

ETHICS:

A College Course

by

Marvin C. Katz, Ph.D.

c. 2007

ETHICS: A College Course

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. WHAT IS A CONCEPT?	7
2. WHAT IS VALUE?	8
3. ARE THERE DIMENSIONS OF VALUE?	10
4. WHAT IS GOOD?	17
5. WHAT IS A SCIENCE?	20
6. WHAT IS ETHICS?	26
7. WHAT IS MORALITY?	34
8. IS ETHICS A SCIENCE?	38
9. WHAT IS SELFISHNESS?	47
10. WHAT'S IN OUR SELF-INTEREST?	54
11. WHAT DOES ETHICS PRESCRIBE FOR MORAL HEALTH?	59
12. DOES THE END JUSTIFY THE MEANS?	66
APPENDICES	
One: What is Value Science?	73
Two: Ethics and Self-Interest – a dialog	81
Three: What were some historic schools of ethics?	87
<u>Bibliography</u>	92

ETHICS: A College Course

C. 2007

Preface: In Philosophy questions are as important as answers. Good questions lead to interesting problems to analyze. The analysis goes on continuously. In philosophy, as in science, there are no settled conclusions. The book consists of 12 questions and some tentative answers to those questions are offered. These answers may prove controversial and provocative; they are designed to stimulate discussion. {Each teacher is of course free to compose his or her own quizzes and tests based upon the discussion material offered in this course.} Of course, many more than twelve questions are raised by the author within this text, and several more will occur to the reader. The non-philosopher may ask: What is philosophy? Here is one way to illustrate it: If a person was ever left waiting at a bus stop by a bus which failed to stop but kept right on going by, and he then asked himself: "Was I neglected or ignored?" he was doing philosophy. For Philosophy is *the continuous clarification and analysis of concepts.*

The approach to the discipline in this text is formal: We aim to define our crucial terms as we go along, and to introduce more precision into a field where meanings of words have been rather slippery. A meta-ethics will be presented before an ethics is deduced from it. It is widely held among philosophers that an ethic ought to be prescriptive. The reader will find that this course in Ethics has its share of prescriptions. For a meta-ethics that does not generate a normative ethics is not too useful while a normative ethics without a meta-ethics is arbitrary. Is it asking too much that a theory of ethics should be relevant to life? This author does not think so.

INTRODUCTION

FORMAL AXIOLOGY: THE META-ETHICS

I shall draw upon the insights of Dr. Hartman, indicating some of what I learned from his moral philosophy. His major work was the remarkable book, **THE STRUCTURE OF VALUE** (Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1967), now out of print, but available through the Library of Congress.

The metaethics is in the definist, non-naturalist, formal-logical mode of philosophical theories. It holds to the less extreme form of ethical nondescriptivism of Hume, as characterized on p. 108 of Frankena, **ETHICS**, 2nd ed.

It claims, furthermore, that without values, ethics could not exist, that value knowledge is logically prior to ethical knowledge. It is formalism in the sense that it contains formulas, a calculus, symbols, variables, etc. It was created by a polymath genius named Prof. Robert S. Hartman. An institute bearing his name was set up in his honor. You may look up his biography in Wikipedia, and there you will find references. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_S._Hartman Also we offer here a link to his explanatory paper entitled "The Measurement of Value."

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

People are different. They do not look alike. They do not all sound the same. And they all think differently. Formal Axiology is the science that studies how people think when they determine the value of different things, when they compare things, and how those value assignments either represent or distort reality.

The ethics that Formal Axiology generates, with its Calculus of Values, is rather extensive and one can learn more about it by perusing the research papers at that Robert S. Hartman Institute website.

It is an ethical theory that synthesizes and incorporates kantian ethics, virtue ethics, and human rights, among other normative theories that will be recognized by the perceptive reader. It cannot reasonably be equated with utilitarianism or consequentialism -- although it agrees with many of Mill's beliefs and his goals.*

The current theory of Ethics offered in this course does however proceed in a fashion that Bentham would have liked, since he too admired a systematic, formal approach. Spinoza would also endorse the formalism.

The underlying value theory confirms an existentialist hierarchy of values, rather than a platonic one. It places life above things, and things above theories and ideologies. In contrast, the case has often been made that Plato and Aristotle emphasized thoughts and thinking above worldly concerns; and practical, functional, worldly, material factors above human life.

Since ethics concerns topics of moral *value*, as well as the good life for the *good* person, it is imperative to consider some *value theory* prior to addressing ethics itself. We will endeavor to show that axiology is logically prior to ethics.

***)A question that the school of thought known as consequentialism needs to answer is how does one measures a "consequence" or an "act"? These terms are quite vague and have not been adequately delimited. What are their boundaries? Can anyone offer a genus or a differentia for either of them?**

FOUNDATIONS OF ETHICS AS SCIENCE

The science of Ethics is built upon a basic assumption. The statement of it, and some of its implications, are important enough to constitute a chapter in itself. We shall in our first chapter explicate the structure of a concept. As the reader will see, the viewpoint it offers with regard to concepts presents less philosophical problems than alternative formulations which do not include the application of the concept (the extension) as a part of the package; for they then somehow have to relate the intension of the concept to its extension.

Once the structure of a concept is understood we are enabled, in Chapter Two to define the notion of value. Then we introduce the reader to dimensions of value, and this is done in Chapter Three. A definition of Value enables a definition of good. Then we can explore what it means to be *a good person*. Furthermore, since we have earlier explicated “value,” we can now logically discuss “moral value,” This we do when we inquire ‘What is Morality?’ That will comprise our seventh chapter. We also define ethics itself in terms of our frame of reference. We make the bold claim here that Ethics is ready to be treated scientifically. It is incumbent upon us to explain what we mean, and Chapter 8 is devoted to that project. Since we claim that ethics is ready to be treated scientifically, it is appropriate to define what is meant by ‘ethics’ and by ‘science,’ a logical procedure. We can meaningfully use mathematics in a science of Ethics because the numbers represent – as explained in Appendix One - value quantities that we can measure. These numbers are scores earned on a values inventory.

Every theory or system rests on some basics, some primitive terms and assumptions. Most of mine are out in the open, in contrast to other purported systems of ethics. We will begin by *revealing our basic assumption* for a systematic Ethics which can employ scientific method.

Chapter One

WHAT IS A CONCEPT?

One of the main activities of philosophers is to analyze and clarify concepts. **My assumption is that every concept has an intension and an extension.** The extension (except for a null class) has members. The members possess properties detectable by the five senses. These *properties* can be *named*; the collection of such property names is a set of attributes. (Some exceptional concepts, such as mathematical symbols; and fictions; have the intension numerically-identical with the extension. *E.g.*, tensor, hyperspace, conjugate complex number; unicorn, tooth fairy, etc.) The term “*attribute*” shall mean “*name of a property*.”

The intension is a description and often a connotation accompanies it. *Descriptions* consist of definitions - which are finite descriptions - and expositions. Thus every concept has these components: a name (sign, label, designator); a meaning; and a class of application. In order to draw mathematical-type deductions set-theory will be utilized. Then these deductions can be consistently interpreted in terms of the data of ethics, Let us stipulate that the intension of a concept is a set of attributes (property names) that describe members of the class of application of that concept. These class members are also known as “referents,” or examples of the concept. For instance, “ball” is a name or designator of a concept whose meaning is, say, “round, bouncy toy” and whose application consists of all the balls that are now, that ever have been, and that ever will be. Each ball is a referent of that concept. The attributes here were “round”, “bouncy”, and “toy.”

Chapter Two

WHAT IS VALUE?

Value is a relation of a concept's meaning to its referent's properties and is always a matter of degree. Let us say that an item being evaluated falls under a concept, "C", where "C" is understood to be the name of the relevant concept.

Specifically if the attributes in the mind of the judge match the properties the judge perceives in the item, s/he will correctly, by this definition, say the item has value – as a C. If, in the mind of the judge making an evaluation, the set of attributes to some degree corresponds to the set of properties possessed by a referent, bijectively (one-to-one), then one may safely predict that the person will designate the item or thing s/he is judging to be "valuable."

The 'matching' process often occurs as a gestalt, instantaneously. Many judgments are snap judgments. They occur in 'the blink of an eye.' At times the rating, prizing, grading or evaluation can be quite deliberate and qualify as a considered judgment.

To sum up, *value* is the relation of a concept's meaning to its referent's properties. Let us formalize this, give it a more rigorous treatment, and dub it "the axiom of value."

The axiom (or basic premiss) for value science is the definition of value. It reads as follows: Something, X, has value to judge J, at time t, if and only if J perceives a one-to-one correspondence between the meaning of X (as J understands it) and the properties of this actual X (as J conceives of them, senses them, or experiences them.) If

that correspondence holds, *even partially*, J will call X "valuable." X may be a situation, a person, a thing, a symbol, a model, a theory, a myth, a technicality, a category, anything at all.

The correspondence is between two sets. The first set is the meaning of the concept under which X is subsumed. For purposes of analysis, and theory construction, meaning is here understood as a *set of conceived attributes* in J's concept of X. The second set is the *set of properties* which J experiences in this X, where X is the topic of the evaluation. When the term "good" is defined in a later chapter, all this will become quite clear. The student will note the close relationship between the valuable and the good.

These notions serve as quantifiers for value theory, in this case *value-quantifiers*. They are quantifiers of qualities. To say something has value is to imply *some* correspondence; to say it is good is to imply *full or total* correspondence. This is isomorphic with the discipline of Logic which defines the logical quantifiers: some and all. (The t in the formula reminds us that a judgment might change over time. The evaluation is only a snapshot, not something "etched in stone.")

In summary, a thing has value if it even partially fulfills its concept. This will depend upon the concept held by the one who is doing the evaluating. The beauty of this definition is that it directs us to be explicit about what intension that judge has in mind to determine if it is at all like the one some other judge may have in mind (with regard to a concept with the same name) which s/he might hold. This will reduce confusion and could obviate the incidence of violent arguments and disagreements.

Chapter Three

ARE THERE DIMENSIONS OF VALUE?

Hartman, the inventor-discoverer of formal value-theory, derived, to start with, four dimensions of value. One of them, based upon concepts that are incoherent, is called Transposed Value, and its cardinality is only a fraction, close to zero. {Zero value suggests no value at all.} The other three are based upon the fulfillment of three basic types of concept: the formal concept (constructions of the mind); the abstracts (classifications, categories); and the singular concept (uniquenesses). The Dimensions of Value have these names in his system: Transposed Value, Systemic Value, Extrinsic Value and Intrinsic Value. Each one is worth more than the earlier one. Each dimension has a measure assigned to it, with which it correlates. The Transfinite Theory of Sets is employed to measure the richness of the intensions of the values. For many good and fitting reasons S-Values are finite; E-values have denumerable intensions; while I-Values have nondenumerable intensions. Study Formal Axiology (also known as Value Science to learn of the rationale for this.

Illustrations of The Dimensions of Value when applied

A "house," for example: 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." [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 is what may be designated "The Intrinsic Value", or I-Value of that house.] Now it is

"unique." It is "Our lovely home." So, you see, the "house" can be seen in at least three ways.

These three ways are the result of applying the three major dimensions of Value to the concept "house." The dimensions are Systemic Value; Extrinsic Value, and Intrinsic Value. These are fully explained in the papers of Robert S. Hartman. You may read some of his papers, which are written in plain English, at this site: <http://www.hartmaninstitute.org/ResearchTopics/tabid/61/Default.aspx>

Especially read the reports "The Basic Concepts of Formal Axiology," "Axiology As A Science," and "The Measurement of Value." Other articles presented there may prove helpful also if you wish to learn more about the Science of Value — a science which is "the mother tongue" for a science of ethics.

An important derived formula to keep in mind is **I > E > S**.

Ethics is concerned with the good life for the good person. This discipline of Ethics is a subset of value science (Formal Axiology) and it deals with *moral value*, which is seen as a species of the genus 'value.

OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE VALUE DIMENSIONS

Language may be (S): technical or formal; (E): social, conversational; (I): private, personal or metaphorical.

A human **group** may be (S): a society; (E): a collectivity; or (I): a community (having family spirit.)

A **social pattern** may be (S): uniformity; (E): individualism; or (I): individuality.

Loyalty may be (S): to the state or system; (E): to social pressure; or (I): to the conscience.

As you recall, the basic dimensions of value are: No Value; Transposition of value; Systemic value; Extrinsic value; and Intrinsic value, ranked in order of the size of their

cardinality, or degree of value.

To simplify, I'll speak in terms of *the degree of value* entailed. There is zero value; fractional value; finite value; countable value; and uncountable value. Zero value is indifference (or insensitivity to human value). (This is a moral deficiency, as indifference often leads to negative value, due to slippage. Illustrations of negative value would be sociopathy and psychopathy.) Fractional value is a reference to Transposition. Finite value is the size of S-values; the intension of E-values is denumerable (countable); and the cardinality of I-values, based upon their intensions, is nondenumerable. All this is explicated within value science.

The following is a value-dimensional analysis of "motivation." Fractional value applied to **motivation** arises when one says to himself: "I have no particular reason for doing x" The odds are, then, that s/he will not do x.

