's research at Harvard University in regard to Artificial Intelligence and its social impact, see:
https://futureoflife.org/2017/10/30/podcast-ai-ethics-trolley-problem-twitter-ghost-story-joshua-greene-iyad-rahwan/

For research sources with respect to "happiness," see:

https://www.livehappy.com/science/you-are-what-you-tweet

World Happiness Report

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Happiness_Report**On Rankism**:
https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/somebodies-and-nobodies/201701/president-trump-poster-boy-rankism

On **living in a more peaceful world** and how it can be done, see:
http://www.worldwithoutwars.org/

End Note: When we refer to the 'data of ethics' we mean data such as altruism, kindness, understanding, empathy, generosity, reciprocity, integrity, compassion and

76

Nonviolence. Also to be explained and ordered as the study advances are concepts such as: sincerity, truthfulness, forgiveness, responsibility, and authenticity

On Corruption:

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

With respect to the question: "Are we wired for empathy at birth?"   see: https://curiosity.com/videos/are-we-hard-wired-for-greed-or-empathy-floating-university/

http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/29/books/review/just-babies-the-origins-of-good-and-evil-by-paul-bloom.html

Roots of Empathy - research results.
http://www.rootsofempathy.org/research/

The Five States of Moral Growth in Children - from infancy to late teens

A very good explanation, of **moral health** & the parents' role in furthering it, is located here:

http://www.askdrsears.com/topics/parenting/discipline-behavior/morals-manners/5-stages-moral-growth-children

On the relationship between social class and empathy:

Varnum, M. E. W., Blais, C., Hampton, R. S., # & Brewer, G. A. (2015). Social class affects neural empathic responses. *Culture and Brain, 3,* 122-130.

n this writing, found in the links below, we learn of the views of Dr. Jonathan Haidt who explains how our intuitions are at present influenced by our culture: https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/guest-blog/jonathan-haidt-the-moral-matrix-breaking-out-of-our-righteous-minds/background. For the detailed argument, see:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11699120

How automation creates jobs:
http://www.siia.net/blog/index/Post/70201/Automation-Often-Creates-Jobs-Just-Ask-Bank-Tellers

On the theory and practice of Basic Income as an ethical policy, and to learn where it is working, see:

http://www.siia.net/blog/index/Post/70828/An-Idea-Whose-Time-is-Coming

https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/01/why-we-should-all-have-a-basic-income

http://www.independent.co.uk/topic/universal-basic-income

https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/03/these-entrepreneurs-have-endorsed-universal-basic-income

https://www.marketplace.org/2016/12/20/world/dauphinhttp://fortune.com/2017/09/03/universal-basic-income-economy-study/

On Behavioral Ethics

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Behavioral_ethics#Behavioral_Ethics_Meets_Behavioral_Law_and_Economics

Also https://ethicsunwrapped.utexas.edu/videos

Anthony Appiah, Becoming Cosmopolitan, (NY. W. W. Norton & Company, 2009)

Paul Bloom, Just Babies:The Origins of Good and Evil (NY: Random House-Crown, 2016)   https://www-m.cnn.com/2014/02/13/living/what-babies-know-anderson-cooper-parents/index.html?r=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2F

Paul Edwards, The Logic of Moral Discourse (Glencoe: Free Press, 1955)

[David Gauthier](), Morals by Agreement **(Oxford University Press,1986)**

Sam Harris, *The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values (*NY: The Free Press, 2010)
https://samharris.org/books/the-moral-landscape/
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Moral_Landscape

Robert S, Hartman, The Structure of Value: Foundations of Formal Axiology (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press,1967)

Thomas E. Hill, Contemporary Ethical Theories (New York: Macmillan, 1950)

William James, "The Moral Philosopher and the Moral Life," in The Will to Believe and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy (Boston: Longman Greens, 1896)

Steven Johnson, Farsighted: How We Make the Decisions That Matter the Most (NY: Random House, 2018)

Marvin C. Katz, Ethics as Science - http://myqol.com/wadeharvey/PDFs/ETHICS%20AS%20SCIENCE.pdf (2000)

_____ Ethics: A College Course - http://wadeharvey.myqol.com/wadeharvey/Ethics_A_College_Course.pdf (2010)

_____ Living Successfully - **https://www.amazon.com/LIVING-SUCCESSFULLY-science-Ethics-benefit-ebook/dp/B01NBKS42C** (2017)

Rushworth Kidder – How Good People Make Tough Choices (New York: Random House, 1996)

Iain King, How To Make Good Decisions and Be Right All the Time (London: *Bloomsbury*, 2008).

Robert Reich, The Common Good. (Knopf-Borzoi Books, 2018)

Harvey Schoof and Kristin Clark, Living A Richer Life: It's all in your head   (Amazon Books, 2018)

P. H. Nowell-Smith, Ethics (London: Penguin Books, 1954)

H. A. Prichard, Moral Obligations (Oxford: The University Press, 1930)

Jeremy Rifkin, The Empathic Civilization (NY & London, Penguin Books – J. P. Tarcher, Inc., 2010)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Empathic_Civilization

Michael Shermer, The Moral Arc: How Science Makes Us Better People (New York: Macmillan, 2015)

_____, Why People Believe Weird Things (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1997)

Henry Sidgwick, The Methods of Ethics (London: Macmillan,1874)

Peter A. Singer, How are we to live?: Ethics in an age of self-interest (Amherst, NY: Random House & Prometheus Books, 1993). See reviews here: https://www.amazon.com/How-Are-We-Live-Self-Interest/dp/0879759666/ref=asc_df_0879759666/?tag=hyprod-20&linkCode=df0&hvadid=312168414377&hvpos=1o1&hvnetw=g&hvrand=13457932900959127828&hvpone=&hvptwo=&hvqmt=&hvdev=c&hvdvcmdl=&hvlocint=&hvlocphy=9021476&hvtargid=pla-490521533755&psc=1#customerReviews

Sidney Zink, The Concepts of Ethics (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1962)