

CHEATING

**THE ORIGIN, NATURE, IMPORTANCE
AND IMPROVEMENT
OF BUSINESS AND OTHER ETHICS**

WALLACE R. BAKER

©2017 Wallace R. Baker

4. HUMAN ETHICS – SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS IN UNDERSTANDING ETHICS AND EVOLUTION

Charles Darwin

This subject was raised by Charles Darwin when he wrote "Any animal whatever, endowed with well-marked social instincts, the parental and filial affections being included, would inevitably acquire a moral sense or conscience, as soon as its intellectual powers had become as well developed or nearly as well developed as in man"¹⁹.

Konrad Lorenz

Konrad Lorenz, an Austrian, who received his medical doctor degree in 1928, a PhD in Zoology in 1933 and later became a Professor of Psychology, loved and studied animals very carefully. He generated many interesting and controversial theories.

In 1973 he shared a Nobel Prize in Physiology of Medicine "for discoveries in individuals and social behavior patterns" with two other important early ethologists, Nikolas Tinbergen and Karl von Frisch.

In the introduction to the French version of one of his numerous books "On Aggression", it is explained that the instinct to combat its own species is necessary in natural selection but it can be harmful. He showed evolution invented mechanisms to direct this behavior into unexpectedly inoffensive channels. Lorenz leads the reader to profound thoughts.

He was a controversial leader in the most important progress in the last century researching and learning about animal behavior that illuminated understanding of human behavior described by researchers and scholars later in this book²⁰.

¹⁹ Darwin, Charles, 1982, *The Descent of Man*, [1871] pp. 71-72.

²⁰ Lorenz, Konrad, 1963 in German, French edition, 2010 *L'Aggression* – Flammarion, Paris. Also see Wikipedia, the free Encyclopedia on Konrad Lorenz.

Julian Huxley

A distinguished biologist, Julian Huxley²¹, had a very well developed ethical conscience, even though he was an atheist. He was a great admirer of Charles Darwin, like his grandfather Thomas, and they all believed in evolution. Evolution had occurred in the past in bodies of animals and their minds. Now the biggest evolution in man will be in the realm of ideas and how his mind works. This was to be the psycho-social stage of evolution - a radical change in ideas and how man's mind works. Therefore "man must reunify his life within the framework of a satisfactory idea-system" ... "The new pattern of thinking and attitude is necessitated by the increase of knowledge demanding to be organized in new and more comprehensive ways, and by the failure of older ideas which attempted to organize beliefs round a core of ignorance."

He names the new idea-system "Humanism" because "it can only be based on our understanding of man and his relations to the environment. It must be focused on man as an organism, though one with unique properties. It must be organized round the facts and ideas of evolution, taking into account the discovery that man is part of a comprehensive evolutionary process, and cannot avoid playing a decisive role in it."

In his view one can rely only on knowledge that comes to man not from other worldly sources. In this way, he believes there is a unity of mind (spirit) and body. Man is a global part of the rest of life and nature, and this affirms the unity of mankind.

His views of Humanism are that it is not static but a directional process just as life was not created but evolved.

²¹ See his chapter "The Humanist Frame" in *The Great Minds Series, Evolutionary Humanism, Julian Huxley*, Prometheus Books, 1992, pp. 72-115.

His humanistic philosophy was not to think in terms of absolutes such as absolute truth, morality, perfection or authority.

He thought knowledge was increasing, behavior could improve and new directions could be found.

He thought that as man evolved his objectives would be less on acquiring power, efficiency, growing populations or creating wealth, but rather on reaching greater fulfillment as a human being.

Julian Huxley, an enthusiastic follower of Darwin, thought successful idea systems replaced older ones which lost peoples' beliefs. It is in this way that the medieval god centered organized thought belief in God. Revelation is now slowly disappearing in favor of a science centered pattern where truth is found through experience and experiment and the idea of human progress.

He also writes that "religions are organs of psychosocial man concerned with human destiny and experiences of sacredness and transcendence."

In this way, man has attempted to explain complex situations beyond the grasp of his brain and understanding.

He also points out that man is subject to the same energy as in the cosmos. In addition, although man is different from other natural phenomenon, there is genetic linkage to others on our planet.

As an evolutionary biologist, he compares the present development of man to the moment in time when our amphibian ancestors came out of the water to become land dwellers. Thus he compares a biological change to a psycho-social period of evolution.

In his view, now is the time for a "scientific study of values" which some philosophers and theologians think is impossible because the subject of values is not within the realm of science. But Huxley argues that they are

something in the world and “capable of being investigated by methods of science”.

Huxley's optimistic view of psycho-social evolution is very attractive to some thinkers. But one needs to consider the possibility that evolution does not always lead to a happy ending. Sharks are a very ancient fish that are successful in surviving evolution. But it is difficult to say that evolution has made them any more ethical. Evolution shakes things up, sometimes improving a species for the better or worse in terms of goodness or ethics. With regard to human psycho-social improvement, man's own efforts to improve his conduct towards better ethics through proper education at all ages hopefully entering into the DNA over time may be possible but not certain. With humans, things often go wrong.

Desiderius Erasmus, a Humanist

Philosophers including theologians have been referred to as humanists, like Julian Huxley. An earlier humanist, perhaps the most famous, who focused on literature, ethics, morality and religion, was Desiderius Erasmus (1466 or 69-1536).