Finite value occurs when one does x for vanity reasons. The internalized sentence is: "Others will like me better if I do x." S/he may do it for a little while, but then slack off, and fail to keep up with doing x.

Countable value arises when one does x for the benefits one sees in it. It may be reasons of health or fitness; or some kind of personal gain. If you believe it is important to do x for some external reason, you are likely to do x for a longer while, but the motivation is just not as strong as it is at the next level, the intrinsic dimension:

Uncountable value occurs when one does x for fun; or one says to him/herself: "Doing X -- that's the kind of person I am." Or, "I simply enjoy doing x." Now one is likely to continue x-ing. One will keep up with the program, whether it is exercising, or moral behavior such as being kind to others,

or courtesy, or whatever. It is likely to become a habit. See Chapters 7, 10, and 11.

THE BASICS OF VALUE SCIENCE ILLUSTRATED (in a song lyric)

There was in the 1930s and '40s a popular song entitled: "Did You Ever See A Dream Walking? Well I Did!". The lyrics referred to the fulfillment of a concept, namely, a girl a fellow had pictured -- and here she is walking down the street toward him!!! He calls that situation "Good!" Well, every time we use the term "good" we mean the same thing: we have a vision of something; and we perceive an item or thing which has everything that our vision said it would have. The result? We call it "good."

Thus goodness is full value! Most people would agree that a map is good when it matches the territory, feature for feature; otherwise not. So goodness is being "all there" under the concept we have put on it. But things can be perfect and unique as well as good. Again it comes down to perspectives which we have as evaluators, as judges. The dimensions of value help us to understand the place of perfection and uniqueness as distinct modes of value fulfillment. Let's define our terms by applying the value dimensions to produce these three definitions.

Full Value: (S) PERFECTION; (E) GOODNESS; (I) UNIQUENESS.

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

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

When people identify and bond with the following they become Intrinsic values: Liberty, Freedom, Integrity, Beauty, Truth, Goodness, Authenticity, Creativity, and so forth. Those are often I-valued. When someone Intrinsically values something they see, they may call it "a beauty" or speak of it as "beautiful." When a person I-values a sound, he or she will call it "music." When I-valuing a person one may speak of that person as "a friend", or as "a partner" or perhaps as "beloved", or one may fall back on poetry, or pet names, or some private,

intimate expression that only the two of them understand. Other concepts, which when identified with become I-value applications, are Love, Community, Spirituality, Veracity, Reality, Sharing, Happiness, Ecstasy, Joy, Intuition and Insight.

THE “ALGEBRA OF VALUE”: an exercise in value theory

Consider a set with three elements: {0, 1, V}.

Here are some axiological Interpretations of the symbols:

0 = Indifference or apathy. 1 = Fact. V = Value.

[For V one may substitute S, E, or I or any sets of them]

n = measure of (the cardinality of) Systemic Value.

Aleph-null (a transfinite number) measures E-value, Aleph-sub-one measures I-value. These cardinalities are the sizes of the respective intensions. Hartman, in his writings, and especially in his book, THE STRUCTURE OF VALUE, has explained at length the reasons why these measures are most appropriate.

[A colon will follow after each algebraic theorem; the interpretation of it will then be placed after that colon.]

Axiological Theorems:

V to the -1 power = $1/V$: The negative fact of value is a tiny fraction of value. And the higher the value negated, the less value is the result.

To take the root of any value = to transpose = to diminish the value.

$V^0 = 1$: Indifference to value is a fact.

$V^1 = V$: The fact of value is value.

V^V is Composition of Value = one value enhancing another. Examples of value-composition include approval, praise, support, endorsement, upgrading, boosting, providing a helping hand, being kind to, loving, etc. It is *being constructive*. It is an increase in power of the original value.

V^{-V} or V_V is Transposition of Value : a value downgrades another.

1^V power = 1 : No matter how you value a mere fact, it is still remains a fact.

0^V power = 0 : Valuing utter indifference will not increase its value...it's still neglect and still has little or no value.

$0 + 0 + 0 + 0...= 0$: Apathy added to indifference is still apathy.

In Formal Axiology, n is the cardinality of systems, of S-Value (Systemic Value). The following *axiological proposition* involves a finite sum of cardinal numbers:

$n = 1/v + 1/v + 1/v + 1/v + 1/v + 1/v + 1/v$: Every system has imperfections (e.g., it may be incomplete; or it may be inconsistent.) Every system is flawed.

In the Algebra of Value, 'ought' is represented by a minus sign, indicating that there is a gap between two states, the 'ought' telling us of the discrepancy between them.

AN INTERPRETATION OF MULTIPLICATION IN THE ALGEBRA OF VALUE:

There is a word in English that expresses both becoming more valuable as well as a recognition that value has been added to the situation along with being thankful for it.

That word is “appreciating.” And that shall be understood as the interpretation of the multiplication sign in The Algebra of Value. It indicates that an individual becomes more valuable when he/she appreciates either another person, or even a new concept regarded as ‘a bright idea,’ an inspiration. It connotes that if one appreciates *another* person he has added value to *himself!*

Since it is a living individual who does the appreciating, this, for reasons you will understand after reading Chapter Six, will be designated in the “Axiological Algebra” by employing the letter **I** (which stands for Intrinsic Value.) **I** will be multiplied by either **I**, **E**, or **S**; or some combination of them, perhaps by some complex symbol in the Calculus of Value, which will be included in an advanced course in Formal Axiology. The Algebra results in the Calculus.

One may appreciate either a person, a thing, a service, a beauty, a sentiment, a theory, a formula, an ideology, or a system. In fact, one may appreciate anything at all.*

Note the analogy: What exponentiation is to multiplication, composition is to appreciation. In mathematical associative linear algebra, repeated multiplication of the same variable is raising it to a power. In Value Theory, appreciating a value any number of times is composing: appreciating something or someone is an instance of composition of value. The structure of value-composition is V^V . The original value is enhanced and enriched by the process of composing. It indicates that if one wants to add value, one way to do this is to be constructive.

*) Logicians of good will who are willing to help, may construct the theory for the science of Ethics by supplying more interpretations for models that will prove to be analogically suggestive and theoretically fertile. The equations will show a relation between measurable quantities and predict that others can confirm that this relation holds.

Chapter Four

WHAT IS GOOD?

What is actually defined is “x is a good C, [to judge J, at time t.]” It is what is known in logic as ‘a *contextual* definition.’

Here, specifically, is how Hartman defines x is a **good C**.

x is a good C if and only if

(1) x is a member of the class named C (x is an instance of the concept).

(2) Cs are phi, beta, lambda,... (C is described by those specific attributes. “...” means *et cetera*).

(3) x is phi; x is beta; x is lambda;

That's all there is to it. It is *objective* -- in the sense that it can be taught in a classroom and many can comprehend it at once, in many climes and times. [I am taking 'objectivity' to mean 'intersubjectivity.'] It uses *variables*. Hence it covers more data than any theory which does not have variables. It does show that good depends upon meaning, and meaning, is in the mind of the individual. We cannot take the judge of the value 'out of the equation.' It is, of course, relative to the one who applies it. It is *subjective*....as well as objective at the same time. We have established in the theory that something is valuable to the degree that it fulfills its concept. And it is good if it fulfills it entirely.

That definition of "x is a good C" is the 'axiom' on which the rest of the system will be erected. Subjectivity enters into

it. We can't get away from that. But eventually the theorems derived should have the same universality as Euclid's theorems of plane geometry.*

(Of course, we are aware that there are other geometries, such as Riemannian, but if someone chooses to work on a plane surface, then Euclid is appropriate and universally acceptable. His conclusions are *universally* taught as an introduction to geometry. Polyani has persuasively argued at length that every science contains subjectivity.)

If a valuer, judge J, experiences a *complete match* between the two sets of which we spoke earlier when defining the notion of "value, then J will correctly, according to the theory, call X 'good.' This is axiological goodness -- NOT to be confused with moral goodness. The X is judged "good" *under the concept C*. Under another concept it may not be good. E.g., A good nag is a bad horse. A good stale orange is a bad fresh orange. A good murderer is a bad person. This discipline requires one to be quite specific as to the concept in question.

A **good** car has *everything* a car is supposed to have, in your picture of a car. A good person likewise has a full set of features and characteristics that a person would ideally have. To call something "good" is to say it has full value, and that it completely fulfills the meaning of its concept.

*) It matters not if some 'thinker' comes along who wants to call the theorems of Euclid or of Ethics (as science) "absolute" or "subjectivist" or some other label that makes him or her sound sophisticated. The author will not indulge in that practice. What does matter to an applied ethicist or casuist, is to gauge whether that thinker, or any other person, lives a moral life, a meaningful life, a life of quality, as measured by the science. If the critic reveals himself as empathically-handicapped (has moral astigmatism), and/or finds the very thought of altruism to be repugnant, then a reader will more fruitfully spend time working with those who are morally-healthy to some extent, and building on that, but will not give up the attempt to find common ground, shared values, on the part of those who seem to disagree.

Philosophy encourages us to view things from differing perspectives. When human individuals are the topic, we may view them (S) anatomically or physiologically; (E) psychologically or (in groups) sociologically; or (I) as radiating with *uncountable* possibilities, as irreplaceable treasures, as having depths to be explored and cultivated, as possessing untapped gifts and talents, that is, we may view them from an *ethical* perspective. The Intrinsic viewpoint, equivalent to what Husserl spoke of as Intentionality, when it is focused on a person is the Ethics viewpoint. Chapter Six will examine the implications of this.

These definitions of value and of good (based, as they are, in set theory) and the models derived from them permit scientists in this field to then analyze where value controversies arise, have arisen, and will arise. They can now objectively categorize, analyze -- and even synthesize -- with regard to values, value-judgments, ratings, prizings, and the usage of value terms.

By means of value science "ought-judgments," as you will see later in Chapter Eight, have been logically reduced to "is-judgments, to matters of fact, and have thus been made objective. *There we will also cite falsifiable experiments pertaining to Ethics, by Greene, Gintis and others.*

First, however, we ought to define what science means since we believe that Ethics can, in a sense, eventually evolve into a mature scientific discipline.

Chapter Five

WHAT IS A SCIENCE?

Science observes and measures the world. From those data it infers the empirical laws that govern physical, biological, and moral processes. Explanations of large classes of phenomena or noumena must make testable predictions and be falsifiable. That is, there must be a way to make an observation that could disprove the explanation. The requirement of falsifiability rules out supernatural explanations. There ought to be a way to disprove a scientific proposition. Science is humble, recognizing that all findings are tentative. When scientists speak of an overarching explanation as a *theory* “the term does not mean, as it can in everyday parlance, somebody's off-the-cuff guess,” wrote Sharon Begley, a science writer for Newsweek Magazine.

THE NATURE OF SCIENCE

Science has three basic parts: (1) the theory, (2) the data, and (3) the bridge laws.

The theory is a model of models; a logical network of interrelated terms and their relations which provide a frame-of-reference.

Data points are unordered, unexplained, yet they often are roughly-correlated rather than totally disordered and disconnected by the time the scientist examines them.

The formulas and logical models of the theory are interpreted by means of the bridge laws with relevance to the specific data.

“Science” actually comes from the Latin word *scientia*, which means “to know.” That makes sense, since a

conventional definition of science is: "the observation, identification, description, experimental investigation, and theoretical explanation of phenomena." In other words, the search to know more. A rigorous frame-of-reference provides the theoretical aspect within which terms are defined with some precision and the data is explained.

SCIENTIFIC METHOD

The scientific method is a process that helps scientists investigate a topic and discover the facts. Here, idealized, are the steps involved (not necessarily always in this order):

The first step is to decide your purpose -- ask a question about something.

Next, research the topic and see what's already known.

The third step is to form a hypothesis. This is your guess of the answer to your question.

Then you suggest some experiences (or frame an experiment) to test your hypothesis.

Next, you analyze the data from the experiment. Did the experiment add confirmation to your hypothesis? Or did it disprove the denial of the hypothesis?

Your analysis will create your conclusion -- what are the results of the process?

Scientists then share their conclusions so everybody can learn from their work.

There is no reason why topics relevant to Ethics cannot be put through this process. The Science of Value, founded by R. S. Hartman, can provide the rigorous frame-of-reference within which ethical terms are defined and thereby related to the other terms in the system. The scores on a personal values inventory can supply the data to be analyzed and understood. We have explained the scientific method; now

let's explain what we mean by the term 'science.'

As we said at the outset of this section, science = a logical frame-of-reference, a set of data, and the bridge laws (rules of interpretation) that connect the two. Let's explain further: The framework -- employing mathematical or logical models -- when applied to the unordered, unexplained data by means of the bridge laws, serves to order and explain that data. It also, when a time factor is introduced, enables prediction. This definition avoids our confusing the sciences of Physics, Chemistry, or Ethics with either Secretarial Science, Scientific Checkers, Chess by the book, or any other systematic body of knowledge. Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Medicine, and Ethics are hypothetico-deductive disciplines employing induction along with deduction, and which involve the steps of scientific method outlined above.

ABSOLUTE OR RELATIVE?

