BASIC ETHICS:

A systematic approach

by Marvin C. Katz, Ph.D.

(2014)

Table of Contents   **Page**

FOREWORD Let us begin with some Meta-philosophy. R. S. Hartman, in his book, THE STRUCTURE OF VALUE, has defined "Philosophy" as: "'the continuous clarification and analysis of vague concepts." As philosophy is done successfully concepts become sharper, less vague or ambiguous, clearer, more exact and more precise. One way this is achieved is by defining one's terms. As a result communication is facilitated and greater understanding occurs. In writing this booklet I owe a great debt to Hartman (1910-1973) who was my teacher and mentor. This booklet would not have been possible without the influence of his creative genius.

A formal system, using a definist approach, when applied, by means of bridge laws (rules of interpretation), may well be relevant to everyday life. This is how physical science works: the math models are very abstract and arid, but the technologies engineered by means of a substantive interpretation of the formal symbols and formulas give us the comforts of life such as the invention of the telephone, the TV, the smartphone, etc. The same can occur in Ethics: artists and designers will be inspired by the ideas emanating from the theory to produce ethical technologies, such as more efficient and effective means of education that tend to liberate the student and wake up consciences. I will have more to say about this later.

As we turn to the field of Ethics, which is concerned with **the good life for the good person**, as well as with **those principles that have value for us** to live by, let us begin by defining the terms "value" and "good" so that the reader will understand what this author means when he uses these words.

Something has <u>value</u> if it possesses some of the properties needed to fulfill its purpose (or its definition, or its intention.) If it has all the properties needed, let's speak of it as <u>good</u>. A good x

exemplifies its concept. (It has all the attributes that - according to the meaning of that concept - things of that sort are supposed to have.) To illustrate, if a "ball" is supposed to be round and bouncy, and this item referred to as a "ball" is indeed round and it is bouncy, then it is "a good ball." Your conception of "ball" may have many more requirements, but if this actual specific item has them all, then it is good (as a ball.) We note that value is a function of meaning, the more meaning, the more value. If something is meaningful to you, you are likely to consider it valuable, and the converse is also true.

WHY BUILD A SYSTEM OF ETHICS?

Admittedly, every system has some flaws. What's the benefit of a system anyway? Why think systemically? ....Just because it helps you see that there is more than one dot and then it helps you connect the dots. ! At its best it shows you another perspective, or helps you make more efficient use of resources For all these reasons and more we need theory. But to focus on the systemic alone is a mistake, for that would be over-valuing it. We need to take advantage of the other dimensions as well.

It is predictable that a coherent, reliable discipline of Ethics will gain acceptance in wider areas of the planet as it suggests new technologies and/or modes of media that serve to spread and facilitate the adoption of morality -as defined in the system; or to phrase it in another way, as the system of Ethics serves to facilitate a Quality Life for one and all.

###########

META-ETHICS AND BASIC VALUE DIMENTIONS

With the Axiom of Value – which is the formal definition of the term "good" - and with standard set theory we will below demonstrate that once the axiom is applied to value itself, it comes up with three basic dimensions: S, E, and I. This is a logical procedure. Then in End Note 4 of A Unified Theory of Ethics, we turn to applications; the chart found there shows how useful and wide-ranging these analytic tools are for yielding new definitions of terms. The terms are related to one another both as to degree of "betterness", and as to how they correlate with other terms having the same dimension of value. Here is a link to the first part of it:
http://wadeharvey.myqol.com/wadeharvey/A%20UNIFIED%20THEORY%20OF%20ETHICS.pdf

Furthermore, we will explain in the pages that follow that when the axiom is applied to the self-concept we derive the definition of "morality", which is synonymous with "moral value" in the system.

From these definitions we derive three dimensions of value, as follows: [Those with a Math phobia will want to skip the derivation and go now to page 8.] There are three kinds of number which mathematicians acknowledge: finite; denumerable; and nondenumerable.   Or, to say it another way, finite, countable, and uncountable.   [To illustrate, think of "7" (or the letter n in algebra), numbers which are finite. Then think of the integers: these numbers are countable but nonfinite since they go on indefinitely. And then think of the number of points in a continuous line segment, which is an uncountable number.] So a value which has only a finite amount of the properties required to fulfill its description (its concept's intension) will be named S-value – where S stands for Systemic.   A value that has only a denumerable (a countable) amount of properties will be spoken of as an E-value, where the E stands for Extrinsic.

And a value that has a nondenumerable (an uncountable) amount of the property-names (attributes) which are needed to describe something (or someone) having uncountably-many properties {such as your mother, your wife, your dear friend, your priceless treasure, a museum-quality artifact, etc.) …that value dimension we shall dub I-value, wherein I stands for Intrinsic. Intrinsic values are seen as gestalts, for if asked to list all the features of one's girlfriend or mother, a person wouldn't know where to begin to enumerate them – there are just so many. Enumeration is inappropriate and is not necessary**.**

I think we all agree that the formula 90 > 20 > 4 is true with regard to arithmetic. It is the same with the three basic dimensions of value - with regard to valuation: A higher infinity is greater (in size) than a lesser infinity;[1] which in turn is greater than a finite amount. An infinity of what? In this case, an infinity of meaning. And, as we are about to explain, value depends upon meaning.

The Systemic values arise by the fulfillment of mental constructs. They are constructed by the mind. They are defined into being: the result of postulation. Definitions are of finite length. The Extrinsic values arise by the fulfillment of worldly matters. And the Intrinsic values are the result of the fulfillment of situations to which we have given ourselves, our involvements, our deep interests, our loves, our highest appreciations, our realities. Common applications of the dimensions are: I-values are people values and spiritual values; E-values are the value of things and stuff from everyday life, the daily material values; and the S-values are the Intellectual values.

To *fulfill* in this context means for the actual (properties) to match the ideal picture of something or someone you have in your head.

_____

1)   **The number of curves in hyperspace is larger than the number of integers.**

"The name sets the norm" Hartman liked to say. By this he meant that the meaning of the concept that goes with **the label** you put on whatever you are valuing – **the name** – sets the norm: when you name (or designate, or associate a word to) an object, there is a meaning of that word that is associated with it. That meaning is the measure: it provides a norm for the object (of your attention) to fulfill. If it does match, if it does fulfill its concept, then you will likely tend to consider the object to be a value, or to 'have value.'

The logical Hierarchy of Values (HOV) is shown concisely in the formula **I > E > S**. Among the formula's interpretations are: Life takes priority over materials; Health is more important than Wealth.   Material (and wealth) are more valuable than theories, systems, ideologies and schools of thought. Also it tells us – as the old saying goes – "Life is larger than logic." It is 'existential'' because it affirms life – the life of individuals. That is one of the main thrusts of existential philosophy. [Cf. S. Kierkegaard, EITHER-OR].