Encyclopedias note there were ancient predecessors to humanists in South East Asia, China, Greece and Islamic countries. Then there are early Renaissance examples like Erasmus and later secular humanists like Julian Huxley. Humanists included those who were benevolent to other humans. For the Greeks, education (Paideia) in the liberal arts was an important part of humanism. However, the word “humanism” only came into current use in the 19th century. Humanists often look to science rather than to religion and revelation for ethical guidance.²²

²² See generally Humanism, Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia and Renaissance Humanism in the Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

Erasmus is often described as one of the first “modern” persons closer to our time than to the medieval world”.²³ In this article, his modern approach to education is described which is truly remarkable and explains well why he was referred to “ a leading light of Christian Humanism” with his writing, about 1509, on the importance of early liberal education for children, which should, he wrote, include the participation of the children’s parents.

Erasmus, the Dutch illegitimate son of a Catholic priest and a physician’s daughter, was a faithful Roman Catholic all his life.²⁴ He lived in Holland early in his life. He was a highly talented and dedicated scholar of good literature, and the outstanding restorer of the Latin tongue north of the Alps. He lived and taught with honesty, modesty and good ethics.

Erasmus wrote to a friend in 1500 “[...] in all of what I have hitherto said about my good friends, I was speaking of my books, it is their friendship that has made me perfectly happy, my only misfortune being that I have not had you to share this happiness with me”.²⁵

A reading of Erasmus’ correspondence in Latin, although well written even in translation, seems to some scholars to be excessively wordy and long. He often wrote very fast. On occasion he expressed deep love for young male friends that seems a bit strange to present day readers. He also wrote some vicious invective against his guardian who separated him from a friend. See Letter 58/To Thomas

²³ <http://www.faqs.org/childhood/Co-Fa/Desiderius-Erasmus-of-Rotterdam-c-1469-1536.html>; this article refers to the book by Johan Huizinga, *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation*, 2011, ISBN 9781499124651.

²⁴ For a description of Desiderius Erasmus’ life, see Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia, the Encyclopedia Britannica 1953 on line, the New Catholic Encyclopedia (2003), from *World History in context*, and *Encyclopedia of the Renaissance* (2000), from *World History in context*, Content Level=Advanced; and Johan Huizinga, *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation*, ISBN 9781499124651.

²⁵ Letter 125/ to an un-identified person, p 253, *Collected Works of Erasmus*, Volume 1, the *Correspondence of Erasmus*, Letters 1-141, University of Toronto Press, 1974, Toronto and Buffalo.

Grey. However, it is true that his thinking is detailed and precise and often sentimental in his devotion to his friends which he expresses forcefully and freely.

One should remember that he was highly motivated to revitalize “theology and popular piety”. See page XVIII of Introduction in Huizinga cited above.

These characteristics did not prevent him from being an intelligent critic. He prepared a new translation and edited and corrected the Latin New Testament based on the original Greek text. He was also one of the best Latin scholars in existence. His revision of the New Testament upset the Catholic clergy who were shocked and angered by his criticism of the holy scriptures which he corrected.

In addition, he was highly critical of the actions of the Catholic clergy, especially the fanatics, and how badly many of them behaved.

He probably started the Reformation movement unintentionally by these intelligent ethical criticisms. However, it was his view that the Catholic clergy should reform from within. Luther, who was his contemporary, had some different ideas including the desirability of a Protestant split-off from the Catholic Church. Erasmus was against such a separation because he feared it would lead to violence which it did for a long period in Europe. In addition, he did not agree with Luther on some important religious issues like free will.

Erasmus wrote other interesting books and was credited with being the author of a total of 10%-20% of the books published when he was the most active, which was shortly after the printing press was invented. Thus he was a most popular author who wrote an astounding amount. In addition, he was a good friend of the major publishers. He entertained and often amused his readers.

His other most famous and hugely successful essay, a powerful satire of contemporary thinking, was “The Praise

of Folly” written in the space of a week in 1509 and printed in 1511.

In this essay, Folly, a goddess, praises in a virtuoso style her virtues which include self-deception, madness, superstitious abuses and corrupt practices of the Catholic church, folly of pedants, self-love, inebriation, ignorance, laziness, flattery, forgetfulness, pleasure, wantonness, intemperance and heavy sleep. Other subjects dealt with in this essay are tyrants, fraudulent merchants, militant theologians, decadent clergy and brutish monks. She concludes that life would be dull and distasteful without these qualities.

Erasmus was a true European and spoke many languages. He spent his early life in Holland where he went to school. He then lived in Paris from 1495 to 1499 where he taught students. Then he spent three years in England where he returned several times and where his friends were leading citizens, including Sir Thomas More, later beheaded by Henry VIII because he stayed loyal to the Pope after the king started the Church of England. Erasmus received a degree of Doctor of Divinity as an honor from the University of Turin. He went to Venice to print his *Adagio*, a collection of wise Roman and Greek sayings which he updated throughout his life. One reason he traveled and lived in so many countries was to secure his absolute freedom to study, write and speak his mind and teach freely. He had an enormous number of friends throughout Europe, many of whom were leaders and distinguished scholars and theologians.

He put his study and writing time first, before insuring he had enough to eat and lodging. For these, he relied on his notoriety, and on his friends to provide for him. But this characteristic meant he often had plenty of money but at other times lived in absolute poverty.

He lived in present day Belgium at Louvain and Germany but in the latter country, he could not stand the heating stoves there, preferring an open fire.