In science, the theory, while tentative, is in a sense 'absolute' and universal, yet the application (often called Engineering) is an art, and is thus subjective and relative. Hence science -- and this will include Ethics considered as science -- is both at once *absolute* and *relative*. [We shall support this argument in depth as we return to this theme in our future discussion.] To insist it must be one or the other is to think Systemically, to think in terms of black-or-white, and thus overlook all shades of gray as well as other colors.

THE AXIOM

Hartman believed that every science originates from a basic concept which is fertile: it has what Carl Hempel has spoken of as empirical import. To Hartman that basic concept is an

axiom. An "axiom," in this sense, is a basic premiss which is part formal and part empirical. Thus it qualifies as the sort of concept which Kant would call a *synthetic a priori*.

For Physics the axiom is the concept of energy transformation. Historically Physics really began by conceiving of motion, not as Aristotle spoke of movement or change, namely, "potentiality becoming actuality"; but rather, as Galileo's great brilliance of thought conceived of it. He proposed that motion (or rate of speed) consists of "space units divided by time units." [$r = D/t$] With that breakthrough The Science of Mechanics – the oldest branch of Physics – was founded. Today we write:

$$\text{velocity (directed speed)} = s/t$$

and after Newton extended and modified the formula it now reads $s = (at^2)/2 + kt + C$. When generalized this yields $F = ma$, Newton's second law of motion. It all started with Galileo's redefinition of movement.

The 'axiom' for Chemistry is The Law of Conservation of Energy. It suggested the possibility of setting up chemical equations. They show that mass and volumes are the same both before and after a chemical reaction. This launched a science that was quite new in the early 1700s.

For Biology, we would venture to suggest that the 'axiom' is the definition of a living cell.

As we pointed out in Chapter Two, the 'axiom' for Value Science is the definition of x is a valuable C (where C stands for the concept under which x falls, the category of which it is a case, the class of which it is an element).

The 'axiom' for Ethics is "Every person has a self-concept" and a person can get to know himself, to accept himself, to create himself.. One can – if one works on it -- differentiate

his concept and come to see why s/he is unique and has a special contribution to make. She (or he) can have a purposeful life, one of high quality, one that is quite meaningful.

Hence, for Ethics we are postulating that everyone, under normal conditions, at one time or another in life, has a self-concept. That is to say, every individual likely has a name, has a self-image (or Self) and possesses one or more of the features depicted in that self-image. The study of these self-images, and investigations as to whether and to what degree they correspond to actual features objectively possessed by the individual, is a major part of the discipline the writer chooses to call *Ethics*.

To review, we have argued that true sciences spring from an 'axiom'. That *fertile concept* is a seed, so to speak, which has within it the potential of flowering into a full-grown tree. In some cases it is a formula that gives rise to a system that can be applied to reality.

CONSTRUCTING A NEW PARADIGM

I offered above a definition of Science. Now I shall offer the theoretical aspects of a novel perspective on ethics....an attempt to construct a new – yet, of course, very ancient – field that goes by the name: Ethics. In the process of so doing, the alert reader will recognize teachings from Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, Kant, Mill, Carnap, and others too numerous to mention.

Earlier we explained how science can be in a sense absolute and relative at the same time. Ethics, a subset of

formal axiology – value science - analyzes moral situations and dilemmas with its tools, and offers certain norms, but each individual decides for himself or herself whether to take those norms seriously and live them -- that is where the relativity comes in.

However, the science predicts that certain behavior returns value for one's effort, while other lifestyles will give one very little to no value in return: then it is up to the individual to choose which paths he wishes to pursue. One may choose a life which is meaningless; or one which is filled with quality and value: the choice is up to each person! So while the standards are objectively universally valid, the judgments made and the lives chosen are strictly up to the individual, and in that sense are relative and subjective.

Just as we would not want to confuse the science of botany with a rose -- the rose has an aroma, the science doesn't -- we would not want to confuse the data of value science (which are values) with the scientific theory which does not force anyone to do anything. {Interestingly, to an axiologist, the theory itself can be seen as a value, and analyzed as such, but that is not our task here.} Our task at hand is to construct a system of ethics with explanatory power which can organize ethical concepts into a frame of reference with wide applications.

Certain norms when taken seriously and made part of a person's self-image can *as a matter of fact* make our lives beautiful and happy; and there are many other personal norms, and resulting behaviors, which will *as a matter of fact* lead to misery and suffering. There are certain things that we ought to do *if* we want to be happy. Making these clearer is a task for a good prescriptive (normative) ethics.

Chapter Six

“Human beings should live for joy in their lives on earth. If others do not hold that premise, or hold a contradictory premise, I can courteously point out any inconsistencies they may be guilty of, and there are often many. If their beliefs depend on errors of fact, I can gently point that out. If their beliefs are logically self-consistent, I can point out as a matter of fact that they are drowning themselves in boredom and misery for no reason whatever, and they are not as happy as they could be if their happiness in this life were their primary value. If they spread anguish and coarseness and slavishness, ... on the basis of my own position, if not theirs, I can even call them immoral.”

---R. Redmond,

WHAT IS ETHICS?

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 generate a number of moral principles. Our definition is novel and offers a new paradigm. To be ethical is to I-value oneself and others.

When an individual is seen as "unique" 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. When we practice "morality" we are being ethical. The next chapter goes into detail as to what this entails.

RESPECT. A certain level of respect is automatically granted. by those who understand Ethics as science. to

everyone, unconditionally, out of a sense of a shared humanity.

Those who put Ethics into practice treat people respectfully, regardless of how they may think or feel about them.

Ethics, by definition, obligates us to give people active respect even after they've given us reason not to do so.

(For example, one could hold the door open for someone right behind him/her. To express courtesy and manners is one way of showing respect – as well as self-respect.)

As a matter of fact, in *The Calculus of Value*, within Formal Axiology, there are formulas for canceling out "evil" with "good." Their structure is very similar to the algebraic idea that: a minus times a minus results in a plus, or the reciprocal of a fraction is a whole number.

The history of the practice of nonviolent direct action has numerous examples of how it is done and of the startling, unexpected, positive results that ensued when someone was attacked or assaulted and they took it in the right way, in a creative way, with no intention of becoming offensive or aggressive themselves.*

***) Of course there are deviants and criminal minds; and for them it is ethically advisable to follow the recommendations of Dr. Karl Menninger in his classic work, *THE CRIME OF PUNISHMENT*. Offenders would be arrested just as today. We would, however, have indeterminate sentences for every felony convict, and they would have to prove (to a panel of mental health workers, who have been carefully screened for compassion, empathy, moral sensitivity and other high values) that they – the offenders -- are no longer violent by nature, no longer perverted, and have passed their anger-management and empathy-training courses with an A grade.**

In this overhaul of the justice system, juries would no longer function in the traditional sense; judges with staffs of fact-finders would serve to differentiate the serious offenders from the trivial ones. The latter would be subject to a scale of fines. The entire aim of the new justice system would be rehabilitation - if at all possible! It would follow a medical model and would use every technique developed by the science of Neurology. But the standards and criteria for determining that rehab has taken place would be very high. For those who are cold, unrepentant, hardened criminals, or sick madmen, like a John Gotti, a John Wayne Gacy, or a Fritz Haarmann, we would effectively keep them imprisoned away from society for life.

While it is true that disrespect is caused by perceived selfishness or incompetence, and that respect is caused by perceived unselfishness (or by acts useful to the community, or by high competence in certain areas); if we want to optimize the value we get from life we ought to respect everyone, or at least treat them decently and with courtesy, for virtually all have likely at one time or another been unselfish, and virtually all have potential to express some admirable talent or gift, as suppressed and latent as it might be.

Some may be pathetic or slobs but it is best to refrain from name-calling; if they are public officials, satire is okay.

Many people would concede that all people deserve a minimum amount of respect regardless of their prior history. For example, they would have no problem discussing things with a known thief or spending time with the thief, but at the same time they would not invite the thief (or people they don't trust) into their home.

We have all survived. All our people have known slavery or privation, starvation and war, misery, unhappiness, and death. We have survived when so many of life's creatures have fallen by the way. We should give respect because everyone needs it, and we cannot possibly know they do not deserve it more than ourselves. In fact some morally-sensitive students of philosophy have argued as follows:

- 1) Since a good person expresses goodness, s/he returns good for evil and good for good.**
- 2) We should always treat people with the utmost respect, even if they don't seem to deserve it, for only then do we return good for evil, which we do if we are to be good persons.**

3) Ethics is a study of the good person, and the good life for the good person; and in its normative aspects directs us to be good persons.

4) We should thus act as if everyone, everywhere, deserves respect even as we may resist certain aspects of their personality and their output, and inwardly are critical of it. We ought always be courteous to them and allow them to keep their dignity - such as it is. This applies to children, to terrorists, to fundamentalist fanatics, to Josef Stalin, to Bull Connor, etc. Every person always deserves positive regard by the very meaning of Ethics.

5) It is safe to predict that an individual will get the optimum value out of life this way, a prediction based upon the evidence of over 200 practicing consultants in the field of personal growth and development who have been administering a version of the HVP values inventory to thousands and thousands of clients; and based upon the findings of a group of M.I.T. economists, and a group of Harvard Business School researchers. See the citations in the Bibliography.

6) So if an individual wants to get the most out of life, s/he will show respect to everyone.

THE PRINCIPLE OF INCLUSIVITY

Inclusivity means: a tolerance for strangers, a capacity to accept diversity without the loss of a sense of unity. It means being willing to include more persons into one's social circle, and extending the radius of that circle without artificial barriers that would prevent further extension. Most people, it seems, are able to accept a number of strangers within the boundaries that they think of as their own nation;

however, there is no logic to stop them from extending the edge of that circle they identify with as ‘their own.’ Logically the circle could even embrace the entire planet Earth. Another name for this principle is “The Ethical Radius.” Each individual could ask himself or herself: How far does my ethical radius sweep? Morality, as is evident in the next chapter, concerns an individual’s self-concept. We enlarge our self-concept by complying with the ethical Principle of Inclusivity, thereby widening the circle of who we include, who we relate to as brothers and sisters, thus extending our ethical radius. This is a result of Education (applied Ethics.) It sets a good example.

ARE THERE ETHICAL FALLACIES?

We previously explained that Ethics arises when we value persons. This is true by definition and for all the reasons in Dr. Rem Edward’s arguments (Sec. 1.C) here:

<http://www.hartmaninstitute.org/html/Ch.1,RV&Va.htm>

False logic results in a *fallacy*. Faulty thinking in the field of ethics will be known as ethical fallacy. Now that Ethics has been defined, I shall present two Ethical Fallacies, expressed by Dr. William Kelleher in the following quote.¹ They are The Instrumental Fallacy and the Ideological Fallacy.

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

has established that $I > E$. As you recall from the metalanguage for ethics, Formal Axiology, $I > E > S$.

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

“The Ideological Fallacy: This is the false assumption that ideas are more important than persons are” is the way Dr. Kelleher explains it. Whenever the idea of “gender,” or of “race,” or “rank” – all intellectual constructs, or conceptions – which have no actual physical existence – are used to separate members of the human community, and to enable some to claim superiority over others, this is a violation of Ethics. Why? Because it indicates a failure to I-value persons. To hold any of those “isms”: racism, sexism, or rankism, is to commit The Ideological Fallacy. In symbols this situation is $S > I$, again, a fallacy.

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

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

- 1) Public education when it values a student as a unique, intelligent, creative person with potential for growth and development;
- 2) Sending someone who needs it – a person who has

From the book Progressive Logic, (Los Angeles, Empathic Science Institute, 2005) pp. 10-14. For more information see <http://www.empathicscience.org/proglog.html>

been convicted of a crime, or a drug addict -- into rehab is another example of Instrumental Enhancement;

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

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

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

WHAT SERVES AS MORAL SANCTIONS?

There are at least three dimensions of moral sanctions.

(Systemic): The body of ethically-sound and consistently-enforced law. [Those with psychopathic tendencies are restrained chiefly by this.]

(Extrinsic): Public opinion.

(Intrinsic): Pangs of a sensitive, educated conscience (which vibrate at the very thought of wrongdoing.)

As you know, by prior deductions within the science, it follows that the (I)-sanctions -- the Intrinsic-sanctions of the conscience -- are more valuable than the Extrinsic sanctions; which, in turn, are more valuable than the Systemic-sanctions. [The proof is based on their

cardinalities within the system of Formal Axiology. There is not space in this book to review the entire Calculus of Values. However Appendix One will enumerate some of its accomplishments and will describe the measuring instrument which, in its construction, employs that calculus .]

We are *not* saying here that only one set of values is “right.” The author does not claim that the system of ethics presented in his book is the only system of ethics. However, it is offered as a model that best fits the data. What are the data of Ethics? Altruistic behavior; heroism; codes of conduct; beliefs; happiness; success; optimism; evidences of moral development; conscience; norms; claims of rights; self-actualization techniques; moral sanctions; etc. etc. There are many departments and branches to the discipline, many areas of research.

What we can do, in Ethics, objectively and impartially, and what we are doing, is to judge the consequences of living by a particular value system. We can reason about who we or others will become if we live by one or another code, and we can check our reason by observing what becomes of the people who do live by those codes. I refer to this process as ‘life shopping.’ It amounts to a cost-benefit analysis of which way of life returns the most value. Our working hypothesis is that Intrinsically-valuing individual persons will yield us the most benefit in the long run. Each reader can verify this for himself or herself.