One result we can derive from these definitions is that **I-value is richer in properties than is E-value**, and that   E-value is richer in properties than S-value. These relationships, as you may recall, can be depicted in a formula, the HOV. When we apply the definition of value to the very concept "value" itself what results are these three basic dimensions of value; and we arrive at the necessary conclusion that I-value is more of a value (more valuable) than E-value, and that E-value, in turn, is more of a value than S-value. Value is a function of meaning: the more meaningful something is, the more valuable it is.   This provides us with a hierarchy of values (**HOV**). Let us review some of the fine points:

Meaning serves as the **measure** (of a concept's value.) For purposes of logic, 'meaning' is the intension of the concept; it consists of a definition, and the exposition – or description – of the features that make up that

individual (item or person.) These features, or qualities, are property-names or they are properties. {Every concept has a name (a designator or label), a meaning (a set of property-names or attributes) and an application. A member of the class of application is a referent (a case or an example.) A referent possesses properties. This applies to the self-concept as well. In that case the name becomes a proper name; the attributes are the individual characteristics or features; and the application is the body and the **conduct** of the particular individual. *Thus* an understanding of this becomes *relevant to Ethics*.}

Let us make note of, and remember, the formula, **I > E > S**, as this will come in handy later. For now we call attention to the fact that what is richer in quality, is richer in meaning, and that to have more properties is, *a fortiori*, to have more meaning. Another way to look at this derivation of the three value-dimensions and thus to aid in the understanding of them, is to note the three kinds of entities to which they each appropriately apply. Ontology tells us of such entities.   It explains that we employ, constructs, abstracts, and singulars (or particulars.) Constructs of the human mind are Systemic values.

We Systemically value technicalities, the financial system, thoughts, ideologies, zebra codes, zipcodes, scientific theories, systems – anything created by the mind.

Abstracts are categories which have been abstracted from reality by ignoring specific properties in order to arrive at a more-general classification. As we classify, or select certain common features which specific, concrete, things have. we are Extrinsically valuing. We gain in generality but lose in specificity. We are in the socio-economic domain, the world of everyday common sense, the material world, the world of Extrinsic values.

When we focus on the specific, the particular, the one-of-a-kind unique entity we are Intrinsically valuing. We have entered the domain of emphasis, emotion, metaphor, intimate and private language, *satori*, I-and-Thou, involvement, intense concentration, diversity-within-unity. It is what Bergson called compenetration, what Husserl called Intentionality,

We get emphatic about I-values, we get involved with them, we become one with them, we form a continuum between the valuer and what is valued. This is Intrinsic valuation. To value is to prize, prefer, desire, assess, qualify. To I-value is to see something as a whole, to give it our focus, to interact with it, to treasure it, even to have reverence for it. Life, love, liberty, leisure, joy, beauty, individuality, morality, integrity, sincerity, authenticity are I-values. If we call something "genuine" or "real" we are I-valuing it. We tend to I-value our hobbies. We also I-value our deepest convictions. When we I-value we <u>care</u> about what we value. Caring, as will soon become quite clear, is an important application of Intrinsic valuation. When we care about a person, the evidence shows we don't mind sharing with that party.

These three basic dimensions of value, S, E, and I, are matters of degree [by definition, each has a different and distinct degree of meaning] and thus they can, when applied, serve to measure value,   they are, in a sense, analogous to segments on the electromagnetic spectrum, in that they also form a spectrum – a spectrum of value. These dimensions of value can be used as tools of analysis, as will be seen when we apply them in Ethics One application of the dimensions will be to the project of ranking the traditional academic schools of ethics we find in the history of ethical ideas

In the following discussion I shall argue that some traditional schools of ethics are better than others; and I shall use the meta-theory for Ethics to demonstrate my case.

We need a way of justifying the view that the value of a school has a place on a hierarchy with regard to its betterness or worseness. First let us review some of   those basic ideas.

As mentioned above, formal axiology [value logic] already has a hierarchy built into it, namely, the logical Hierarchy of Values (the HOV) shown concisely in the **formula I > E > S**. We explained why Intrinsic Value is a more valuable value than Extrinsic Value, which in turn is far more valuable than Systemic Value. (I is better than E which trumps S.)

Now we will show **how the leading schools of ethics can be ranked**, and ranked in a fitting and fair manner. The formula will aid us in this task.

The three major schools of thought in academic ethics are Virtue Theory (VT); Consequentialism; and Deontology. The latter is concerned with promises, contracts, rights, duties, obligations and imperatives (which it claims are universal and categorical.)

Consequentialism is concerned with the impact that specific actions and policies will have on human flourishing. [The adherents of this school – or perspective -- grant that "flourishing" is a shifting and expanding concept – as more is learned about it.) Consequentialism reminds us that the more happiness and the less suffering we have the better our lives will be. Thus we should act in such a way as to maximize happiness and minimize suffering. On this view, the right thing to do is to choose that action that is believed to promote the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Moral right and wrong depend on consequences – do the good consequences outweigh the bad? This approach to ethics gives us a sense of direction, a goal to aim for. It provides guidance for sound decision-making.

Modern Virtue Theory teaches that we have a responsibility to care for our family as a first priority, and a responsibility to ourselves to strive to be of virtuous character. We are to treat our

spouse or other close family for whom we have greater responsibility with more care than we would treat strangers.
This is the moral thing to do. [Some deontologists agree with this also.]

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

We need all three sets of tools in our toolbox: there are some strengths in all three schools of thought. Let's keep in mind, though – using here some concepts from Gestalt Psychology – also Visual Optics - as we emphasize one of these perspectives it becomes "figure" while the others are "ground" (background) …as we give our attention to one of these schools the others tend to recede into the background of our thinking. However it would be negligence to totally ignore any of them. They all can be helpful - as is seen in Appendix Three, pp. 86-89, in ETHICS: A College Course. Here is a link to it: http://tinyurl.com/24cs9y7

Of course, disciples or exponents of a single viewpoint will claim that their specific school of thought is the best approach to account for ethics and for the moral life.

In my view, after an analysis of all three perrspectives, and after giving deep consideration to the topic, while they all deal with quality-of-life issues, while they all praise responsibility, Virtue Theory seem to be the most morally-sensitive with its many subtleties, and its spelling-out with some specificity ways to be immoral, as well as how to live the good life, it looks to be most fitting as an application of I-Value. (VT shows one how to live a principled life, a life in which high ideals are implemented.