He also lived in Basel, Switzerland and worked as an editor and advisor to the Froben Press. There he produced a new edition of the Colloquies, a collection of dialogues on subjects such as war and soldiers' life, scholastic studies, the art of hunting, a lover and a maiden, the shipwreck, enquiry concerning faith and a beggars' dialogue.

The role of Erasmus in forming and promoting ethical ideas that exist today is substantial. This conclusion is based upon the fact that he knew the situation in the ancient world beginning with the Greeks, continuing through the Roman world throughout the dark ages until the Renaissance and the enlightenment, of which he was a precursor. Based on the content of his thinking and writing, the ideas he had have influenced Locke and ultimately U.S. constitutional practice up to the present date. Freedom of thought and speech were his most precious ideas and are fundamental in the U.S. today. U.S. conservatives especially hold these freedoms at the top of their values. Those on the left do also but they tend to emphasize equality as well.

An interesting and useful way to appreciate Erasmus' ethical and political ideas is to compare them with those of a contemporary of his, Machiavelli (1469-1527). This comparison has been made carefully by Gennady Stolyaroy II.²⁶

Stolyaroy first points out that these two thinkers and writers had totally different approaches to governing in that Machiavelli, in *The Prince* (1513), explains how a leader should enhance the power of a state while virtue and moral objectives are secondary and should only be employed if practical and useful for this purpose. For Erasmus,

²⁶ What follows in this section is drawn from the Liberal Institute, Machiavelli and Erasmus compared, <http://www.liberalinstitute.com> (viewed in June 2016).

leadership is leading with moral principles. For Machiavelli, even honesty is not necessarily wise. A republican system of government is not considered by Machiavelli as efficient as a unitary powerful, absolutist ruler which Cesar Borgia favored: the latter employed treachery, deceit, conquest and murders to increase state power. For him, leaders should inspire fear not love in their subjects. He was aware that this was a double edged sword. Inspiring hatred is counter-productive for a leader so he should avoid inflicting harm or expropriating property from the population, where possible. This was for practical reasons to avoid unnecessary hatred and conflict.

Some believe Machiavelli wrote *The Prince* to enhance and ingratiate himself with the rulers of Florence even though his personal convictions were more ethical.

In comparison with the ideas in *The Prince*, Erasmus' ideas were totally different. He believed a leader of a government should follow ethical and moral principles. He should ensure the fair administration of justice for the people, do the right thing, do no violence or plunder, sell no offices and accept no bribes.

According to Paul Johnson, an English catholic historian, Saint Paul and Erasmus were the leading and effective Christian heroes. Their example served as inspiration to governments of the United States. In this way Erasmus' influence drew deeply on past moral teaching and projected it forward.

Machiavelli was not necessarily against war if it led to securing political power.

Erasmus was against war which he thought was monstrous and unjust. In war he was disgusted by bilateral cruelty committed by both sides. In the 20th century, many millions were killed in World War I and World War II.

Toleration was not a goal for Machiavelli as it was for Erasmus who liked free expression and felt he was a citizen of the world.

Erasmus, unlike Martin Luther, believed in free will and the possibility of an individual to decide upon and reach his own goals. Machiavelli's primary interest in state power limits the free will of individuals.

Erasmus was living proof that his moral ideas could lead to a successful life which consisted of a remarkable amount of literary and ethical writing. He sometimes wrote up to forty pages in one day. His writing was widely read and it influenced many other people.

Where Erasmus' enlightenment thinking influenced Locke and Voltaire, Machiavelli influenced Otto von Bismark and imperial Germany, and authoritarian state with big government intervention, military discipline and expansion of frontiers by war which continued and burst into two horrible World Wars in the 20th century. This could have been avoided if Erasmus' anti-war policies had been followed by both sides. This result proves that morality and ethics pays in human conduct – this kind of conduct would have avoided millions of war casualties.

Jessica Flack's and B.M. de Waal's Principle Paper entitled: "Any Animal Whatsoever" Darwin and Building Blocks of Morality in Monkeys and Apes.²⁷

Jessica Flack, a well-known scientist who worked at the Santa Fe Institute, and Franz B.M. de Waal, based on their observation and study of social behavior and inferred psychology of monkeys and apes who are the living animals

²⁷ Flack, Jessica C. and B.M. de Waal, Franz B. M.'s paper *Any Animal Whatever - Darwinian Building Blocks of Morality in Monkeys and Apes*. The first Principal paper is found from page 1 to page 29 in *Evolutionary Origins of Morality, Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*. Edited by Leonard D. Katz, Imprint Academic, U.K. (2000). This book is remarkable because of the large number of leading scientists who have prepared principal papers and others who have prepared commentaries on the principal papers and response to the commentaries.

most closely related to us, find "building blocks" for later evolution of human morality. This conclusion contradicts to a great extent Thomas Huxley's famous conclusion in "Evolution and Ethics", in an 1871 lecture where he advocated that the search for morality's origin should be outside biology – a dualistic view of nature and morality which is still shared by many today including ethologist Richard Dawkins.²⁸

The degree to which the tendency to develop and enforce moral systems is universal across cultures (according to Midgley 1991 and Silberbauer 1991²⁹) suggests that moral systems do have biological origins.

They further argue that "the sets of rules that govern non-human behavior in their social groups provide clues to how morality arose during the course of evolution". These rules provide order necessary to the stability of social systems. They also note that justice "creates a *modus vivendi* [...] so that life can go on indefinitely in the future" (citing Kumnov 1979, Garrett Hardin 1983. *Is Violence Natural?* p. 412).