Chapter Seven

WHAT IS MORALITY?

"Growing, or the continuous reconstruction of experience is the end at which we ought to aim...All social institutions have a meaning, a purpose. That purpose is to set free and to develop the capacities of human individuals without respect to race, sex, class or economic status....the test of their value is the extent to which they educate every individual into the full stature of his possibility...."

John Dewey, in Reconstruction In Philosophy (NY: Holt, 1920), p. 186

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

----- Carole Bayer Sager

These quotes raise the question: "So from the standpoint of ethics as science what is morality anyway?" Some say morality is the converse of hypocrisy. That is not bad as a first approximation.

When asked What is Morality? my first response is this: It is "Self being true to self." When you are true to your own *true self* you are being moral. {This phrasing, by keeping technicalities to an absolute minimum, thus gives only a rough approximation to the definition which is expressed later as a structure in symbolic logic, arising from the Axiom of Value.}

A more technical definition:

Morality = Increasing correspondence with an improving self-image.

This implies that we must all keep growing (in the sense of becoming more empathic, more clear in our values, than before) throughout our lives. It also implies that we must "walk the walk" and not just "talk the talk." We must avoid hypocrisy if at all possible. And we comprehend that we will get more value out of life, have a more meaningful life, if we are moral. {Rather than insist we 'must' do these things, it is wiser to say: it is preferable for us to act morally, for the following reasons :}

If one is not continually growing, striving to be a better person, striving to improve, to learn more, to reach for higher standards, to live serenely, to be oriented toward joy, to lead a more meaningful life, *then one is failing to reach the degree of morality one could and thus one will not get the benefits in fulfillment that is the reward of a life filled with Intrinsic values.* In other words, one will fail to attain the valuable life -- speaking Ethically -- that is analogous to the physically-healthy life. The latter is in contrast to the life of a person burdened with illness and suffering constant physical afflictions. In Ethics the analog of this is known as immorality.

A still-more-technical definition of "morality" is this:

$x \in X.$

[x, the individual, is a member of the class named "X". "X" designates the proper name of that individual who has (or, observably, fails to have) the properties that constitute all that that person can be and become.] Note that the structure of the self-concept is the same as that of the concept "value" defined in Chapter Two above. This is

appropriate since morality is *moral value*. The fulfillment is a dynamic process, one of continual self-improvement.

Morality can be both objective (in part) and subjective (in part) and thus not totally one or the other. Permit me to explain why.

As I define it, morality = $x \in X$. This is to be understood as: individual "x" is a member of the unit-class named "X" -- e.g., Bertrand Russell has "Bertrand Russell" as his self-concept, and the question is: does Bertie aim to live up to his highest ideals for himself as a person - the highest that he can imagine? He can aim at a systemic, extrinsic, or an intrinsic self-image. Each one has its implications for character formation and life satisfaction. This relationship of a person with the degree he/she fulfills his/her self-concept (and its accompanying meaning -- the self-image) is how I conceive of "morality." It is a measure of the degree of fulfillment.

We must avoid this misunderstanding: To be moral does not mean to become whatever I really want myself to be; for then, if my self concept includes murder, rape, and conquest, by this definition that would at first glance appear to be moral. We already explained that morality is a relationship of correspondence with an improving self-image, and we described what this might mean and what it implies. It is being true to your *true self* which, as we pointed out, means that one strives to live up to the highest ideals for himself that he can possibly imagine. If he is still petty, sadistic, insensitive or craven he will rate low in his morality score. This topic is also discussed in the manual by Katz, ETHICS AS SCIENCE, See pp. 27-29 of this PDF file: <http://tinyurl.com/2yxbyf>

Morality, it is evident, has both its objective and its subjective components. It is objective in that people who know Bertie well, including his mother and his close friends can give a composite picture of how they see him, the individual in question. To this can be added how his colleagues, fellow-workers, neighbors, etc. view him. And psychologists can profile him, including forensic

psychologists; also he can submit to various diverse personality and value profiles and inventories that test his interests and core beliefs, and boil these test results down to a score or rating. This can be rather objective.

How Bertie himself conceives, perceives and experiences his own self-image and his behavior will be largely subjective. So it is not a matter of 'either-or' but of 'both-and'. We would be better off if we avoided Systemic thinking and instead see it as a multi-faceted topic. Since $I > S$ it is more valuable for all of us to think intrinsically.

I do not take "morality" to mean our moral judgments, yet even most of our moral judgments involve objective facts (properties of matter, causal relationships, etc.) and thus are partially objective.*

Morality, as a subset of Ethics in general, is as we argued earlier both objective and subjective; and it also is absolute and relative -- both at once. It is (like Newton's Inverse Square Law, or like The Standard Model in Nuclear Chemistry) *absolute* on the chalk-board but it is *relative* when the formula is applied: relative to the data, relative to the person using the formula, relative to any number of things. {We are aware that the board can be erased, and in science it is the case that models are frequently revised and are replaced by better models; the same is true if Ethics is approached with that attitude, with a scientific perspective.}

In later chapters we shall be supplying further details about morality. (See esp. p. 82 in Appendix Two.) Of course, analyzing with some precision the concepts of ethics is a cooperative endeavor. I'd like to invite you, the reader, to refine and enhance the new system. Your constructive contributions are most welcome.

*)It is interesting that in value science the plus sign, meaning summation, is interpreted as "added value"; perhaps we could interpret subjective plus objective as indicating that when we add some facts to a subjective set of propositions we have increased the value. (Note, incidentally, that in the business and corporate world a major objective is to add value. An employee is honored or advanced in a well-run firm when he adds value to the company. A firm gains good will and profit if it adds value for the customers.)

CHAPTER EIGHT

Has any major scientific discovery not been howled down by established opinion? Yet years later people say “How blindingly obvious! Why did nobody think of that before?”

----- N. Leigh

IS ETHICS A SCIENCE?

Q: Please remind us, what is ethics, by definition?

A: Ethics - a subset of the Science of Value -- is the science that results when Intrinsic Value is applied to Individuals, and Social Ethics (Political Science) is the science that arises when the Intrinsic Value dimension is applied to groups. Properties true of that value-dimension become true of Ethics. As to what is known about that dimension... Intrinsic Value (*I-Value*)... *it* arises when one perceives an uncountable amount of meaning. Its measure is aleph-one or higher. In transfinite math that is known as the power of the continuum. That is the cardinality of I-Value. To clarify all this and to become aware of the other primary dimensions, visit this site and read the articles, beginning with the papers by Hartman:

http://www.hartmaninstitute.org/html/Research_topics.htm

Ethics, as a discipline, will resemble Music Theory in many ways, but especially in this respect: The notation, staffs, notes, physics of vibration, acoustics-theory, etc., are universal; but *each composer writes his own tunes, makes his own music*. He or she is grateful for Music Theory and Appreciation but eventually acts as an individual and produces something unique. It is the same with Ethics:

each individual lives his own unique life, but the theory shows him how to build on his strengths and eliminate his weaknesses. If he wants to take advantage of this information, he can.

According to Leo Rangell. M.D., Ph.D., “ideas, feelings, fantasies, thoughts, affects, anxiety or worry, or a feeling of guilt, or shame or depression, i.e., the potpourri of mental facts, are as much determinants of human health and happiness, or illness and malfunctioning, as the somatic, the physical world of the body. Humans are affected, and guided, by them just as by an action or event in the external "real world". “ It is all one organism, the brain, the nervous system, the body. According to the philosopher, Suzanne Langer, of Harvard University, in her book, MINDING, we think even with our toes.

Cognitive Psychologists have found ways to make all this objective by isolating the specific sentences that we say to ourselves that are causal of specific emotional outcomes. A belief is to an emotion as a barometer reading is to the weather. Both the set of these specific beliefs (valuations) and the barometer readings can be objective. Why? The belief to which I refer is a self-sentence, it is something we tell to ourselves about ourselves or about our relation to the rest of the world.

These beliefs (value judgments) are highly relevant to morality, and thus logically are facts for Ethics to analyze. The collection of those self-sentences comprise our self-concept, our self-ideal, so to speak. As you recall, morality is self increasingly corresponding to an improving self-ideal. The psychic facts of which Dr. Rangell speaks are caused by the individual’s personal value system, and all the beliefs associated with it. In this sense, human lives are

the data for Ethics. No one can deny that one's life is highly influenced by one's thoughts.

Joshua D. Greene, a Harvard neuroscientist and philosopher, said multiple experiments suggest that morality arises from basic brain activities. Morality, he said, is not a brain function elevated above our baser impulses. Greene said it is not "handed down" by philosophers and clergy, but "handed up," an outgrowth of the brain's basic propensities.

I find that to be an interesting fact, namely, that we are "hard wired" to be moral by the nerves in our brains; but some people, of course, have some brain damage and cannot practice empathy.

A source book, that contains evidence that the right kind of giving (also known as Altruism) tends to result in a healthier and happier life, is the following:

WHY GOOD THINGS HAPPEN TO GOOD PEOPLE: The Exciting New Research that Proves the Link Between Doing Good and Living a Longer, Healthier, Happier Life by Stephen Post and Jill Neimark. (Hardcover) NY : Broadway Books - Doubleday Publishing Group, 287 pp.

Dr. Stephen Post, the author, is a bio-ethicist on the faculty at Case Western Reserve in Ohio. Medical doctors consult him frequently on subtle, casuistic problems in ethics.

Hard evidence is presented in his remarkable book to validate the correlation between Altruism and what I have referred to as the good life for the good person...which eventually makes for a high-quality social order, even resulting in a life of higher quality for persons who are not so (morally) good. {The oppressors, manipulators, and

exploiters will also be affected in a positive direction, if M. K. Gandhi was right. And he was a moral genius.} Stephen Peterson, at the University of Michigan; Daniel Gilbert, at Harvard University; and Robert E. Lane have also made intensive studies of the concept "happiness."

Herbert Gintis, along with other social scientists, present cross-cultural evidence in a book with the title **Moral Sentiments and Material Interests: The Foundations of Cooperation in Economic Life** by [Herbert Gintis](#) (Editor), [Samuel Bowles](#) (Editor), [Robert T. Boyd](#) (Editor), [Ernst Fehr](#) (Editor) [The M.I.T. Press, 2005] The evidence indicates that there is a human tendency to be socially fair rather than narrowly selfish. Using scientific methods they studied altruism and reciprocity, and the evolution of human cooperation. The authors note that humans seem genetically programmed to have at least some sense of fairness and of self-sacrifice for the common good. They do not in this book make an attempt to delineate hereditary from cultural aspects, as that was not their aim.

Dr. Greene, Dr. Post, Dr. Bruce Hamstra, Dr. Roger Blair, Dr. Herbert Gintis along with his colleagues Drs. Bowles, Boyd, and Fehr have all provided us with falsifiable experiments within the field of ethics. This is an important fact. It adds what the great philosopher of science, Carl G. Hempel, referred to as 'empirical import.'

ON THE IS-to-UGHT RELATIONSHIP

"I'm skeptical about the initial Humean claim because I'm skeptical about how much of our assertoric discourse is really "purely descriptive." Hume and others are perfectly correct to say that one cannot validly derive something in a conclusion that wasn't in the premises, but there is a lot of covert value-

judgment intertwined in our ordinary "factual" claims about the world, so much so that the logicians' ideal of totally distilling denotation from connotation frequently won't work, because by the time we've removed all axiological connotations from an assertion, we've changed its meaning."

----- Andrew Jeffery

In conventional Philosophy courses we are taught that one cannot get from "ought" to "is" or vice versa. Why? Well, because Hume said so. If he said it, it must be so. We have all heard "We can't derive normative statements from descriptive statements." Even though it is "impossible," Hartman did it. It may well be that what we learn in old textbooks is not always the last word on a subject; it gets dated over time.

Since "ought" is a value copula, it is appropriate to invoke some value- theory, as preliminary to arriving at a sound and reasonable definition of the term "ought."

At this point it would be appropriate to review the material in Chapters 2 and 4 so as to recall the axiom of value and be very clear about what fulfillment of an intension really means. Comparisons of two values must be comparisons of two entities which fall under the same concept. If the concept shifts, one is in danger of comparing oranges to toy elephants. [This can be done legitimately if the concept is "things" or maybe "commodities." Then one may say,

To learn more about Hartman's approach to axiology, and to get further details, one may visit the site of the research institute set up in his honor, and read some of the Research Reports. Just search for the Robert S. Hartman Institute for Formal and Applied Axiology.

There one may read some articles by him, and discover how extensive his output was. One may also visit The Library at The Univ. of Tennessee at Knoxville, and request to see the Special Collections of his papers, letters, and articles. The curator there will show the visitor over ten shelves with many large boxes to a shelf, each box filled with letters, papers, books, manuscripts and files.

perhaps, “the former is better than the latter (as a commodity.”] The name sets the norm. One wristwatch is *better than* another if it has more wristwatch features than the other, all else being equal (and if the concept doesn’t shift.)