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

He/she deliberately builds an admirable character by the techniques of habit formation …unless one is acculturated into it early in life by one's parents, guardians, or family; or tribe, or community ["it takes a village"]. Hence Intrinsic Value, when applied, fits most closely to VT.

Extrinsic Value, applied to the three schools of ethical thought, yields Consequentialism, for they both deal with the external everyday world, the socio-economic policy matters. They are both concerned with practical decisions, with the effect of actions on human well-being and happiness. An action is right if it leads to more happiness in your life provided you take into consideration the welfare of others; and can sidestep "zero-sum games." Game theories, with their finite rewards and penalties fit here; also determinism; behavioral conditioning; political affairs; the common good; concern for humane public policies. Common goods are public health measures, emergency-management agencies like F.E.M.A., the protection of the environment (clean air and water), peace-keeping and other police work, fire-prevention, etc.

Systemic Value, applied to this topic, results in Deontology, with its rules to live by, its categories and categoricals, its declarations of human rights, and lists of obligations. Here systematically doing one's duty is the emphasis – staying within the boundaries of proper behavior. It does, to its credit, demand that we treat others as ends, not as mere means to an

end. Thus one who takes this imperative seriously eschews the manipulation of other people, one carefully avoids exploiting others.

The Consequentialist would criticize this position by insisting that we must examine the consequences of this way of living. It could be dangerous, they warn. A strict adherence to a Rule – or rules -- could blind one to the variability and variety of life-styles that produce a high quality-of-life, could steer one into a 'valley' in "The Moral Landscape," instead of to a 'peak.' At the peaks individuals flourish and blossom. They are most likely to be creative since they have the means and the leisure to indulge in the pursuit of a worthwhile project.

A virtue-theorist may criticize Deontology for being too rigid and barren. Without a good character (which is prerequisite) a person might not keep his promises, pay his debts, attend to his obligations, nor express responsibility. One's vices may interfere or even prevent one's adherence to the imperatives. So first and foremost cultivate the virtues. We have rated the academic schools in order of priority. We are here setting forth a modernized, 21st-century paradigm, a new perspective for this ancient study known as "Ethics." In the next section, with the aid of the meta-ethics presented above, we shall define what we intend to mean by that basic word.

WHAT (IN THIS NEW PARADIGM) IS ETHICS?

As we explained earlier, caring results from Intrinsically-valuing a person or persons. The field of Ethics is actually defined (within the new paradigm here proposed) as the **discipline**, **the department of knowledge, that is generated when one I-values individuals.**

Ethics is the discipline that arises when individuals are valued Intrinsically (in contrast to being valued Extrinsically and/or Systemically.) As the frame-of-reference becomes clearer, and the relationships among its defined terms becomes apparent the reader will see why it is reasonable that this discipline bears the name, "Ethics." Ethics is a system which will derive a number of moral principles. To be ethical is to I-value oneself and others.

Hence, when an individual is seen as "unique" s/he is being viewed from the ethical perspective. When one understands that each person is a precious treasure of value not to be defiled in any way, but at the very least to be respected (if one can't bring oneself to love him or her), and treated with dignity ...then one is acting ethically. When we believe that every person has "a story to tell" we have entered the field of Ethics (in our sense of the term.) When we practice "morality" we are being ethical; and we will soon go into detail as to what this entails**.**

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 is Anatomy/Physiology. It is concerned with *systems* of the body, organ placement, the skeletal and muscle systems among others. This as the **Systemic** view.

The next is the social/psychological perspective. This looks at an individual (or a group of them) in a more meaningful way. Now we have functions we perform, such as memory, perception, goal-directed behavior, capacity to align ourselves in cohort groups, associate with categories or types, to organize, etc. This view of individuals is the **Extrinsic**. As explained earlier, this is the everyday, socio-economic, role-playing, functional, worldly, pragmatic way of looking at us.

Another perspective is the Intrinsic, and that is the one we shall focus on during our project here, To review, when we Intrinsically value we give our undivided attention to whatever we are currently valuing; and we come to identify with it; and we bond with it. We concentrate on it, and get involved with it or with them. We experience it fully. We find uncountable meaning there. 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.   When we Intrinsically-value individuals *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, or a stereotype, 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 of priceless value, as having some dignity.

Ethics – according to this new paradigm - is a body of knowledge, just as is Medicine or Musicology. It is a perspective on human beings, in which they are regarded in a certain specific way -- namely, as infinitely-valuable treasures – or if you wish, as of indefinitely-high value – treasures not to be defiled; as organisms with a wide range of conceptions, perceptions and experience, capable of deep feelings and deep thoughts; as creatures having a story to tell ...if one succeeds in getting them talking about their life, including their inner-life. Someone with a sense of Ethics is okay with caring and sharing.

A good system of Ethics would encourage and recommend not only that an individual possess a good character, and be one who keeps his promises yet also be one who is concerned to see effective results and social policies that *enhance well-being*. This system does that: it integrates the best insights from all the

major academic schools. For if one I-values individuals, it follows from that that one will want to I-value himself and others, and thus will have self-respect, and will also care about others. Then, out of self-respect the individual would want to develop a good and decent character (including wanting the steps that lead up to acquiring it.) Such a person would strive to keep promises, fulfill obligations, and be responsible. **and** definitely would care to implement policies that promote a quality life for all. Now that we have offered an exact definition of our field of interest, let's define what we mean by the term "morality."

We showed in an earlier chapter, that "value" - by definition - involves a <u>match</u>... to put it in plain language: a match between the ideal and the actual. When the actual fulfills the ideal, there is value. - [Note that when I used the vague-language phrase "the actual fulfills the ideal" I meant that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the two, not that one "reaches" the other.]   If one wants more detail, see the more-exact language spelled out on pp. 7 through 9 of the manual, ETHICS: A College Course, where "value" is defined with precision in a professional manner Here is a link to it: http://tinyurl.com/24cs9y7

Ethical values thus also involve a <u>match</u>. Morality {- by definition within the Unified Theory of Ethics -} is a match between one's ideal Self and one's actual self. Of course, it is the individual himself (or herself) that sets the ideal, that determines his/her self-identity. It is you who defines yourself. If you define yourself as 'an authentic person' then it is you who would live up to that self-image in order to fulfill your self-concept, and thus be a highly-moral individual.

In my work I make the point that Ethics begins with the perspective that every individual is of uncountably-high value. {I admit that that 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?}

Here is the rational argument for the claim: 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. Thus we may conclude that we would have an ethical world if the vast majority - as a result of education - believed strongly that each *individual is highly valuable...* Let's take that as our assumption - our hypothesis to be fulfilled - and see what would happen.