What exactly is the social behavior that leads these scholars to this conclusion? They note that "many non-human primates for example seem to have similar methods to humans".

The important question is "to what degree has biology influenced and shaped the development of moral systems?"

To answer this question one needs to explore behavior in other species that are analogous (similar traits that arose by converging evolution due to the presence of similar selection pressure or evolutionary conditions) and perhaps

²⁸ See Orr, H. Allen, January 11, 2007 Mission to Convert, *The New York Review of Books* p. 21.

²⁹ Midgley, M., 1991, *The Origin of Ethics. A Companion Guide to Ethics*. Ed. P. Singer, Oxford. Blackwell Reference. Pp. 1-13.

Silberbauer, G., 1991, *Ethics in Small Scale Societies. A Companion Guide to Ethics*. Ed. P. Singer, Oxford. Blackwell Reference. Pp. 14-29.

analogous traits that evolved in common evolutionary conditions, and perhaps analogous to our own (traits that evolved in a common ancestor and remain present in related species due to common phylogenetic descent).

This behavior relates to resolving, managing and preventing conflicts of interests within their groups and such methods, which include reciprocity and food sharing, reconciliation, consolation, conflict intervention and mediation. These are the very building blocks of moral systems in that their existence indicates, as Mary Midgley (1991, p. 12) wrote "a willingness and a capacity to look for shared solutions to conflicts". Sympathy, empathy and community concern are also "prerequisites" of morality recognizable in social animals.

Food sharing is widely practiced in many types of primates. Petr Kropotkin (1902) thought organisms not necessarily struggle against each other but collectively against their environment. Robert Trivers (1971) later, in *The Evolution of Reciprocal Altruism*, refined this idea into simultaneous co-operation or mutualism. In such case one party benefits and the other has a cost generated by the time lag between giving and receiving. Richard Alexander (1987) saw reciprocity as essential to the development of moral systems.

Several hypotheses exist why individual primates voluntarily allow others to take their food, i.e., to avoid becoming the recipients of aggression, to enhance their status, the individual likes to show off and that this is a start of mutual obligations that can involve exchanges of other things or privileges including sex.

This most interesting and carefully researched article by Flack and de Waal concludes by defining possible evolutionary building blocks of the human moral system also found in other types of animals as divided into four groups.

These authors organize the building blocks into the following four categories:

1. Sympathy related – this occurs where there is friendship linking humans and animals, they help each other and are emotionally linked. This occurs especially in case one is disabled or injured – sympathy is created. Another factor intervenes if one puts oneself into the other's shoes imagining how the other feels.
2. Norm related – social rules are created which apply to societies. Each member of the society internalizes them and makes them part of their operating system. Failure to follow them is expected to be punished, i.e., society is regulated.
3. Reciprocity – one expects others whom one treats well to reciprocate or be subject to punishment in some form.
4. Getting along – this aspect of behavior relates to the practical and natural desire to avoid conflict which most normal animals have. Conflict is sometimes necessary but has a cost which can fall on either party. Having friendly relationships with those around you is generally an asset. Sometimes avoiding conflict requires negotiations to protect one's best interest.

The authors also note that the "foundations of morality may be built on our emotional reactions to one another but morality itself is no doubt also tempered and sometime modified by two additional factors" i.e., "our ability to evaluate the situation, generalizing their emotional reactions". It also "may be tempered by our understanding of the consequences that our responses to the behavior that elicited the emotional reactions have for ourselves and others".

The authors cite David Hume (1739), Adam Smith (1759) and Edward Westermarck (1912) for the proposition

that "human morality is powerfully influenced by emotional responses and is not always governed by the abstract intellectual rules upon which we have supposedly agreed. The primate research implicitly suggests that this emphasis on the tale of emotions is both insightful and accurate –in primate groups individuals are motivated to respond to others based on emotional reactions they have to one another's behavior."

This idea that emotion may be fundamental to morality contradicts many philosophers like Emmanuel Kant (1785) who believed "that the human sense of right and wrong is more a consequence of rational processes than emotional reactions".

From the above it seems obvious that non-human primate behavior in societies having strict dominance hierarchies may not be exactly moral beings "but they do show indications of a sense of social regularity that parallels the rules and regulations of human moral conduct"

(de Waal 1996 a, 1996 b, Chapter 3).

Two other scholars believe the study of animal behavior proves that animals act morally and don't just have the building blocks of morality as described by Flack and de Waal. They cite examples like a gorilla at a Chicago zoo who returns a 3 year old child who fell into its caged enclosure to their keepers. See Beckoff, Marc and Pierce, Jessica, 200 Wild Justice: The Moral Lives of Animals, University of Chicago Press.

Gruter – Primates and Law

Margaret Gruter and Monika Gruter Marhenn are quoted on page 38 of "Evolutionary Origins of Morality" edited by Katz cited above in an abstract of their short article "Building Blocks of Legal Behavior –The Evolution of Law".

The Gruters accept the theory of building blocks as a starting point for a legal system that emerged from a certain pre disposition in human nature.

They mention reciprocity, dispute resolution, sympathy and empathy, which play a role in law.

They cite one of the greatest human judges, Oliver Wendell Holmes, for the proposition that the legal system comes from the deepest instinct of man.

This observation is more applicable to laws relating directly to human moral or ethical conduct and to the legal system as a whole than to other purely technical legal rules.