That is how we employ the term “better” in formal axiology. In the same way, the relation “better for” can be carefully defined .

The "ought" now based on the "is"

Better means: more valuable. To say "'x" is better for y than z is' means: x more fulfills the meaning of y than z does.

For example, Heifetz more fulfills the meaning "violinist" than Henny Youngman does. Therefore, Heifetz is a better violinist than Youngman. And it follows that a Jascha Heifetz violin concert is better for an audience of music lovers than a Henny Youngman violin concert is. We shall now employ the definition of "better for" as we examine the "ought"- judgment.

Saying: "x ought to R y" -- a paradigm for ought-judgments -- is, by Hartman's definition, an abbreviated way of judging that:

"it is better for x to R y than to S y or to R z (at time T)."

In this way, each definition is built upon a previous one -- a rigorous procedure. Given what x, y, z, R, and S are, an ought-judgment may be true, false or indeterminate.

An empirical inquiry is called for with respect to each

such judgment. Thus the ought is in effect reduced to a series of is judgments.

If, as an illustration, I judge: Heifetz ought to play the drums all day," Heifetz here is x, drums is y, and play all day is R. Now this would be a false judgment which when expanded would perhaps read: It is better for Heifetz to play the drums all day than either for him to listen to drums being played or to play the violin all day.

Or, to say it yet another way: "It is the case that the meaning of playing the drums all day overlaps more with the meaning of Heifetz's life than listening to drums does or than playing violin all day does. . ." possibly a false is-judgment (most of the time.)

Heifetz himself decided on the meaning of his life, to be a concert violinist. We all ought to decide our *own* meaning.

If you thought the term "ought" functions as an imperative, as in : "You ought to go clean your room, kid!" you might reasonably ask at this point, How do you get from an indicative to an imperative?

You *ought* to go clean your room! =df. = (Given who you are, and given what cleaning your room means) It is *better for you* to clean your room than not to -- or than to play some other game right now. And that is a fact. And here are the reasons why it is better for you: 1) it would please your mother; 2)you will continue to get an allowance 3)you will enjoy more -- once you get used to it -- I predict, living in a clean, neat atmosphere 4) etc., 5) etc.

The former phrase [before the equals-by-definition sign] is shorthand for the longer phrase.

The former is an imperative -- or at least is put in imperative

form here -- the latter is a set of descriptions of what is. Of course, the ought-judgment may be false; the facts have to be investigated to determine this.

In this example, the x is 'you'; the R is 'go clean' and the y is 'your room.' (This was merely an illustration, not a comment on the nature of the universe.)

Sometimes the y is the null class.

In "Brian ought to relax" the X is Brian; the R is 'to relax.' That means: It is better that Brian relaxes than if he doesn't (or that he do something else), Whether that is more valuable, all around, is for a consensus of impartial observers to decide -- just as any other objective matter.

Public confirmation is the criterion.....remembering what Bertrand Russell said in a moment of sarcastic humor: "Objectivity is a delusion shared by several lunatics at once."

The above explication is only one of several possible ways to base the "ought" on the "is." If I say "Brian ought to relax" it is like an Euler (or Venn) diagram: I am saying there is an overlap between who Brian is, and what relaxing is. It may be that only Brian -- or those who "know him better than he knows himself" -- can tell us if this proposition is true. **Sound value judgments are based upon a knowledge of the facts.**

Recall that in the Algebra of Value, the ought was represented by a minus sign, indicating a gap between two states, the supposed ideal and the actual.

THE CONSCIENCE AND ITS RELATION TO GUILT

There is bad guilt and good guilt. The bad guilt is present

when one feels s/he somehow should be punished, for something s/he did that was immoral. This is not constructive. It is a neurosis. It is self-defeating and counterproductive. This kind of guilt, which often leads to depression, is a condition in which one tells oneself: "I made a mistake, and therefore I should be punished for it. I deserve torment for having done that. I am no good. I am worthless." This illogical thinking only makes matters worse and is very likely to result in more bad judgment and destructive action based upon it.

The "good guilt" which I prefer to call "pangs of conscience" is what an educated, sensitive, conscience feels. This informs us that something is wrong, and directs us to work out a program so as not to make the same mistake twice. It is akin to regret and disappointment. Hence, we note that there are two sides, so to speak, of conscience: the Reflective Conscience and the Directive Conscience. The former twinges, or sets off alarm bells; the latter directs us to practice what we preach, to be morally consistent, and to be true to ourselves.

For further details on the specific distinctions between these two sorts of "guilt," see the book by Bruce Hamstra, WHY GOOD PEOPLE DO BAD THINGS: How to make moral choices in an immoral world (NJ: Carol Publishing Co., 1996).

For an in-depth analysis on the structure of conscience, see M. C. Katz, SCIENCES OF MAN AND SOCIAL ETHICS: Variations on the theme of human dignity (Boston: Branden Press, 1969) pp. 19-21.

CHAPTER NINE

WHAT IS SELFISHNESS?

The question is often raised, "Why not be totally selfish?"

A blind person, feeling selfish, might say: "Why should I pay for my city to have street lights?! I don't use them. I don't need them." His thinking is faulty since those who do see by those lights are less likely to run over him with their cars. If he were more enlightened he would be willing to pay some taxes to support the building of those street lights.

The value-scientist in order to speak to this issue, employing the value dimensions with which you are by now familiar, proceeds to define three types of social relationships:

Systemic: Dependence

Extrinsic: Independence

Intrinsic: Interdependence.

As you recall, $I > E > S$ means I-value is infinitely more valuable than E-value; and, in turn, E-value is better (more valuable) than S-value. This is basic value science. Hartman explained it all in detail in his book **THE STRUCTURE OF VALUE**.

The conclusion one may then draw is that interdependence with others is far, far better than so-called "rugged individualism" -- the pretence that one is independent -- or national isolationism, when that nation is well-off and fairly

comfortable. Perhaps individualism and isolationism correlate with the "selfishness" about which the questioner was inquiring.

While it is much better to be 'independent' than to be in a state of dependency (unless perhaps one is still immature and is under 17 years old), since I-Value is infinitely more valuable than E-Value, it is superior, by a quantum leap, to be Interdependent, *i.e.*, to be aware that we need each other, and that "no man is an island," as John Donne put it many, many years ago. It is indicative of spiritual as well as moral growth and development to realize that we are all connected.

Maybe it is some individual's dream to "get away with" an embezzlement, and then take off to someplace where they will live a life of luxury. Does that life involve interacting with some people? Will that individual be able to trust those people not to "rip him off" -- after he has set the example that that is the kind of world he is willing to tolerate and even perpetuate? If he has done it, why shouldn't others?

To be ethical is to be morally consistent -- to have a single standard, not one for oneself and another for everybody else.

So let's not envy those who engage in embezzlement as a way to gain comfort or, "to live happily ever after." Those who select crime, or cutting corners, or bait-and switch are, in effect, voting with their feet for the kind of world they want to live in: they want everyone to always be cheating everyone else. They want personal corruption. They ignore - - or are indifferent to -- the pain that they may have caused to the party they embezzled. They can't deny that they are thereby getting a world that is more chaotic, more anarchic

in the worst sense of the word, more unstable. ...Happy in how they 'got away with it', they now can indulge in pleasures galore -- as long as they buy them.

Applying the value-dimensions to "Positive emotion," we arrive at three positive emotions, namely,

Systemic-emotion: Satisfaction.

Extrinsic-emotion: Pleasure

Intrinsic-emotion: Joy (Also Love). Recall that $I > E > S$.

Conclusion:-- true love and joy are infinitely better than mere pleasure; and it is better to be pleased than only satisfied.

If the reader really loves himself/herself, he/she will aim to experience Joy – which, as we have shown, correlates with Interdependence.

Sharing, teamwork, partnership, altruism, a giving kind of love will get for a person a more meaningful life, a more high-quality life, than the self-absorption and egocentricity which the questioner referred to as "selfishness." The latter is not really in our self-interest. And it is still true that we often act out of self-interest.

So it turns out -- as paradoxical as it may seem -- that the wisest form of selfishness is unselfishness.

Let us postulate for the purpose of theory construction that most of us, most of the time, operate out of self-interest whether we are conscious of it or not. Even when we are most altruistic, charitable, or self-sacrificing we shall hypothesize that there is something in it for us. This is not to claim that self-interest serves as a motive for our actions. Self-interest is NOT to be confused with selfishness which

is a disregard for others along with a lack of respect for them.

If you perform an act of loving kindness with no calculation of benefit and with no intention of winning any sort of reward it appears on the surface to be selfless. According to this hypothesis there is something in it for you, even though you did not seek it, namely a warm feeling that you have done some good, and you are gratified that in some small way you have made the world a better place. So it was in your self interest to do it.

In contrast, a selfish person thinks "me first." I must "get mine." He or she shows no respect for others, and thus fails to be ethical.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELF-INTEREST AND SELFISHNESS

Dictionaries tell us that being "selfish" means: thinking of yourself alone, in the sense of putting yourself first while pushing others aside, showing disrespect to others who are there around you either by neglecting them, or in not offering to share some good fortune you suddenly came into. Selfishness is concentrating on one's own advantage with disregard for others and may involve doing something that affects someone else adversely, such as taking something to which we are not entitled (theft); or depriving someone of something to which he/she is entitled. Selfishness indicates a lack of respect, a failure to value other persons in a way that would be to one's maximum advantage: optimum moral health is obtained when one Intrinsically-values other persons. What this means in detail will soon be explained in more detail..

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

We are not isolated individuals; we form groups. The more the needs and wants of others are taken into account, the more we can say a person is acting self-interested in a proper manner. A selfish person asks only: What's in it for me? A moral self-interested person asks: What's in it for us?

Some philosophers have argued that selfishness is the root cause of all unjust action through the ages. Hobbes identifies selfishness as being the impediment to our social contracts: After we make these agreements to live in society, he says, "wrong" comes from acting selfishly, from claiming a right to whatever it is we feel like taking at the time (a life, a woman, money, etc.)

Every crime and injustice has stemmed from selfishness to some extent (except maybe in cases of utter madness.) We are social creatures and being selfish is an impediment to living in society. Ethics can teach us to put ourselves in perspective and thereby to live a better life.

The difference between self-interest and selfishness is not one of degree (as some would suggest), but of kind. As we said, a selfish person is someone whose actions affect others adversely, and who takes something he is not entitled to from another person.

When I go to sleep at night because I am sleepy, I am acting in my own self-interest. But no one would say that I am

being selfish. How is my going to sleep at night an act of selfishness? It isn't, of course.

So it is important to distinguish (as many do not) between selfishness and self-interest.* And some philosophers have said that one of the troubles in this world is that people often do not act in their own self-interest - and these philosophers add - 'in their own enlightened self-interest'. That is, their real self-interest, and not merely what appears to them to be in their own self-interest. In fact, in his famous "Wealth of Nations" the great philosopher of economics, Adam Smith, bases his economic theory on the premise that people should all act for their enlightened self-interest, and then that everyone would benefit. And this idea has become the foundation of free-enterprise and Capitalism.

Notice, though, this is not an argument for selfishness. It is an argument for enlightened self-interest, and it makes a sharp distinction between selfishness and self-interest.

Why is selfishness bad? Well, because it is unethical, (based on the paradigm offered in this new system of ethics; one which many people may take some getting adjusted to due to a condition known as 'future shock') and thus immoral. It is wrong to do things at the expense of others. And, in the long run, it is contrary to self-interest since others may retaliate, and if one gets a reputation for selfishness s/he will do badly in life.

***) If one takes the position that all acts are selfish, then there is nothing that will persuade him otherwise because he will be able to rationalize any and all action as having some selfish motivation. It's called Sophistry and it runs rampant. I suspect that folks who believe there is no such thing as an unselfish act are merely projecting their own character. They might need to ask themselves why they can't be unselfish.**

We used the term “wrong” just now. What does it mean? It is right to be good, and to do good. It is wrong to be bad and to do what is bad. Since a student of the first four chapters understands the valuable and the good, this insight should be helpful in understanding what is right. To compose value is rightness. Wrongness, of course, is the opposite policy. To commit transpositions of value involving individual persons is wrong.

The term "self-centered" to describe someone means something different again. A self-centered person is someone who is engrossed in his own affairs. He is largely concerned about how circumstances affect him. He may act selfishly, or he may not. It would depend.

“The completely differentiated person is the person who is completely himself or, more specifically, the person who completely fulfills his concept of himself, which is the concept "I." According to our definition of value, such a person is a good person, and it is this goodness that we define as moral goodness. The various expressions for moral goodness, such as "sincere," "authentic," "genuine," "honest," "true to oneself," all mean being completely who one is. This moral goodness is the subject matter of Ethics”

---Robert S. Hartman

We all need to differentiate our own self-concept to appreciate our own uniqueness, and to become more integrated as a person, so the better we are at seeing these subtle nuances such as the difference between self-interest, self-centeredness, and selfishness, the better we will be at defining ourselves, and then developing our special talents. Then our work will be our play, and we can love and really enjoy our work.

Chapter Ten

WHAT'S IN OUR SELF-INTEREST?