Dr. Jonathan Haidt, does research in Moral Psychology, and has a Moral Foundations page on the web in which he describes universal human nature. Whether this nature is based upon our evolutionary and tribal past, or whether we have brain modules for the way we behave, or both, is not the main topic here… but we do tend to behave in certain ways and to believe certain prevalent ideas. Science (especially psychotherapy) has shown this. Procrastination, perfectionism, perversions, fetishisms, over-generalizations are very common among us human beings.

Furthermore, there are ethical fallacies (errors in thinking, confusions) that we often commit: fallacies such as racism, sexism, rankism, ageism, speciesism, regarding persons as mere things -- and thus it's okay to abuse them, or discard them -- or, even worse, treating them as numbers -- and thus it's okay to erase them. Persons are *not* just things or numbers. They are *much more complex*.

If ethics has a purpose, I would say it is for an individual to integrate his/her outer self with his inner Self.

Mores, by definition, are the practices of a human culture.

Ethics is not to be confused with mores. Cultural relativists, Logical positivists, and moral nihilists often commit this fallacy. The discipline of Ethics prescribes principles to facilitate the living of the good life in the same way as the discipline of Medicine prescribes drugs to relieve pain. To live a good life is to live a quality life - a life filled with meaning, a life in which one makes a difference.

Although this perspective on "ethics" was set forth by R. S. Hartman in 1967, it finds confirmation in the work of Alan Donagan, who in his book The Theory of Morality (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977) argues that there is a coherent theory underlying the general moral outlook and behavior of all (normal) people, though it is not necessarily consciously expressed.

He explains that rules of ethics are not basic, nor are rights, or virtues. Instead these are all generated by a more fundamental assumption: persons are valuable in themselves.

Thus, the reason why murder is wrong has nothing to do with the maximization of happiness, much less the command of a deity, or the exercise of virtue, but the fact that murder results in the destruction of something intrinsically valuable: a human life.

A "good action" is an action that (Systemically) proceeds from sound reasons; (Extrinsically) has outcomes that meet with approval and gets something worthwhile done; (Intrinsically) shows respect for others and reflects living out one's principled beliefs on the part of the one performing the action. If it meets those three criteria, we are justified in speaking of it as "a good action."

NORMS: THEORETICAL AND APPLIED

There are three kinds of norms:

(**S**) Formal norms.

(**E**) Facultative norms.

(**I**) Obligatory norms.

Examples. A formal norm may be **X**s are to be **y**s. This is a proposition in Logic, as part of a formal system of Ethics.

The facultative norm for this statement might be: **Humans are to be (morally) good persons**: decent to one another, kind, helpful, ready to be of service   if possible, responsible and accountable, compassionate, inclusive, tolerant, respectful, courteous, devoted to making things better, etc. …all of which follows if one regards a conscious human being as Intrinsically valuable.

The obligatory norm relevant here would be:
I want to be a good person, and I intend to be!
My attitude will be: Whatever it takes! Thus I will be mindful of what Demerest & Schoof have named "The Central Question of Life," - seeking to engage in deliberate practice of it - focusing on each detail involved and making tiny adjustments to stay on track... until it becomes a habit to ask it of myself. The question amounts to this: **How can I make things better for all concerned? How can I, in this situation, upgrade it? How can I add value?** For details, see Answering The Central Question (Philadelphia, HeartLead Books, 2010.) http://www.amazon.com/Answering-Central-Question-Peter-Demarest-ebook/product-reviews/B00584UREC/ref=dp_top_cm_cr_acr_txt?ie=UTF8&showViewpoints=1

If there is an activity with respect to which I tend to procrastinate, I am going to approach it from an *axiogenic* standpoint: I will FOCUS; and GET

IT DONE !!!

If I notice a Perception Gap (wherein people seem to be addressing the same topic but are actually talking around each other - perhaps due to the ambiguity of their words, etc.) I will ask questions, seek deeper understanding of the other person's position, so that I can get at the heart of the gap, and do what I can to close the gap, to find the common ground, to reconcile. That is the axiogenic approach to the problem.

STAGES OF EVOLUTION IN ETHICAL INSIGHT

 We can analyze ethical development through the ages into three major stages by means of employing again the three basic dimensions of value known to Value Theory, namely **S, E,** and **I**.

S-value (Systemic Value): a selfish, self-centered concern with my own survival and my own welfare;

E-value (Extrinsic Value): a favoring of the welfare of my kin and/or my in-group members - my tribe;

I-value (Intrinsic Value): favoring the harmony of my human species, and eventually perhaps even compassion toward most mammals, and caring about the Earth's environment. (Ecological harmony.)

We know our true self-interest when we have reached the stage where we Intrinsically value both ourselves (Self-respect) and other persons (Empathy and Kindness - or at least courtesy and respect)..
Then we are wise and enlightened..

Humans have evolved: in the Pleistocene Era they were at the S-value stage.

Ten thousand years ago we had evolved to theE-value level of development.

In the 21st Century we are evolving to an Intrinsic level of development. We are coming to appreciate that the harmony of the entire human species is in our best self-interest.

Seek wisdom and enlightenment in order to **flourish.**

When asked for the evidence for this schema, I explain that I got the idea from a research study by several researchers, some of who are Neurologists, some Geneticists, and some Moral Psychologists. They were responding to a theory put forth by Johnathan Haidt. A link to it is here:
www.sciencemag.org/cgi/eletters/316/5827/998#10 251

This is not to say that that altruism and community haven't been important to humans from the beginning but this model of cultural evolution presented here serves to emphasize the prevailing consciousness of each era. We have witnessed an evolution of ideas even in our own time. R. M. Kidder stated it well in his book, HOW GOOD PEOPLE MAKE TOUGH CHOICES (NY: Simon & Schuster,1955) p. 42, when he commented on the moral development he witnessed in the history of Western civilization:

"When it was still right to own slaves, it was already wrong to eat people. When it had become wrong to own slaves, it was still right to possess women as property. When that became wrong, it was still all right to blow cigarette smoke in your neighbor's face. Now, with smoking in disgrace, it is still all right to use and dispose of polystyrene foam cups, regardless of their long-term effects on the environment. More changes, clearly, are in the works."
--Rushworth Kidder

Now it is becoming respectable for gays, or lesbians, to marry who they choose. Social Security and Head Start are established institutions. Healthcare is slowly becoming an entitlement in most of North America. People are gradually becoming aware of what it takes to maintain bodily health ...which gives a new meaning to 'healthcare.' Some day, people of color will get to vote without hinderance.