How, When and Why Did the Unique Aspects of Human Morality Arise?

This subject by the author of this book is discussed later and is mostly drawn from Christopher Boehm's recent book "Moral Origins".

Are We Really Altruistic?

This question is addressed by Elliot Sober and David Sloan Wilson who answer by noting that "group selection is conceptually coherent and empirically well documented" in the evolution of unselfish behavior. In a second part of their answer considering psychological egoism versus altruism they claim that due to evolution "humans have altruistic ultimate motives".

Can Fairness evolve? Game Theory, Rationality and Evolution of the Social Contract

In this part of the book, Brian Skyrms's principal paper is entitled Game Theory, Rationality and Evolution of the Social Contract. Titles of Comments include Motivation and the Games People Play, When Evolutionary Game Theory Explains Morality, What Does it Explain? (a sanction based conception?). Other subjects covered are Rational Deliberation versus Behavioral Adaptation, The Evolution

of Cooperation in Hostile Environments, Distributive Justice and the Nash Bargaining Solution.

This section of Katz's book has many equations, charts, and explanations that look like mathematics.

Relation of Science, Religion and Ethics – E.O. Wilson

Others like E. O. Wilson, a world renowned socio-biologist and Pulitzer Prize winner, prefer to rely on science and studies of society to better understand ethics. In his book *Consilience*³⁰, he notes all knowledge is related directly or indirectly so it is important to find the relationship of one kind of knowledge with others. Some characterize this skill as “genius”. Obviously different kinds of knowledge are more closely related than others. In his other books he explains that with primitive man, ethics had survival value because it improved the efficiency of cooperation and teamwork in the group. Primitive men could create a stronger common defense if they cooperated. They could kill more bigger animals for food if they hunted together rather than singly.

In his article *Hardwired for God*³¹, Wilson seeks a possible explanation for the persistence of belief in God or a search for divinity as a result of evolution because it is so common if not an almost universal characteristic of human beings. There must be a reason for this need for belief.

He notes the growing importance of science which has doubled knowledge every fifteen years or so for three centuries. Science now shows coherence in the world between the different disciplines. Today much of biology has become a specialized branch of chemistry and physics. There is a webwork of cause and effect explanations that link galaxies to neutrinos and living tissue to ions and

³⁰ E.O. Wilson, 1998, *Consilience –The Unity of Knowledge*. Alfred Knopf.

³¹ E.O. Wilson, 4 Oct. 1999, *Hardwired for God –Is our search for divinity merely a by-product of evolution?* Forbes ASAP, pp. 132-134

molecules. A molecular base for heredity was not imagined in the past.

Many believe problems of the origin of existence, essence of life, the nature of the mind, the meaning of human life are within the domain of philosophers and religious thinkers. Some of these mysteries are being clarified or explained by science to some extent.

This leads to the question of whether religion and moral reasoning have a biological origin, which is part of ethology, the study of animals. Man is an animal too.

It should also be kept in mind that life is complex with different kinds of animals who operate in many different ways. Appropriate conduct for one kind of bird is different from that of an elephant, a whale, a tiger, an alligator or other species. This is also true for different kinds of people and their institutions and businesses. They are all different so ethics is not a unified subject but rather a diverse one. Are they moral principles formulated outside human existence –divine will or natural law? Or has humanity evolved these principals on its own during its own genetic and cultural history. Examining these questions, E. O. Wilson believes this "is what science is doing in case of spiritual and moral authority". It is possible that religious emotions that religious people feel are neurobiological and do not come from some higher God separate and above each of us. It is possible these religious thoughts are part of the evolution of the brain and its genetic history. This idea is reinforced by the theory that a number of scientists have had that a group sharing a strong religion survives more often and better than other groups not having a strong shared religion. The former probably cooperate more and could be more willing to sacrifice themselves in times of danger or conflict. A group that has a common religion derives its source of truth from its religion. An example of this is the Muslim religion where the rules supposedly come directly from Allah, God, through his word in the Koran.

Fundamentalist Christians rely on the texts in the Bible to find the truth.

However, with the advance of our knowledge of science and the acceptance of some of Darwin's scientific ideas, the creation story in the Bible seems fictional to most educated people given scientific evidence and accumulated archeological and fossil finds. Thus the foundation of our beliefs and knowledge is shifting from faith based knowledge and divine revelation to scientific progress. Science often has the advantage of verification through experiments that are repeatable and universally shared by other scientists. Faith based knowledge and ethics vary depending on which religion each person has. There are many different religions and cultures in the world so this source lacks universality.

Times have changed and although a majority of people in the world claim to be religious, the building of huge cathedrals in Europe by workers with strong faith for little or no money is finished. This hypothesis is that "powerful emotions of religious experience are entirely neurobiological, that they evolved as part of a programmed activity of the brain favoring survival of the tribe and individual, and that the particular form they have taken was therefore shaped by the long and idiosyncratic genetic history of the human species". Did we evolve "biologically to accept one truth but then evolved intellectually to accept another" –the scientific one where truth is revealed slowly through increasing knowledge. According to E. O. Wilson "the transition from one foundation of thought will be gradual and because it is knowledge universally shared, probably benign." He believes the shift from faith-based ethics, supposedly based on divine revelation, will slowly give way to more faith in science which is open to all and in this way democratic and not authoritarian like much of faith-based religious ethics. The scientific approach has the advantage of being constantly reviewed and revised and

may therefore be less subject to becoming outdated and perhaps more credible. It is also possible that religious principles developed over many centuries reflect conditions which no longer exist especially with such rapid globalization, so ethical and moral principle probably should be adapted to existing conditions.