To enhance our self-interest we seek to maximize the value we get out of life. This does not have to be calculating, nor does it have to involve scheming; it can be spontaneous. It is usually an unconscious or preconscious process. One of the best ways to do this is to live a meaningful life. This entails serving others without being a martyr, expressing love, showing responsibility -- which means being ready and willing to be held accountable, making a contribution to the well-being of individual persons, extending one's "ethical radius" to include a wider group than earlier, identifying with the family of human-kind, and, as time goes on, becoming a better person than you were before.

It has implications for policy also. Once we get broad agreement that humans have often acted in what they perceived to be their self-interest, we might then go on to ask: What is truly in our self-interest?

Our enlightened self-interest would indicate clearly that just as, *on the individual level* of our bodies, we want our heart, lungs, liver and brain to work together in harmony, *on the social level* we want the human family to work together in harmony. Just as a tiger (whose cubs were stillborn) has nursed and reared piglets, and dogs have raised kittens, and cats have nursed puppies, just as animals can get along, we would -- in our enlightenment -- want the rest of us to get along. We are aware that in the animal world there are predators and prey; humans may be distinguished from those animals by the fact that we have teachable ethical knowledge,

Sincerely inquiring as to what is truly in our self-interest, we would then arrive at some basics, such as stability, peace, minimum nourishment standards for all living human individuals, pure water, decentralized energy sources available to each dwelling, etc. The reader could probably add to this list.

[There are higher goals for which we could aim. Eventually we might even strive to understand the meaning of the universe -- and become one with it; but for the present to reach out to the human species and identify with it is enough of a goal.]

ON MORAL CONSISTENCY

If a logical system were inconsistent, any proposition would follow from it, and it would cease to be logical. Ideally, every logical system should be consistent; it ought not contain any inconsistencies. (Kurt Gödel proved that for a mathematical system, expressed in logic, even if it is consistent, there will be some mathematical truth that can be expressed that will remain outside of the system, and thus the system in that sense is incomplete.)

In the same way, an ethical system, while it will be incomplete, must be self-consistent. And a self must observe the Principle of Moral Consistency and be self-consistent. This is another way of saying we ought to avoid hypocrisy, for to have a double standard is to be hypocritical.

{The science will eventually measure degrees of hypocrisy, and if one rates more than 50% in this factor, one is in danger of immorality. All these terms need to be defined with precision; ideally they would be interpretations of specific symbols in a mathematical model. In time this will be achieved as the science of Ethics evolves, just as natural science has. This process will not be forcing people into any mold, but will be theory construction. See for example, in Chapter Two the axiological, non-mathematical, "Algebra of Values."}

HIGH ETHICAL STANDARDS AND SELFLESS ACTS

What one often deems "unselfish" is an act that cares for another individual, at the expense of one's own personal comfort. In a sense, there are "selfless acts." Examples - when done without any thought of return, or of making oneself feel good - would be leaving a generous tip to a waiter or waitress you'll never see again, putting out a fire at a stranger's cabin, giving to a cause the recipients of which are totally unknown to you. These instances expend your own resources or put you at unnecessary risk and promote an unrelated party's interest. A more extreme case would be pushing a child out of the path of an oncoming vehicle which then runs you over. That was an unselfish action. Many such incidents have actually occurred. When they do, we speak of "heroism." No one can deny that human beings have been heroic on occasion. It is safe to predict we will witness selfless acts in the future. Let us at this time make a value-dimensional analysis of ethical living inspired by a scale that Lawrence Kohlberg, of Harvard University, worked out. It was based upon an understanding of what he learned from Piaget and others about stages of moral development in a human being.:

SYSTEMIC: At this level the person is committed to ethical principles such as avoidance of harm to others, responsibility, civility, caring and kindness, sharing, good citizenship, honesty, openness, sincerity, excellence, dependability, moral consistency, etc.

EXTRINSIC: At this level the person is committed to exercising in practice the principles believed even if it entails violating an unjust law. Some would go so far as to uphold human and animal rights if these principles were part of their self-concept.

INTRINSIC: Here one is willing to take harm upon oneself if necessary to protect others. **Selflessness. Love.**

ON HAPPINESS

Tom Bodett wrote: "A person needs just three things to be truly happy in this world, They are someone to love, something to do, and something to hope for."

A German dramatist and philosopher, Johann von Goethe, wrote: "Who is the happiest of men?
He who values the merits of others, and in their pleasure takes joy, as though t'were his own."

The founder of the philosophy of Transcendentalism, Ralph Waldo Emerson, wrote the following on the topic of success: "To laugh often and much; to win the respect of intelligent people and the affection of children...to leave the world a better place...to know even one life has breathed easier because you have lived. This is to have succeeded."

I will now differentiate *happiness* from *success*. (Both of these are ethical concepts relevant to Ethics as science. For Ethics is about the good life for the good person.)

Success is getting what you want, while Happiness is wanting what you get -- in the sense of liking what you have. [There is more to it, of course.]

Happiness is also a feeling you get as you anticipate getting

closer to a goal you have long worked for.

Stephen Peterson, at the University of Michigan studied the concept "happiness." Dr. Peterson's findings indicate that what makes a person happier is to have good relationships with other human beings, to do work that person likes to do, and to be a contributing member of some community.

And "success" is, more precisely: the progressive (day-to-day) realization of worthwhile, predetermined personal goals... that reach into your highest potential. You must set the goal in advance and not just stumble onto it; that's what is meant here by "predetermined." It must be a personally-chosen goal, not one that is imposed from without by another. And it has to be a worthwhile goal, else reaching it would not make you a success. If it does not make you stretch, make you better than you were, you can't call that success either. It helps if you *want* the goal as a drowning person wants to breathe air. If you are very *determined* to pursue it, you will turn every barrier into a turnstile.

Each day when we arise we can decide to be happy that day, no matter what. Much research has been done lately on happiness and some of it is reported on here:
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/arti...>

Also, an earlier, and more extensive report on the concept "happiness" is found here, in Time Magazine:
<http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,1015902,...>

Chapter Eleven

WHAT DOES ETHICS PRESCRIBE FOR MORAL HEALTH?

**“Some people see things as they are and say why?
I dream things that never were and say what not?”**

-----G. B. Shaw

One can take the position that human nature is self-contradictory and still subscribe to scientific Ethics, that is, to Ethics as a scientific discipline. Here is this author’s view of human nature:

We are at once risk-takers and cautious; fragile and strong; wise and foolish; defensive and aggressive; smart and stupid; simple and complex; and in so many other ways, living contradictions.

Even so, cognitive psychologists have shown that much of the mistakes and failures in our life results from what we tell ourselves that is illogical or lacking sound evidence -- overgeneralizing, perfectionism, reductionism of a complex matter to a single factor, i.e., prejudice, etc., etc. These internalized sentences make for neurosis, for poor child-rearing patterns, for all kinds of self-defeating and counter-productive behavior.

Hopefully, the Science of Ethics, as it develops and matures, will generate positive, constructive sentences we can tell ourselves throughout life that will make us successful, effective, competent persons who live a meaningful life.

The Self-concept we have makes all the difference. (Genes play a large role too, but they are at present largely out of our control.) So be very fussy what self-sentences you internalize. They comprise a vital part of your self-image. By influencing the judgments and decisions we make, they constitute the difference between success and failure, and all that's in between. I define "decision" as: Intrinsic-choice. Here is a relevant quote:

"Choice determines direction... Decision determines destiny...."
-- Doug Firebaugh

**Watch your thoughts, for they become words.
Choose your words, for they become actions.
Understand your actions, for they become habits.
Study your habits, for they will become your
character.
Develop your character, for it becomes your destiny.
--Anonymous**

ON CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT

Scientific Ethics is not based on rules that tell us the right action to do at any given moment; rather the answer to "How to be morally healthy" is that one is to have a good character. Many of the modern perspectives are derived from insights already well-known by the ancient Greeks. For example, the science confirms that if we realize that treating others with kindness is appropriate and we feel positive feelings toward others, we are likely to in fact use kindness in our dealings with others. The scientists in the field of ethics are interested in what kinds of persons will live the good life, and it turns out that character development plays a large role in this.

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

Training in empathic development – developing our empathy -- is a major part of Applied Ethics. One of the major applications of this science called Ethics is known as Education; and another is Life Coaching. Having positive role models early in one's life is usually essential to moral development. Through regularly engaging in kind, thoughtful actions, we can develop and increase the degree of our morality. The good person has acquired a sense of values and understands why a specific action – that you or I may say is “doing the right thing” -- is the appropriate response. The living of a good life transcends particular actions and the local social customs and cultural practices. Over time, choosing right over wrong requires less thought and is habitual. Loving kindness is chosen knowingly for its own sake. The habits we form in life are critical to our having a high degree of morality.

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

A good person consciously chooses the right action most of the time. It is not accidental, but rather a deliberate decision to choose kindness. At first, before it becomes intuitive, a highly moral personality will consciously choose and affirm goodness. He or she will recite ethical affirmations as a way of ingraining the principles. Eventually the ethical precepts become a matter of habit. This Ethics is about an entire life. Instead of asking what is the right act here and now, Ethics asks what kind of person should I be in order to get it right all the time. The science of Ethics eventually came to the conclusion that someone who is ethical consistently demonstrates integrity and respect for others. It also found that to know the good is not necessarily to do the good. We must choose the good. There are three stages: (S) Choosing intellectually. (E) Choosing by practicing. (I) Integrating the choice into one's self-concept. Practice is now a habit.

HOW IS GOOD CHARACTER DEVELOPED?

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

It turns out that a major element is *the capacity for making good judgments*. What does this involve? It helps if we ask ourselves: Do I set priorities? Do I put myself into my work? Do I pay attention to getting things done? Do I, in fact, get results? Do I seek excellence in everything I do? Persons of good judgment know the value of *cooperation* as well as to *trust* others until they prove untrustworthy. A healthy skepticism is appropriate.

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

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

How do we develop *character*? There are three stages: Decide what we want in our moral development. Find out what we have. Thirdly, Take steps to close the gap. This is all very fine for the individual, but what about the individual in a group? We are social animals; we do form groups. It is time to turn to social ethics.

Paul Ricoeur, whose research was based on earlier work by Dr. Edmund Husserl, points out that as human beings we have a *need* for harmonious and peaceful relations. That need, he notes, is not satisfied in today’s world. Thus we see that personal ethics blends in with, and is inextricably linked with, Social Ethics. We have already discussed many aspects of social ethics. Some major features of it should, however, be highlighted. And the theory should be applied to some topical issues to confirm its relevance to life. What does this (relatively- systematic) Ethics prescribe for the person in society?

ON SOCIAL ETHICS

It is unlikely that we will ever reach a "perfect" solution to anything so it is advisable that we work together to improve

what we are doing, understanding that each improvement we make will require additional improvements. Can we agree that it is better to be constructive than destructive? If so, this implies an imperative: “Make things better!” If something isn’t yet good, let’s make it good. If something is good, let’s make it even better.

Recall the Algebra of Value in Chapter Two. There we introduced Value-Composition. Since Value-Composition multiplies and intensifies the original value, let’s compose values, This amounts to having a *constructive approach*. Let’s accept what we know about ourselves, with all our weaknesses and all our strengths, and use what we know to create a better world. This would be the logical application of value composition. We would thus be adding value to our lives, gaining thereby richer lives.

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

Just as on the individual level we want to actualize -- bring out our talents and skills -- on the social level why not inventory the strengths of each culture, each tribe, and each nation and use those advantages to reach certain common goals. Why not focus on what we can build together? Why not make each group feel more secure by entering into non-aggression treaties with everyone? Why shouldn’t our own nation initiate the ‘peace race’? These are relevant questions to consider.

If we can agree that violence is destructive, and that we want to be constructive, then we will do all in our power to avoid violence, hostility, abuse. We will take every opportunity to find alternatives to violence. We will no longer admire the mighty warrior. We will admire the heroes of peace....Tolstoy, Gandhi, Martin Luther King and most of the winners of the Nobel Prize for Peace. We will let their lives inspire us.

We will be very careful not to have a double standard, one for ourselves and one for others: we will no longer say to ourselves that while violence done to us is certainly destructive, when we commit violence or heap abuse on others it is not so bad, for it is justified. To think like this is to violate The Principle of Moral Consistency. That Principle tells us to avoid a double standard, and to be consistent. Understanding morality means understanding that we are to be true to our true selves and avoid (or at least minimize) hypocrisy. A double standard is a form of hypocrisy, We often see examples of a person in effect telling us “Do as I say, not as I do.”

This discussion with regard to violation of moral principle reminds us of the issue, a classic one in moral philosophy, which may be posed as an inquiry: does a noble end justify any means used to get to it? This is what we shall focus on in our next chapter.

Chapter Twelve

DOES THE END JUSTIFY THE MEANS?

Do good ends ever justify bad means?

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

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

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

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

First of all, those who claim "the ends-in-view justifies whatever means it takes to reach those ends" fail to define what they mean by the term "justifies." They do not define

it. It is just a very vague notion. Whatever they take it to mean, nothing justifies chaos and the causing of needless human suffering.

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

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

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

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

fallaciously think it will solve problems, when it in fact multiplies them.”