Capital punishment is gradually fading out (except in Texas and a few other states in the U.S.A..) The country is more receptive to progressive policies. Mores change. We acquire a new ethos; though many had to struggle, and some, it seems, had to die, to achieve some of these reforms. We should not forget that.

At a higher stage of ethical insight - the one into which we are currently evolving – the Intrinsic value stage – one would witness the prevalence of the   " favoring of the harmony of my human species" attitude. {One might even dare to comment that in this stage of development *there are no strangers* !!}   We are becoming a global village; we are networking; we are increasingly aware of our interdependence; we share ideas over the internet. At many an internet forum or blog site we find people from all over the planet.

There is more evidence for that This generation volunteers aid and lends 'a helping hand' more than any previous one did. According to a two-page article in the Parade Magazine (supplement syndicated in many Sunday newspapers throughout the U.S.A.), dated March 7, 2010, a new poll has the headline "COMPASSION COUNTS MORE THAN EVER." It reveals that in the U.S.A. there is a boom in volunteering. Many friends have been made from all over the globe, due to technology. This could not have occurred in the 17th century. What are the implications of this for Ethics?

Philippa Foot devised the now famous "Trolley Dilemma" in which by some evil means several people are tied to one railroad track,

and one individual is tied to an alternative one, a spin-off track. A speeding, runaway train is approaching, and in a booth is a switching mechanism that controls on which track the train will run. Most philosophy students are familiar with this hypothetical mind-experiment, used as the basis of discussion.

It is an empirical fact that people tend to hold any single one of their close relatives as more valuable than multiple strangers, when they were told to choose who to rescue in the Trolley Dilemma: "Assume your girlfriend, your daughter, or your granddaughter is tied to track in the train's path. And, say, if 5, 7, 11, or 15, *or more* people were tied to the other (sideline) track. A train is approaching rapidly. You hold the switch in your hands. You are asked who you will likely rescue: her or them."

The vast majority elect to rescue her. They regard her as highly precious. The social scientist, or the poll-taker, will ask them if there is an upper limit on the number of strangers on the sideline track that would be sacrificed. They can't name one. If this girl's preciousness has no upper limit, we say that the number is indefinitely high. It is, so to speak, a (practical) infinity. If one individual can be that precious, then - from the perspective of *their* grandfather, or parent - why not the next? And the next? Why not you, or I? To the moral philosopher, why not anyone alive?   This is theory, yet it has applications to actual life.

Due to social networking, and the ease of travel, and for other reasons, it is becoming true that, in a sense, these days, <u>there are no strangers</u>.

Here are some 'universal' principles for normal people all over the planet. They apply to every civilized individual: Know Yourself. Choose (to be) Yourself. Create (the talents and potentials within) Yourself. Give Yourself; (express your gifts, so as to: Minimize

suffering. Maximize well-being and Quality of life (for all you can)). And thereby create value.

DOES HUMAN NATURE CHANGE?

The prevailing ethos of the times has changed through the years. In other words, there has been cultural evolution which over time has had the effect of changing what was thought to be "human nature." Every time a psychotherapist, or a life coach, counsels a client successfully, and a change in behavior is evident that individual , in a sense, human nature can be said to have changed Every time someone learns something in a school. or outside of one, that person has changed to a degree. The writer is not naïve about the violence and cruelty of which human beings are capable, but there are signs of hope.

The question could be raised: On what data would a science of Ethics be grounded?

I'll respond by citing some facts about the human condition.

Fact: We are social animals.

Fact: We need to give and receive affection.

Fact: Most people **do what they said they would do**. That is how and why we get our household electricity each day when we throw a switch; people acted responsibly to deliver the energy.

Fact: Most drivers do not crash. They observe and comply with the rules of the road. They let another driver pass ahead of them at a merger onto a narrower lane. In this way, and many others,

they display **fair** conduct, etc.

Fact: Most people do not violently attack one another. A few do but they are an exception. Deviant behavior is not normal. Most folks are normal. They often exhibit graciousness. They are courteous. They are tolerant.

Fact: Many people, if they observed an individual walking ahead of them was about to be hit by a falling object, would shout "Look out. Danger!" They would do this for a total stranger without inquiring first about the individual's religion, ideology, or birthplace.

Fact: We have mirror neurons. It has often been observed that in a room full of children when one child is crying many other children in that room will express sadness. Laughter is infectious. Yawning seems contagious often. If one person sees an insect crawling up the arm of another the first person winces. Fear on the part of one often leads to panic by many. Etc. etc.

Fact: People want justice to be done.

Fact: People want things to make sense.

Fact: Some version of The Golden Rule is to be found in virtually every culture on the planet. For example, the principle is formulated this way: "Do not do to another what you would not want done to yourself !" This suggests that empathy and compassion are human qualities.

A majority of the population of the Earth today have a moral intuition that *murder is always wrong and immoral.* [Murder in the first degree is defined legally as entailing premeditation with malice aforethought."] Most people who have normal brains agree

that rape, slavery, and child-prostitution are wrong and immoral. So too are maiming a child and sending him or her out to beg, and also burying people alive …wrong and immoral.

It is also a fact that in the world today people live to an age of 70 years, on average, in contrast to what was the case in the 1700s when they only lived to age 50 on average. Furthermore, CNN reported on 12-15-13, that today 80% of the Earth's population are literate. Progress is being made.

Many veterans of World War II thought that *it was the final war.* As they assessed the damage, and reflected on what they had been through, they figured that mankind had learned its lesson. I have interviewed a few personally, and they were SO revulsed by the murder of some conscripted German teenager which they had earlier committed in the combat situation. They regarded it as so absurd, so foolish on their part, so useless. When they realized that it didn't put an end to war as they had expected it would, they were extremely disappointed and disgusted. They now believe it was "the last good war."

To colonels (and other retired officers) who teach philosophy and military history at war colleges, there are some seven criteria which must be met for a war to be justifiable. One of them is that one's land must be invaded. Another is that the war must be a very last resort AFTER EVERYTHING ELSE HAS BEEN TRIED. Ask yourself, has everything else really been tried before we engage in a war? If you cannot affirm a definite "Yes" then the war *is not justifiable*. It is not a just war.

This theory of Ethics can be counted on as a reliable guide to living a moral life.

A 'theory' in science is not just a guess. It is a logical fit. It all hangs together. It is coherent and consistent.

It will, of necessity, be *incomplete*. Gödel proved that: a system has to be one or the other; it *can't be both,* consistent *and* complete.