There is another reason faith-based religious ethics is slower to change. The clergy and religious leaders have invested their lives and livelihood in their knowledge, culture, churches and doctrine so there is great reluctance, if not fear, in change because their very important spiritual and material interests are involved, not to mention the fear of change and preference for the *status quo*. There is also the force of inertia.

Professor Wilson ends this article by writing "it appears that this division wrought by science and the convergence of disciplines will be the 21 Century version of the struggle for the soul".

The Social Conquest of this Earth

On the cover of E.O. Wilson's new book, *The Social Conquest of the Earth*³², appears a quote from James D. Watson "a monumental Exploration of Biological Origins of Human Condition". This statement implies that the fundamental basis of ethical conduct is closely bound up in our biological history and the evolution of human beings.

This book makes a convincing argument that biological science and other sciences are a reliable guide to reality even though this view is unacceptable to people who believe that the Christian religious Bible version is literally true. However, Catholics tend to accept evolutionary theory controlled by God who is believed to create human souls. Muslims are divided but most of them are not informed of this theory and believe Adam is the beginning of mankind.

³² E.O. Wilson, 2012, *The Social Conquest of the Earth*, Liveright publishing Corporation, a division of W.W. Norton & Company, NY.

As we have previously seen with ethics and religion Darwin's science provides a natural and plausible explanation of the origin of species even though it doesn't explain everything, Wilson's thinking and writing follows that of Julian Huxley with more details and research supporting Darwin's conclusions that man without supernatural intervention could turn this earth by the twenty second century into a permanent paradise for human beings (probably after doing a lot more damage to the earth and humanity and the rest of life) if we "have an ethic of simple decency to one another, the unrelenting application of reason and acceptance of what we truly are..." (p. 297). His last chapter's title "A New Enlightenment" is another way of expressing Huxley's phrase "a radical change with a dominant idea system".

In this most interesting book the author explores human nature touching on its many aspects. He writes:

"If the genetic code underlying human nature (p. 193) is too close to its molecular underpinning and cultural universals are too far away from it, it follows that the best place to search for hereditary human nature is in between in the development prescribed by genes through which the universals of culture are created. Human nature is the inherited regularity of mental development common to our species. They are the "epigenetic rules" which evolved by interaction of genetic and cultural evolution that occurred over a long period in deep prehistory. These rules are the genetic basis in the way our senses perceive the world, the symbolic coding by which we represent the world, the options we automatically open to ourselves and the responses we find easiest and most rewarding to make.

(...) As epi –in the word epigenetic– implies the rules of physiological development are not genetically hard wired. They are not beyond conscious control like autonomic behaviors of heartbeats and breathing. They are less rigid than pure reflexes such as eye blinks and knee

jerks. The most complex of reflexes is the startle response". This occurs when an unexpected big noise is made behind a person by another person who sneaks up close.

The author and his young theoretical physicist researcher working with him divided the problem into two parts, the first being "to identify the instinctive hence non cultural basis of human nature. The second even less tractable problem was the causal relation between the evolution of genes and the evolution of culture or gene-culture co evolution (...).

It had been apparent for some time that many properties of human social behavior are affected by heredity both for species as a whole and for differences among members of the same population" Innate properties of human nature also have evolved as adaptations. "We surmised, too, that the key to the solution is the preparedness and counter preparedness on how people learn culture."

From Professor Wilson's research on this highly complex subject it is clear that genes and heredity (biology) play a major rule in the composition of human nature and how humans behave. Thus biology necessarily plays a major rule in ethical or unethical conduct, along with culture.

In his next chapter "What are We?" in section 21 "How Culture Evolved" on page 212, Professor Wilson's defines "a culture trait as a behavior that is either first invented within a group or else learned from another group, then transmitted among members of the group... that distinguishes one group from another" (p. 213).

Intelligent animals also have culture which E.O. Wilson notes "depends upon long term memory which animals also have but with much less capacity to remember great quantities as humans do.

At one time many scientists thought the mind started out as a blank slate, upon which all culture is inscribed by

learning" but now most scientists believe the brain has "a complex inherited architecture" (p. 217). This comes from genes and culture which emerged about 20,000 years ago based upon certain artifacts made then. The reason man developed this way was his superior long term memory became a working memory. This started before man came out of Africa and continued thereafter.

Language is a reflection of more complicated abstract thought patterns linked to significant stored memory.

Professor Wilson believes that group selection played an important role in this progress.

There was a duality to group selection which included competition among selfish individuals in the group but not so strong that it interfered with the better performance over other groups. Individuals are often selfish to other individuals in their group. This can constitute a sin. But they have another side – they also treat other individuals altruistically. This is referred to as a virtue. This situation creates a conflict in each of us.

This means that there was often good cooperation among group members. Professor Wilson thought that knowledge about how other groups worked permitted the most able groups to act in the same better ways and anticipate and read intentions of competing groups – a considerable competitive advantage. This allowed them to act together fired by religious fervor and gave them the ability to become fierce and fight enemies. This led to survival of certain groups over less gifted groups. Some groups (societies) react more successfully to the environment than others. The survivor societies or groups have greater longevity and fertility of individuals.

Our social and genetic history shapes us but it changes. Genetic change is more slow than social changes but as Julian Huxley has written, new ideas replace old ones.