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

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

Sometimes a nation rationalizes immorality by saying that when it invades, occupies, or in some way aggresses, it is bringing democracy to a people, or it claims to be saving the world from weapons of mass destruction -- when it is the one who possesses them. Why don't we really strive to put an end to such weapons by putting an end to the arms traffic in the world? Why aren't we – in gradual, matched, bilateral phases -- destroying all the nuclear weapons, and chemical weapons that exist (including our own, of course)? Why aren't we launching a 'peace race'?

No, the ends do not justify the means. They never have and they never will. For, as we shall argue below, they cannot. Ethics directs us to always use moral means. Immoral means will corrupt and moral end.

Some philosophers hold that *ends must be compatible with means, and vice versa*. They write:

If you want stability, use stable means.

If you want a peaceful world, use peaceful means.

If you want love, use loving means.

Try it. You may be pleasantly surprised by the results you get!

The research ethicist agrees. Reporting on the results of analysis, it was concluded:

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

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

When you use force -- as I define the term -- you *care about* the one you are using it on, and want to rescue that person from worse harm. Examples: restraining someone who is struggling while drowning; or, closing in on and surrounding -- and thus arresting -- someone who is slashing tires, so as to get him into a rehab center -- on the assumption that possibly he is capable of rehabilitation. If the professionals there, after working with him for a while, decide that he isn't ready to reenter society -- then lock him up until he is ready. Dr. Karl Menninger in his major work: **THE CRIME OF PUNISHMENT, offered practical alternatives to the current penal system and to the prevailing so-called Criminal Justice System.**

IS TORTURE ETHICALLY PERMISSIBLE?

Q: “Are you saying that torture (in principle) is unethical under all circumstances. If so under what principle, what consistent rule?”

A: Yes, I am saying that, and the consistent principle is: respect for the dignity of persons, my own and others. This follows from the very definition (in a metaethical system known as Formal Axiology: its ethical applications) of Ethics, namely:

Ethics, we recall, is the discipline that arises when individuals are valued Intrinsically (in contrast to being valued Extrinsically and/or Systemically.)

Torture, like murder, is always unethical -- since one cannot intrinsically value individuals and yet torture them. Torture, in axiological Ethics, is what is termed to be "a Transposition of Values," a disvalue. It is the misuse of a human life. It transposes two (or more) good values making them into an incongruence, and the result is only fractional value, close to zero...as is demonstrated logically/mathematically within the system. “But,” argues the critic, “the ends (society’s progress towards peace) justify the means (disregard of individual rights)”.

Societal values do NOT overrule individual values, according to the system of Ethics. The theory agrees with Kierkegaard's conclusions that the individual must receive top emphasis!! It is a very pernicious doctrine that would permit the State to dominate over the individual. That view was found in Plato's Republic and is also found in Hegel. It made Nazism possible, and also Stalin's "Communism."

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

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

When we choose Freedom as a core value, we will -- if we know our value-theory -- choose the highest kind of freedom, Intrinsic-freedom, which is our freedom of conscience. And when we develop a sensitive educated conscience we will follow it conscientiously. {Systemic-Freedom is freedom of thought; Extrinsic-Freedom is freedom to move the limbs of our bodies, freedom to travel; Intrinsic-Freedom is the freedom to follow our conscience.}

We then will be conscientious objectors to war. [War is a disvalue (since it means "organized mass-murder in the name of a good cause"), hence, we will want to nullify or neutralize the disvalue, and one way to do that is to object to it.]

What will we do instead in order to arrive at security? We will continue to be aware that our enemies (with the possible exception of a few fanatics who need to be arrested and brought to justice) want the same thing that every human being wants. The same as we do: they want a life with less struggle; a certain minimal level of comfort, of food, of meaningful work to do or games to play; they want to achieve serenity; they want love. We are told they are "our enemies," but we know they want what we want. When

we attain a state of peace they can have it too. For we will share it with them. This applies to the future, not to the past, for our past is filled with brutal wars. Our future does not have to be one of war stories; we can prevent wars before they start by applying what is already known about Social Ethics.

If one wants a happier, a more meaningful life he or she will use the scientific understanding in this area rather than turning for guidance to Machiavelli (who wrote on how to be scheming, manipulative, and conduct warfare. In other words, he taught how to commit the Instrumental Fallacy.)

The choice is up to the individual.

APPENDIX ONE

The Science of Value

Formal Axiology, or Value Science (or VS), is a discipline originated by Dr. Robert S. Hartman in the 1950s. It is based upon an "axiom" (in a special sense of that word) and is derived by deduction from that axiom. The data -- which the science orders, explains, and is able to make predictions about -- is arrived at by induction, by observation or publicly-shared statistical results. The data for this science are the evaluations individuals make, the priorities they set, their thought processes, their decisions. The science has been widely applied and a partial list of some of the major applications will be listed below.

What we value we speak of as our desires, preferences, likes, interests, leanings, tastes, and so forth. What we value strongly we speak of as our needs, our special treasures, or our loves. This new discipline measures values as a chemist measure chemicals. It employs a values test -- something akin to a personality test, but not quite the same -- for this purpose. The test is known as The Hartman Value Profile (HVP). The science has developed so far an Arithmetic of Value, an Algebra of Value, and a Calculus of Value among other models. It has utilized as a tool the mathematics of Cantorian Set Theory, and also Quantum Mechanics.

APPLICATIONS

There have been many applications of VS (value science), such as to making sales managers more efficient, or to aiding workers to find careers that they would love, or to designing new consumer products that have style and esthetic appeal.

Furthermore, VS has already been applied in the following fields: Aesthetics, Decision Theory, Corporate development, Education, Advertising, Ethics, Hospice counseling with terminal cancer patients, Supermarket layouts, measuring the effects of psychodrugs, measuring the efficiency of community mental health clinics, Industrial design, Spousal-abuse therapy, Psychology modeling, Finance, Jurisprudence, Neurobiology, matching couples for compatibility, Psychiatry, Theology, Commodities trading, and Executive-compensation decisions.

The HVP Test

A measuring instrument utilized in value science is The Hartman Value Profile (HVP). The HVP test has proven to be useful for the following purposes:

For young people, the test shows not only their general capacity but also their valuational strengths and weaknesses, as well as the value dimensions in which they are particularly gifted. The test thus has served as a complement to interest, aptitude, personality and other value tests. It also has helped students think axiologically: it has aided them in recognizing that there are values that promote *learning success*.

For executives, the results of the test have served to channel activities -- both their own and their associates -- in the direction of their particular valuational strength, and thus to increase their *decision-making capacities*. It served to check absenteeism and dishonest behavior on the part of the staff.

The HVP test has shown the *compatibility* and incompatibility of the individuals in a group to whom it is administered, and it provided a number of classifications comparing individuals in their various functions within the

group. (Due to the mathematical nature of the scores and the operations possible with them, groups themselves can be measured as to their homogeneity or non-homogeneity, and intangibles such as "group morale", "group spirit", etc., can be exactly defined and determined.)

It has been utilized to match people as mates, partners, associates, collaborators and to facilitate teamwork by indicating compatible and incompatible value patterns. Interpersonal compatibility, it turns out, is the primary basis for positive relationships.

In the case of mental health prevention, the test helped to discover potential suicides and other emotional and intellectual disorders before actual symptoms appeared. More recent studies have revealed the value patterns of different types of criminals, i.e. pedophiles, atychals, etc.

At times the test has revealed a definite pattern for accident proneness which has proven useful for insurance companies, pilot training, etc.

When used in psychotherapy, and in psychoanalysis, the HVP test given at the first session with the patient, indicated the strengths and weaknesses of the person. This proved helpful as an initial guide for the direction of treatment. When it was given periodically, it pinpointed the results of the treatment.

Proof of validity for the HVP test can be found at <http://www.axiometrics.net/Axiology.aspx>

Select the Validity Study (a PDF file).

To find out more about formal axiology (an earlier name for Value Science), see:

<http://www.valueinsights.com/axiology.html>

Research Results

The following empirical studies, among many others, have been done and reported on. The research results may be requested from Mark Moore, Ph.D., President of the Hartman Institute in Formal and Applied Axiology:

- differentiation of normals from underachieving high school students;**
- differentiation of normals from juvenile delinquents;**
- influence of professor's values on changes in students' values;**
- differentiation of successful from unsuccessful college students;**
- relationships with grades in college courses on marriage and family, philosophy, and sociology;**
- relationships with peer-rankings of college students for a hypothetical leadership role;**
- relationships with peer-rankings of college students for a hypothetical counseling role;**
- differentiation of successful from unsuccessful graduate school students;**
- relationships with grades in graduate school courses of philosophy of education and social ethics; and others.**

The author predicts that the rate of development of VS will be the rate at which the value scientists create new propositions to test and the rate at which they report the test results publicly so that others can confirm through their own observations. It will in time become a mature and

respected science. Value Science has just recently emerged from Moral Philosophy and in 100 years will be virtually unrecognizable to its founders and early pioneers.

One testable hypothesis might be that the study of VS makes it easier for a person to be an optimist -- to look for and to find the good in any mixed-up situation, or to face a bad situation and "overcome" it by utilizing techniques indicated by the science -- and thus to derive all the benefits which psychology has shown redound to optimism: better health, more promotions, advancement to higher levels at work, more friends, etc.

Referring to the HVP, the measuring instrument which was alluded to earlier, Dr. Wayne Carpenter had this to say:

The HVP measures your ability to value. Your capacity to value is a talent or ability by which you organize your thinking and emotions to make decisions or value judgments. Your value talent is a measure of your ability to (1) see and filter what is happening around you, and in yourself; (2) build concepts and ideas by focusing on what is important to you; and (3) translate your ideas and expectations into decisions. These three activities are the keys to understanding how we all make decisions.

Your ability to make value judgments is a natural activity of the mind and is similar to musical talent and ability. Each person has certain inborn skills or aptitudes. Some individuals have an ear for musical notes; others can be taught to recognize the notes. Both types of individuals can develop their natural talent and apply this talent as musicians. In the same way, some individuals have better developed natural talent for making value judgments and can make better decisions. These individuals have a clearer idea of

what is important, can see things which other miss, and are very creative problem solvers. They make decisions which always seem to be on target, and are sensitive to the needs and concerns of others.

Value talent, like musical talent or sports talent, can be learned and improved. The first step in developing your value talent is to identify your level of development, and to find out what specific types of talent you have. The value analysis is designed to let you come into contact with your ability to think and make value judgments about yourself and the world around you. This analysis will give you an opportunity to experience the combination of talents which defines your uniqueness.

To complete the HVP, a person is asked to rank the items from best to worst, and the phrases from most agree to least agree. The results reflect an individual's own preferences, which are measured against the objective scale given by formal axiology. Measurement is very precise, yet practically allows for almost infinite variety.

The results of the HVP are derived from logical, mathematical norms, and are not based on the values of any specific population or group. Consequently, it is not a "test" to be passed or failed; and the results have no bias with respect to sex, age, race, creed, or any other socio-cultural classification."

The test is projective while being, at the same time, objective. There are only 18 items to rank on this test. There are two parts to it. Every day people are rating things, and prizing things, and evaluating. These evaluations and value judgments are all "grist for the value scientists' mill." The scientist gives a "read-out." It has to be an objective one

upon which most all the other scientists would eventually agree. However, just as in medicine, not all physicians agree on a diagnosis, there are, and probably will ever be, controversies among value scientists as to their findings.

Dr. Robert K. Smith clarifies understanding with regard to this new discipline in the following remarks:

"Because of Dr. Hartman's work, (which he called "formal axiology") we are able to stated objectively that Mr. X in Japan is attentive to the uniqueness of others and is utilizing 90% of his potential in valuing others uniquely, while Mrs. J in Ohio is attentive to practical aspects and is using 92% of her potential.

[... The social sciences with which we are familiar ... are inductive sciences.]

An example of the process of an inductive science would be trying to predict buying behavior of a sub-group of American, male executives between the ages of 33 and 48, earning more than \$75,000. A person fitting in this group would have probabilities assigned to certain other observed behaviors that are consistent with a certain percentage of the members of this group. So through inductive reasoning we would be able to assert there is a 50% chance that the given individual found in this group drives a leased BMW or Mercedes Benz. This is a beneficial discipline, for it permits social scientists to develop general understandings of certain groups and populations. Its limitation is that... the applications are culturally and temporarily limited.

Dr. Hartman's development of formal axiology is as revolutionary for the Social Sciences as Newton's was for the physical sciences. From his studies of more than 35 cultures and how the people of those cultures assign value, Dr. Hartman discovered the three dimensions of value. ... He was aware of a mathematical system that had corresponding properties to the value dimensions he discovered. By joining the mathematics and the dimensions of value, he created an objective deductive science that measures how persons value their world and themselves."

APPENDIX TWO

ETHICS AND SELF-INTEREST -- A dialog

Daniel asks: Why is ethical behavior better than pure self-interest?

Marty responds: Ethical behavior IS pure self-interest (even including altruistic acts and seeming self-sacrifice)!!