The theory of Ethics set forth here In these pages is, and will be, incomplete; it aims at consistency. Formal Axiology serves as the meta-theory. It defines key terms - such as <u>good</u>, <u>ethical</u>, and <u>moral</u>.

The claim is made here that the new paradigm here proposed will offer some (impersonal) direction. I t is true that in science principles are not arbitrarily chosen. They are an explanation of how something functions. The same applies to the ethical principles derived within this system.

We don't need pessimism nor cynicism. It accomplishes nothing. Those who know their ethics want to make things better; they want to improve, enhance, and build up. They want to facilitate a quality life for all; they want everyone to flourish. If they had to choose they would minimize suffering as a priority over maximizing well-being, but they know that working to maximize value for all concerned will likely result in minimizing suffering and misery.

Ethics, the discipline, accumulates reliable knowledge, and suggests (to those who have the imagination) relevant technologies - with the result that the world becomes more ethical in its behavior.

When individuals, as a result of education, or by their own intuition, learn to go in the Intrinsic direction, **value Intrinsically**, they devise better norms and systems, they become more

effective, and they live with less conflict and more harmony. They pursue the goals of a healthy body and a healthy mind and an ethical life, a good life.

They know that money can't buy happiness ...yet it can help get over some of the sadness. Being efficacious helps too.

WHAT IS MORALITY?

Some scholars argue that the readiness to define key words is paramount to any deep conversation. In the following paragraphs I shall offer a definition of morality. It implies that **how you treat yourself is as important as how you treat others**, in the sense that if you deliberately do the things, persist in the habits, that you know will cripple you or tend to cause yourself an early death, you are in a weaker position to help others. So, if you allow yourself to slip into addiction, mutilation, or some other form of self-abuse, you are not in the strong position you would be if you did not; and thus you will not be able to be of such assistance to people who need your help.

My point is that morality is toward yourself as well as toward others. But what is it? What is "morality"? Since Ethics is about the good life for the good individual person, it is appropriate to first understand what "good" is before we proceed to discuss moral goodness, or morality.   <u>Alert</u>: *In the next five paragraphs I'm going to invoke some Logic and bring up some technicalities.*

In my system of Ethics, I needed a term for the case where - instead of x is a member of the class C - x is now is a member of the class X. Let me explain. When x is a C, that means x is a category or classification. The concept-name is C. For example, this x is a chair. **C** here stands for **chair**.

This particular chair, x - observed by the senses - will be a good chair if x fulfills the definition of what a chair is. If this chair is a knee-high structure, if it has a seat, if it has a back ....then it is good as a chair.

If you believe a chair must have more than its mere bare definition, then you have shifted the concept, say to "easy chair" or "chaise lounge," or "flowery upholstered chair", etc.[C has become C-sub-one, as you become more specific.] Then *this* chair would have to have those extra characteristics, those further properties, in order to fulfill this new description of what you suppose a chair to be. You are the judge valuing it. It is your conception, it is **the name you put on it** - and the meaning associated with that name - that **sets the norm**. We have been discussing value in general. And goodness is full value. Value is a matter of degree; meaning is its measure.

Now if x is a member of the unit-class named X, where **x is an individual**, and **X is his proper name**, then x can be moral to the extent that x fulfills his own definition of himself: X. The latter must not contain any contradictions else it cannot be fulfilled. A good murderer would be a morally bad person, and the better the individual is as a murderer, the worse as a person. His self-concept contains an incongruence, for *in a way he affirms life yet is betraying that value by being willing to take life, or by having taken it.*

So, x is-a-member-of X means self being Self. "Self" is one's self-identity which includes one's self-image, one's values, one's principles, one's moral intuition. Aristotle concluded after some deep thinking, based upon the wisdom of all the philosophers of whom he was aware that **everyone aims for the good.** Criminals and corrupt individuals, however, are *ignorant* about the good. If a

person knew better he would do better. He would know how, and he would keenly know the benefits, both short-term and long-term. [The perverse and perverted need therapy and rehab. Some require being locked away, isolated from society.]   In this context "self" = one's bodily, observable self, one's conduct, behavior, etc. I have named this relationship of self to Self: Morality. Morality is moral value.

Whatever was true of value in general is now true of morality: it is a matter of degree; when complete fulfillment is present we have goodness {also described as sincerity, honesty, authenticity, genuineness, etc.}; it has its dimensions that can be analyzed to see its fine-structure..

From the aspect of the individual imorality means avoiding self-defeating behavior while approaching that which is self-enhancing. It means every person's right and responsibility to avoid stagnation and to pursue self-improvement; to keep "growing" -- if he would be true to himself.

Sometimes this is accomplished by acquiring a new concept, such as "high synergy" or "favorable reinforcement schedule" or "gross national debit" or "the happiness index."   Often it is by building new social institutions which enhance the individuals involved.

The individual and the social turn out, in practice, to be nearly inseparable; however, for purposes of theory and method it is useful to make the distinction.

In order to clear up some possible confusion I should remind the reader: Anyone who commits crimes has a contradiction in his or her self-image. He is affirming non-harming of individuals (including himself) while at the same time denying non-harming of

individuals. If the crime is violent, such as rape or assault, then even more so is the perpetrator a living contradiction who cannot fulfill his/her self-definition because it is incoherent.

Value itself is a match between meaning and reality; and Morality [moral value] - as my system defines it - is a match between an individual's highest moral principles and his/her conduct. Let me explain in more detail:

]f your observable self, your conduct, matches your beliefs, (your 'Self'), and if your beliefs are evolving in a more compassionate, more empathic, more inclusive direction, to that degree you are moral. Your 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 'self-ideals.'

I In this theory of Ethics, I define the concept "morality" as a relationship, of correspondence, between the self and the Self. I shall explain what each of these words mean. I found that William Shakespeare, years ago, had seen its 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

The definition of "morality" is a very dynamic one. I over-simplified

earlier if I left the impression that it 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." "To fulfill" – as used earlier - means: "to be in one-to-one correspondence with." The correspondence is between perceived properties and the property-names which comprise the Self-image (which includes one's self-identity, one's value-structure.) The notion is dynamic because **the person is to be growing in an ethical sense, maturing; more and more his Self is to be absorbing the latest views of to what a human being could aspire. S/he is to become all s/he is capable of being and becoming.** That is the way I understand the concept.

This proposed definition of the term arose as a relationship between other concepts in the system. The most appropriate name to put on that relationship seemed to me to be "morality."

To acquire a fuller, more well-rounded picture of the meaning of morality, (within this frame-of-reference), and   its extensive implications, see the four parts of the book, referred to earlier, entitled A UnifiedTheory of Ethics.