The Origins of Morality and Honor

In section 24 under the above title, he sets forth his views – a rich combination of interdisciplinary knowledge, history and most importantly including prehistory and biology. He poses a question:

"Are people initially good, but corruptible by the forces of evil? Or, are they instead innately wicked, and redeemable only by the forces of good? People are both".

From Darwin's Survival of the Fittest to Human Altruism

Richard Dawkins' theory (kin selection) starts with his idea of the selfish gene, the lowest level – the "fundamental unit of selection"³³. He denies that selection occurs at the level of the species, or a group within the species, or larger groupings, or at the level of the individual organisms. None of these has a unique or special status as a "replicator" like a gene that makes copies of itself, according to him.

The above-cited book is Professor Dawkins' attempt to go further into Darwin's theory and to understand better how evolution has worked, i.e., that a predominant quality in a successful gene is "ruthless selfishness"... which usually "gives rise to selfishness in individual behavior". But "there are special circumstances in which a gene can achieve its own selfish goals best by fostering a limited form of altruism at the level of individual animals"³⁴.

Dawkins adds that it is false that genetically inherited traits are fixed and un-modifiable. We can learn to be altruistic. Culture can also influence behavior. He does not take a position on how important nature is compared to nurture. But he discusses the role of culture later in his book when he introduces "Memes". The first chapter gives

³³ Dawkins, Richard, « The Selfish Gene », 1989 edition, Oxford, NY Oxford University Press, p. 10, 11.

³⁴ Ibid, page 2 (Eagleman, etc).

striking examples of apparently selfish conduct of animals and contrasts it with examples of apparently altruistic behavior.

He cites the extremely bad behavior of black headed gulls whose nests are close together. If parents leave a nest alone, a neighboring parent may eat up a small chick left alone in the nest. Another example he describes is the carnivorous praying mantis female who eats up the male while he is copulating with her by biting off his head.

Good behavior occurs when military heroes in war give their lives to save others from an attacking enemy. Parents also sacrifice their meals to give food, shelter and protection to their young.

Scientists, biologists, ethologists or anthropologists do not all agree on how evolution has worked. E. O. Wilson, a well-known scholar at Harvard, believes in multi-level selection theory in which certain groups develop characteristics that keep them focused mostly on genes who are the survivor “replicators” that create copies.

Dawkins and Wilson are convinced the other is wrong and insulted each other publically.³⁵

There are differences of opinion on how man has passed through evolution since he grew out of the category of apes millions of years ago. There are many theories but no scientific proof of any, since running an experiment under the same conditions to find out is not possible. To have a scientific answer an experiment needs to be repeatable. Man’s evolution up to now is done and cannot be restarted. David Eagleman, a social neuroscientist, in his

³⁵ Flam, Fay

<http://philly.com/philly/blogs/evolution/>

The Latest Altruism War : Richard Dawkins vs E.O. Wilson

article “The Brain Network” cited in footnote 7, appears to accept both theories. This appears to be the best hypothesis: accept both theories as a possibility rather than trying to decide that one theory is right and the other wrong.

Dawkins has a good imagination since he popularized the word “Memes”, to mean a cultural idea that is replicated in future generations and therefore acts like a gene.

Thus our tribal instincts formed thousands of years ago govern our reactions to the modern world are far different than they were at the time when our instincts and emotions were matched with the real world and served to make us survivors.

Even if one is attracted by the explanation of E. O. Wilson one must recognize the persistence of belief in religion is reinforced by those leaders who have a personal interest or believe it is the interest of their community in continuing them. In the U.S. more than 98% of the people said they believed in God in 1990 and nearly 45% today attend church once or more times a week. So the social and spiritual needs of people for religion still have a powerful and very significant hold on the population in the United States even though the motivation is very ancient in origin. Religion fills a human need for many people, probably will not disappear any time soon and will remain closely allied to ethics.

Psychologist Donald T. Campbell's New Ideas

One methodology he used was blind variation and selective retention (BVSR) which some see as "a principle for describing change in evolutionary systems in general not just in biological organisms. This can be seen as a generalization of Karl Poppers philosophy of science which conceives the development of new theories as a process of proposing conjectures (blind variation) followed by

refutation (selective elimination) of those conjectures that are empirically falsified."³⁶

Campbell added that this was the case not only for science but also for creativity for the evolution of knowledge and our cognate abilities in general.

He thought public policy could be improved through use of experimentation as it is in the natural sciences.

He also believed the conformist tendencies in humans help them as individuals to internalize moral rules in social life. His thinking was influenced by Herbert Simon, a leading political scientist with expertise in related disciplines who noted that those individuals who were more skilled at learning their culture absorbed more altruism.

Campbell developed other ways of analyzing ideas and especially "false knowledge... the biases and prejudices that poison everything from race relations to academic disciplines where vested interests in them perpetrate erroneous theories".

Anthropologist Christopher Boehm's theories on Moral Origins

Christopher Boehm draws on many writers and thinkers in his recent book "Moral Origins, The Evolution of Virtue, Altruism and Shame"³⁷.

Professor Boehm's book is dedicated to his friend Donald T. Campbell and draws on a remarkable number of scholars in different fields including socio-biologist E.O. Wilson and primatologists Jessica Flack and Franz de Waal, ethnologists (those dealing with races, their origin, and primitive human societies), genetics and a host of other leading researchers and thinkers, some in new and recently developed fields of knowledge like brain science, moral

³⁶ Quoted portions of this text are taken from Wikipedia on Donald T. Campbell viewed on December 5, 2012.