To simplify one of the main findings of Ethics as a science -- Whatever you do comes back to you. So what is hateful to you, be sure not to do to others! *If you want others to treat you well (-- or even if you don't --) you need to treat others well.* This is basic and elementary for any system of Ethics. All this assumes that one does not have a blindspot in the Intrinsic dimension, that is to say, that one has a capacity for sensitivity to the value of another person. Some are devoid of this capacity, just as a certain percentage of the population is color-blind, or totally tone-deaf. The extreme cases are the psychopaths. So far these are a tiny minority of the human family, usually those who have been severely abused as a child. This abuse is not necessarily physical but may be psychological. [When I use the word "others" it includes the ignorant, the people from a foreign or alien culture, the handicapped, mammals, and especially children.]

Bottom line: treating others well is the best policy for us. It obtains for us the most value, both individually and socially. This needs to be clearly taught in every elementary and primary class in every school.

Jon writes: **How utterly cynical, Marty!**

I take it upon myself to offer an alternative view of 'ethical behavior'. Socially, ethical behavior, according to the general ethical standards accepted in modern societies, involves self-sacrifice of one kind or another.

These ethical standards continue to evolve, though with some lag. For example, these days taxation in a socially responsible society would appear to be for the most part accepted as 'ethical.'

Van writes: I tend to agree with Marty that self-interest (as he means it in the ethical sense, not in the economic sense) and doing good often mesh. And some argue that doing self-interested stuff is better, more honest, and that it works to do good in the long run anyways, but that do-gooders often flounder and do ill instead.

Marty answers: Jon, when I stated that ethical behavior is self-interest, I meant it in the sense that if someone engages in ethical (or moral) behavior, then s/he is maximizing his/her self-interest. For we go value-shopping and we learn that we gain maximum value by behaving ethically. I am not claiming that self-interest is the motive for the behavior only that it's the result, in theory.

When you go shopping, don't you want to get the best value?

I claim that most all behavior is done out of self-interest -- even the apparently sacrificial behavior.....even martyrdom. The latter may not be *selfish*, but it is self-interested in the moral sense of the term.

Recall that Ethics as the discipline that arises when we regard individuals as Intrinsic Values.

One of the basic terms of Ethics is "morality." I defined that as a matter of degree: One is being moral *to the extent* that one's self corresponds with one's Self -- the former being the objective self that observers would say they perceive; the latter is one's Self-image. This Self is the meaning of my life as I understand it, including all my *fine principles*, what I stand for, what I would die for, what values I would give up for what other values, who I am, etc. *If one can truthfully and wholeheartedly say: "I enjoy being myself", "I love my work (or what I do)", "I love the beauties of nature", "I'm glad to be alive right now, and I know that people are Intrinsic Values," then one has a good self-image.*

He/she respects himself and respects others, and wants to treat them well. To the extent one is moral, one is valuable; if one is congruent one is good. "Congruence" means: fully expressing in action, in behavior, one's fine principles.

***Morality* is the (ethical) analog of value. *Congruence* is the analog of goodness. 'Value' is partial correspondence; 'good' is full correspondence. If J finds that x entirely fulfills J's concept of x, J will call x "good." When things exemplify their concept, match the intension you place upon them, you will tend to speak of them as "valuable" or as "good" depending upon the degree of fulfillment. (Where, or at what point, one breaks off the exposition of the concept is arbitrary, and will vary from one judge of value to the next.) {I borrowed the term "congruence" from Carl Ransom Rogers, the renowned psychotherapist.}**

Jon: Marty, your clarifications are well-taken. I would make this point though: Doesn't the intention of the individual

count for something? For instance, if the intention of individuals is to behave ethically, in spite of the material cost to themselves, this therefore leads them, for instance, to buy coffee that is more expensive at the supermarket, because it comes from the 'Fair Trade' suppliers. In doing this they are more or less certain that the coffee growers receive a far greater percentage of the retail revenue with this product than with other brands. They are not concerned with the 'value' gain (consciously, at least), but with getting coffee ethically. That is, they would prefer not to have coffee if it means some people suffer through an exploitative financial arrangement as a consequence. Thus, I am still at a loss as to how this, effectively, self-imposed tax, this choice, can be characterized with the term 'self-interest'. It appears to me to be a perfect example of someone subordinating self-interest in favor of a higher ethical principle, and quite literally paying the price for their conviction.

Dianne writes: Marty, you asked, "When you go shopping, don't you want to get the best value?" My answer to that is: No. I also want to know that the folks engaged in producing what I buy have been paid a fair wage. So I too buy Fair Trade....not out of self interest, but out of altruism -- which may be mild, but which is there nevertheless.

You surely can try to argue against this by saying that I am "really" doing this out of self interest - but that is the doctrine of psychological egoism which I don't find to be interesting.

Marty replies: Dianne, I commend you for buying Fair Trade! It is an admirable practice and I wish we had something similar in the United States.

You took the word "value" in that quote from me you cited as strictly economic value (price). I meant it axiologically, though. Hence it would include all kinds of value: the quality of what you would purchase, its esthetic appeal, whether it was ethically produced and/or distributed, whether the store selling it was observing business ethics, etc. I failed to make my usage clear, but when I say "value" from now on, that's how I intend it.

When I claimed that ethical behavior was pure self-interest I was making the point that we will, in more than one sense, derive the most value in our lives when we let morality be our guide, cutting as few ethical corners as possible; keeping our cheating and fibbing to a minimum; refraining from having a double-standard (or to say it another way, applying the same moral standards to everyone -- including children); treating everyone with courtesy and deference -- including the feeble, the disabled, our elders, our kids, our pets, our enemies, our jailed convicts, etc.

If we deliberately and intentionally have integrity, moral courage, eschew hypocrisy, we will, it is predictable, have a smoother, better-working life than those who do not. When people try it they find out it is true. {It worked out fine for Erin Brokovich; and for Ms. Ashley Smith of Georgia in early March, 2005. Even Colin Powell, who saw moral failings and corruption in the regime for which he worked, and who told his boss he wanted to resign, is doing all right today. And so is John Dean who in an earlier day resigned from a corrupt administration.}

Service – which I prefer to speak of as self-fulfillment rather than self-sacrifice -- in the name of love is Intrinsic moral maturity, and that is the dimension of value for which to aim: it returns far, far more value than merely being upright and a good citizen. It is the gift of oneself to the world, to the community, to others.

Gandhi did it for his people, and many a family member does it for their family. As Jon points out, those who, even if they knew of a way to dodge paying them, willingly pay taxes [although they wish they could choose exactly (specifically) where the money will -- or won't -- go] are engaging in a form of 'sacrifice', as is Dianne when she pays more in money for some merchandise, so that sweatshops or child labor may not be encouraged, and hopefully that these practices may die out.

APPENDIX THREE

What were some historic schools of ethics?

I would like to call your attention to this contribution by David Heise, Ph.D. He sums up the major ethical schools of modern moral philosophy, in what he calls the three compartments of an ethical toolbox. Here are (with full permission) his (slightly abridged) words:

Paradigms:

A Paradigm is a “Point of View” or “Perspective” that allows us to organize and make sense of things. Paradigms allow certain things that we might otherwise miss to become visible - by focusing our attention on them and making them come to the foreground. But, at the same time, by focusing our attention on certain things, they make it more difficult to see certain other things because it moves them to the background. In ethics, this has implications for what we value, and the dimensions of value that we see or miss when thinking about moral issues.

Three Moral Paradigms:

- (i) The Consequences Approach: (formerly known as Utilitarianism)

If the fundamental good of our lives is happiness, then 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 leads to “The Greatest Happiness Principle”: Actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness (or well-being), wrong in proportion as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness (or well-being).

Appeal of this Approach:

This paradigm draws attention to what is actually good or bad for people – to specific consequences for happiness and well-being. It reminds us that when we act we ought to work to maximize good and to minimize bad by aiming to promote the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

Weakness of this Approach:

If the rightness of an act is determined solely by appeal to the likelihood of good or bad consequences, then we must be prepared to resort to any means if the anticipated consequences are so desirable. Indeed, we could be required by this theory to commit what we might normally think of as “immoral” acts in the name of promoting the greater good for the greater number of people. For example, we might be required to violate human dignity or rights for the happiness of the greater number.

(ii) The Rights Approach: (Deontological Ethics)

When we speak of human dignity the idea is that there is something about us that is supposed to compel the appropriate respect for the dignity and equal worth of each person. Thus, some believe that the ultimate value is rights and doing the right thing, no matter the consequences.

On this view, the right thing to do is decided by an appeal to a universal principle, regardless of the consequences. This determines our rights and duties. The idea here is that it is wrong to treat people in ways that you wouldn't want to be treated. It is wrong to make exceptions for yourself, as you are no more special, nor morally different, than anyone else. To treat

people with the equal dignity and respect they deserve, we treat them all equally. {More recently, this school has modified its stance to one where it is generally agreed that we treat our spouse or other close family for whom we have greater responsibility with more care than we would treat strangers, and that this is the moral thing to do.}

Appeal of this Approach:

By appeal to a universal principle to which all reasoning people would (or should) give assent, and not appealing to consequences that instinctively motivate the other animals, our distinctively human capacity for rationality is realized. We also treat everyone with equal respect, as we make no exceptions for anyone.

Weakness of this Approach:

Focusing on rights and duties alone can conceal or devalue other considerations, such as the consequences of actions and people's character. For example, decisions to act that fail to consider the consequences of actions can be recipes for moral disasters. Could doing the "right" thing that results in suffering for the multitude really be the "right" thing?

(iii) The Virtue / Character Approach: (today called Virtue Ethics or VT which is short for Virtue Theory)

This perspective focuses on our character – on what sorts of persons we are and should be becoming. Virtues are admirable or excellent characteristics. Thus, virtues and vices have to do with character. A virtue is usually the appropriate middle between the extremes of excess and deficiency. For example, in responding to danger we may feel either cowardice (too much fear) or foolhardiness (too little fear). We need to find the appropriate middle between these extremes (courage). A moral vice is excess either way.

Virtues and character are dispositions (ways a person normally acts in a given situation). The virtues (or good character) are said to lead to a balanced, healthy, happy, flourishing life. Virtues also lead to a good and flourishing society.

Appeal of this Approach:

Focuses attention on what kind of people (and society) we are, as well as what kind of people (and society) we want to become – also focuses on moral “training” or habituation.

-----by David Heise

Here is an axiometric analysis of these three most prominent schools:

(S): Deontology (E): Consequentialism (I): Virtue Theory

Illustrating these three moral-philosophical perspectives, Herbert Gintis wrote:

"Suppose I am observed to take care of my aged aunt Millie. I may do so because I care about the welfare of my aunt Millie....

On the other hand, I may have no feelings for my aunt at all, or indeed, I might despise her. Yet, I might consider it my duty to take care of her (because she is a close relative; because my mother asked me to on her death bed; or whatever)....

Or, I might have an ideal of the ... (good) person, and wanting personally to conform to that ideal, and believing that the ideal includes caring for Aunt Millie, I might do so."

If focusing on one of these perspectives has the effect of concealing or devaluing other perspectives that would be a mistake. The beauty of the scientific approach is that it can eventually embrace and include major aspects of these three dominant paradigms and other perspectives as well, such as, say for example: Chaos Theory, Systems Theory, Complexity Theory, Buddhist ethics, sufi ethics, zen ethics, or the ethics of the Tao. It achieves a synthesis which becomes apparent from the end result although it was not deliberately designed that way at the outset. It will be an emergent synthesis. Those who work within the framework of scientific Ethics proceed on the assumption that ethics can be made more logical, more disciplined, and more integrative. Thus it will cover more data and introduce greater clarity into the field of study.

+++++

Bibliography

William K. Frankena, ETHICS (NJ: Prentice-Hall,1963) 2nd ed., 109 pp.

Stephen Post and Jill Neimark. WHY GOOD THINGS HAPPEN TO GOOD PEOPLE: The Exciting New Research that Proves the Link Between Doing Good and Living a Longer, Healthier, Happier Life (Hardcover) NY : Broadway Books - Doubleday Publishing Group, 287 pp.

Hamstra, Bruce, WHY GOOD PEOPLE DO BAD THINGS; HOW TO MAKE MORAL CHOICES IN AN IMMORAL WORLD (Carol Publishing, Secaucus, NJ, 1996),

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

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

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

Polanyi, Michael, (1891-1976). SCIENCE AND SOCIETY [Chicago] University of Chicago Press [1966, c1964]

Jeanne Segal, RAISING YOUR EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE: a practical guide (NY: Holt, 1997)

Jeffrey L. Seglin, THE GOOD, THE BAD, AND YOUR BUSINESS (NY: John Wiley & Sons, 2000).

Robert S. Hartman, (1910-1973), THE STRUCTURE OF VALUE (Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1967)

Marvin C. Katz, TRENDS TOWARD SYNTHESIS (Michigan, Axiopress, 2004), 142 pp.

http://www.axiopress.com/Book_List.html [Item #7]

Marvin C. Katz, Ethics As Science,

<http://www.workforworldpeace.org/>

Marvin C. Katz, “How the Science of Ethics Will Benefit You”, 2007.

<http://www.hartmaninstitute.org/Default.aspx?tabid=95>

Marvin C. Katz, SCIENCES OF MAN AND SOCIAL ETHICS: Variations on the theme of human dignity (Boston: Branden Press, 1969)