There are at least three kinds of Self-concept to consider, and we

shall generate them by use of the basic Dimensions of Value, namely S, E, and I :

S: The Self-importance (Neurosis)

E: Self-esteem

I: Self-respect.

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-centric" to "axio-genic" …to adopt a couple of words employed by the Axiogenics coaches – educators and facilitators for those (kids and adults) who are ready to learn.

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, an 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."
Transposing values gets to the concept "selfishness."

Let's move up a notch. **S**ystemically valuing self we arrive at another concept: **Self-interest.** This is okay. There is nothing wrong with being self-interested: 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 **E**xtrinsic 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 seeks out teachers, coaches, therapists in the quest for self-improvement, or one engages in self-study. Let's go to a higher stage:

The **I**ntrinsic value of the **self** (the axiogenic awareness) is: Self-transcendence to **enlightenment** – along with humility.. Of all the stages mentioned, this is the best !!!

Once a person has **enlightened-self-interest** he or she knows that: "What helps you, if it really does help you, helps me." "What affects you directly, affects me indirectly." 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 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. He wants to create value. 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, swept in, as his in-group, a larger amount of people. He embraces a variety within a unity. He is aware that we all do better when WE ALL do better. He consciously observes Ethical principles and has made a habit of living by them.

These aren't just words ! This is Ethics !! It will remain theoretical for readers until they actively apply it in life, and thus experience its benefits.

This system of Ethics, in which "morality" is but one term, will, as motioned earlier, never be complete, as it is evolving, as improvements are suggested, and as new discoveries impel its modification for the better.

MORAL DILEMMAS: AN ANALYSIS

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

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

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

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

A detailed discussion of what each perspective entails is found in the book by Rushworth Kidder – HOW GOOD PEOPLE MAKE TOUGH CHOICES (NY: Random House, 0996)

WHAT SERVES AS MORAL SANCTIONS?

There are at least three dimensions of **moral sanctions**.

(**Systemic**): The body of ethically-sound and consistently-enforced law. Statute law.
[Those with psychopathic tendencies, those who lack empathy – due to brain damage or to an extremely-poor upbringing -- are restrained chiefly by this.]

(**Extrinsic**): <u>Public opinion</u>.

(**Intrinsic**): Pangs of a sensitive, educated <u>conscience</u> (pangs which vibrate at the very thought of wrongdoing.) The reader knows already from an awareness of the logical Hierarchy of Value that **the Intrinsic sanctions are the best**.

A PROPOSED WORLD CONSTITUTION

Agreeing with T. McKamey, a world constitution would, at minimum, subject to amendment, contain these declarations:

Be it Resolved

Article One. The people of the planet, Earth, shall exhibit compassion and respect for all others regardless of creed, complexion, location, gender, occupation, status, origin, beliefs, or who they love.

Article Two. The people of this planet shall encourage and appreciate what others can offer, and shall actively find ways to accommodate people from other cultures, with different family values.

Article Three. The people shall promote human rights over corporate rule and they shall oppose governmental infringement on the inherent right of the people. We are to find ways to empower people from the bottom up rather than from the top down, with a view to providing a quality life for all.

~~~~~~~~

This proposed document **sets a standard**. As soon as they are old enough, kids can be taught it in school, in the early grades. They will ask: What are the human rights? And they can then be referred to The Universal Declaration of Human Rights issued by the U.N. They will be expected to be acquainted with some of those items. 😎

➡️So it then becomes a question of working it into the curricula of primary schools. We won't *start* with Texas or Somalia, but rather with other U.S. states, with Nepal, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the Scandanavian countries. There will likely be non-profit organizations that will work to promote the adoption of the constitution everywhere, even eventually in so-called backward nations.

If one assumes *an individual is of indefinitely-high value*, then one has *entered the field of Ethics.* Then one may conduct oneself accordingly .....and perhaps is a bit more likely to do so. **Ethics traditionally has been about conduct.**

If one does conduct oneself as a living application of (the discipline of) Ethics - then one will not commit any of the Ethical fallacies ...summed up by the one word, **rankism,** which is a concept introduced by Dr. Robert Fuller. He gave a brief TED talk to the students at U. of C., Berkeley which is available on You Tube Many have found his argument to be persuasive.http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=djM6cZb8kak&feature=related

Then we will want to defend another person's dignity as we would want that person to try to help us defend our own. We would **not** humiliate others; we see a continuous example of humiliation going on in both television and in the movies. Some day, when people are better educated, this immoral conduct will be

considered -- along with bullying -- to be "uncool."

Also, when people take this derivation seriously, personal corruption will be less likely: We won't tolerate manipulators, extreme hypocrites, those who bribe and those who accept the bribe, those with sadistic tendencies, those who abuse, who insult, dis, and 'put others down.' we will be on guard against those with no principles who will pander, or will employ any means to get to their end in view. We won't have much patience with greed or selfishness either. _E.g_., Elected
officials devoted solely to enhancing the 1 percent. It is important to work for public financing of political campaigns on all levels, so as to remove some of the temptation to corruption; and it is vital to screen candidates for office to see if they have Ethical principles **before** voting for them.

Let's envision an ethics that would apply all over this planet, Lets, for a moment, dream that everywhere on Earth civilization would set in. Assume that people will be civil. Imagine what such a world society would look like, by way of acknowledging the truth in the concept: "Without vision the people perish." Now having vision, the next step is to work To implement it, to **work to make it happen**.

There are *social technologies* too that have come into practice. Here are some examples: the printing press; the jury system; The Do-It-Yourself movement of the 1960s (thanks to Stewart Brand's Whole Earth Catalog); the world-wide web, the open source concept; BioBricks, which gave us designer bacteria some of which can eat petroleum polluting our harbors; distributed programming; assigning a project for highschool teams to solve in a national contest; CNN's "Heroes" effort to honor the unrecognized who work on solving a real problem, on alleviating a pressing need of the disadvantaged and the destitute; the Kahn

Academy on YouTube giving free tutoring for self-instruction in many subjects (maybe on Ethics and morality some day); social entrepreneurship; and, perhaps most efficient of all, the X-Prize, and incentive prizes like that, which present a bold challenge, with a deadline for solving it....and find venture capital to back up the prize. All this is Applied Ethics. Theory can result in practice.

For details, see the book by Peter Diamandis, ABUNDANCE: The future is better than you think. I highly recommend it to all. Read this inspiring book. It is quite cognizant of the dangers too, and of what could go wrong. The book is very sophisticated, very factual, and is a very scholarly piece of work. http://www.diamandis.com/

WHAT DO SUCCESSFUL ENTREPRENEURS SAY?

"Give more than you take !" - Steve Jobs

"Share your trade secrets." - Steve Wozniak

"New tools make new practices. Better tools make better practices." - Stewart Brand.

REPLIES TO CRITICS

Critics may be heard to object: *After many centuries of education the practice of bullying and humiliating doesn't seem at all threatened, does it*?

For centuries human beings have been ignorant - say, for example, as to how to land on the moon, or how to manufacture an iPhone that works - but that - telling the story of our history - does not prove anything about what's coming in the future.

Of course people humiliated one another through the ages, and still do to this day They also held slaves, they drew and quartered prisoners, they drowned women for being witches, they made sex slaves out of children, they were sure the Earth was flat.   Some of these practices have just about ended because the human race has become more enlightened, more ethically sensitive. Why can't that trend continue ?   In the future we may have better ethical systems that teach their conclusions more pointedly and directly, due to their utter logic. This current theory is humbly offered for the contribution it can make, when practiced, until a better theory comes along.

some basic applications of the discipline of Ethics. are Education; Life Coaching {adult education}; and Therapy {remedial education.}

CRITIC: *If I have to choose between one man's death and a hundred's... it's a coin toss. ... Or so it seems from what you have written.*

To say "it's a choice between one man's death and hundreds" is to get it backwards; much better would be to look at it this way: in general, **one conscious individual's life is as precious as hundreds,** and therefore we ought to proceed with that in mind !

CRITIC : *So, you can choose to kill one man and save a hundred, or kill a hundred men to save one. Which choice is the ethical one? I don't see.*

By choosing not to kill even **one** person, be it man or woman. I thus choose not to kill **a hundred people.** In this policy I agree with Kant.

Immanuel Kant held that to perform a definite action that you are pretty sure will result in someone's death is to be a willful cause of that death, and this makes you "a criminal" by his definition.

A crime that results in the death of many is worse than a crime that causes one death. To grant that is both good ethics and is common sense. However, we should preferably choose among greater goods than among lesser evils. Our orientation ought to be to maximize value.

An imperative stemming from the premises of this theory ire the recommendations that all of us **consscientiously object to the whole notion of murder ...even when it is organized. Renounce war** as a way of life! Renounce tyranny as it is developing in its early stages. Snuff it out with nonviolent direct action. Make a better use of diplomacy than we do now.

It all follows from a sense of Ethics (in its new perspective, its new paradigm.)

AUTONOMY AND INDIVIDUALITY AFFIRMED

The axiological analysis defining the degrees of value in social relations is as follows:

S: conformity

E: individualism

I: individuality, self-leadership, and autonomy

As the reader can by now infer, every individual's autonomy and individuality is encouraged by the theory. Everyone is free to comply or to not comply with any part of the theory if they so choose. ...just as they can ignore what we know about Physics, or about nutrition, or Psychology.

[As a matter of fact, there are plenty of physical scientists who are not happy with how Physics currently understands and portrays "gravity." And there are plenty of Biologists who have competing theories of evolution, but they all believe in evolution. And much of physical theory (*especially some findings of Quantum Theory*) is counter-intuitive to the 'man in the street.']

We, for the most part, have a moral intuition. It is these days known as the 'conscience.' Some have a more-educated conscience than others. As Ethics builds and gets a reputation as a reliable body of useful information, it can be taught in classrooms, it can be included in textbooks, and its formulas can be written on blackboards the world over. People can learn. Education can become more efficient. Its content can become more vital to contributing to a quality life for all.

Some have read the major work of Thomas Hobbes, LEVIATHAN or ***The Matter, Forme and Power of a Common Wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil*** — and have, as a result of its persuasive power, become followers of Hobbes. I ask them this – when they express their admiration of Hobbes' argument :

 Do you want *rule by an absolute sovereign*? Since that is one of the main things the book, Leviathan, argues for.

Based upon your life-experience, friend, do you believe that human interaction is a case of "war of all against all"? As that is how Thomas Hobbes perceived what he called 'the state of Nature.'

In light of the evidence presented by working Psychologists and Neurologists such as Joshua Greene and, and Paul Bloom { - the author of the book, <u>Origins of Good and Evil</u>. Sam Harris just interviewed Dr. Bloom See his blog, - accessed **December, 2013** - [http://www.samharris.org/blog/item/the- ... d-and-evil](http://www.samharris.org/blog/item/the-...d-and-evil) -} and in view of the extensive research done by Jeremy Rifkin for his book <u>The Empathic Civilization,</u> **we humans are pre-wired at birth** to be nice to each other - unless we have a bit of brain damage; or suffer some form of neglect in our formative years - **and thus** the real "state of (human) nature" is empathic and compassionate. In 1651 they didn't know these facts. So Thomas. Hobbes did the best he could based on the information he had.

To help people live ethically, Hobbes advocated a social contract. While many philosophers can agree that a social contract adds value, just as any contract does, still better is a confidence that each of us has the welfare of all of us in his heart. To arrive at that view takes self-development, perhaps due to education, to the point of Enlightenment. {Of course we don't want to be overly-accepting, trusting, and gullible either. The secret is to find the balance between extremes.}

Not everyone, obviously, has yet had that amount of education. We don't trust one another yet; we are **overly-** skeptical sometimes. This causes us to miss out on potential opportunities ...which we might have gained had we made sufficient inquiries and done enough research to close the perception gaps, and get to a place where we are comfortable, and have peace-of-mind instead of anxiety.

It takes some work, but it's worth it. Ask questions. Reflect. Ask more questions. Ask for the reasons why certain requirements are put in our path as we attempt to reach our goals. Ask what it

would take to remove those obstacles, or to breeze through them; to turn a barrier into a turnstile? But the key is to be problem-solving oriented. First we have to care. Do we really want to provide a Quality Life for all? Do we see the benefit this would have for us?

Are we smart enough to see it? There is a bell curve when it comes to intelligence, just as there is when it comes to height. But one can, through self-development, move oneself toward the genius end of the curve. Everyone can be an artist at something. We all have a contribution to make.

We need, when something comes up (such as a social interaction, a perceived misunderstanding, a personal crisis, a decision to prioritize) to ask ourselves: **What choice can I make and what action can I take, here and now, so as to maximize value?**

How can I close any perception gaps? How can I innovate or create a needed product or service? How can I give service with a smile? How can I uplift, or upgrade? How can I render a sincere compliment? How can I make someone feel that they matter? How can I make a difference?

When we reach that place of enlightenment we won't whine nor complain, but will take effective actions to get us closer to fulfilling our shared goals. We'll seek common ground, and we'll work to make it happen.

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