³⁷ Boehm, Christopher, 2012, *Moral Origins, The Evolution of Virtue, Altruism, and Shame*, Basic Books. A member of the Perseus Books Group Philadelphia P.A.

psychology, evolutionary ethics, neurobiology and animal and human cognition. However, his book adds original elements in that it follows closely, the history of man drawing evidence from different periods and knowledge from different fields. But not all researchers accept his theories.

"Moral Origins" explains the importance of Darwin's 1859 "Origin of Species" describing a scientific theory which severely shocked many believers in religions who thought the Bible was literally true including how the world and its inhabitants began. His theory was totally different from the Bible story i.e. that hereditary variation was something that provided the basis for selection for survival among plants and animals as conditions on earth changed as there was abrupt temperature change in our Pleistocene era.

Professor Boehm in his first chapters directs his attention to how natural selection could produce people with conscience, virtue, altruism and the universal trait of shame which he states exists in all cultures and even perhaps in some apes. A "survival of the fittest" theory, a phrase coined by Herbert Spenser, is based on the strong individual competition (egocentrism leading to the survival and the contest to reproduce). However, this theory has difficulty explaining why good qualities such as treating unrelated persons generously exists and how virtue and morality and altruism are part of a man's character.

Boehm's theory goes farther than Darwin in explaining these developments. He proposes working hypotheses relating to the mystery of human generosity especially extra familial generosity and how "Golden Rules" taught by communities tend to amplify our innate generosity. He also considers whether selection and survival of some groups is the reason why generous and cooperative individual traits survived and were perhaps amplified despite the more powerful selfish individual competitive drive in man. In

competition between groups the theory is that the more efficient and effective groups survived.

Boehm is a great admirer of Darwin because he developed good theories based on relatively little evidence available to him. He also noted he did do the "first cross-cultural research" relating to different cultures. In addition, his theories were reinforced by his knowledge of geology. So he had a transdisciplinary approach which provided a more solid foundation for his ideas.

Boehm also advances as a major claim that group punishment of some individuals plays a major and important role in curtailing cheaters, free riders and overly aggressive alpha males that such punishment can not only influence group life but also shape gene pools in a similar direction (p. 15).

The author has a concluding paragraph in his first chapter entitled "A new way to use Darwin". He follows Darwin's thinking that analysis of evolutionary developments over time can produce powerful explanations especially if they include abundant naturalistic detail and "holistic natural history" approaches (p. 14).

By looking at long periods of time, he concludes that humans used intensive social control, and thus individuals who control better their anti-social tendencies for fear or punishment were better at adopting their groups' rules and became better fit for survival. They developed a conscience as they internalized their group's rules. Punishments discouraged free riders. As we acquired a stronger moral sense, this also facilitated "extra familial generosity".

One point in his book I found most interesting was that at a certain point in man's development in a hunter gatherer group members shared the big game they killed. Killing big game provoked sharing. Such bands tended to be egalitarian rather than hierarchical with one very strong arbitrary leader in their social organization. It is in such egalitarian societies

he argues that ethics generosity and morality can develop because egalitarian groups hate an unethical authoritarian leader.

Egalitarian bands can more often make better decisions because discussion by a variety of different types of people among members of the egalitarian group often produces the best solutions to problems which lead to better chances of survival.

In chapter 4 "Knowing Our Immediate Predecessors from Present to Recent Past", Professor Boehm projects backward present day anti free rider social control to more recent hunter gatherers to try to assess their effect on human gene pools. He discusses excessively harsh punishment which could have a major effect on such individuals' reproduction and gene frequencies and gene pools in general.

To do this accurately it is helpful to study the recent Pleistocene period since archeologists consider these people as culturally "modern". The author believes these people arrived about 45,000 years ago in Africa.

The author searched to find the most representative ancestors of modern man and contemporary models to study of the right hunter-gatherers which involved ten years of research effort studying 339 of them in order to weed out what were not egalitarian groups. He then studied the egalitarian groups which existed in the Late Pleistocene era.

He refers to his models as "Late Pleistocene appropriate" foraging societies (LPA). He found some such societies that still exist today.

Boehm thinks having a historical sample of social behavior of these humans should help us understand where virtue, altruism and shame arose in the human species.

Although these hunter gatherers had stone tools and produced artwork which they had in Africa, this knowledge does not provide enough understanding of their social

behavior which can come from carefully chosen contemporary hunter gatherers who appear unchanged by more recent events such as agricultural settlement, cities and other more modern developments.

"With a third of these worldwide LPA societies now coded in fine detail with respect to their social life", the author concludes the fifty he has chosen all are mobile nomads who don't store their large game meat individually but store it collectively. They never dwell in permanent year-round villages (p. 79). The average size of bands is 20 to 30 persons and each family cooks on its own fire.

In the late Pleistocene climate change was very rapid posing serious challenges to man. Professor Boehm thinks this could be the reason for fast growing brain size required to meet these changes and challenges. Social equality among hunters was the rule.

Capital punishment has been found in bands of hunter gatherers. This harsh form of social control usually concerns only males. It probably affects gene pools since these dangerous potential fathers are eliminated. Moral outrage drives such social punishment. The same is true for people punished by banishment and social ostracism.

Besides examining the Pleistocene men carefully, he also goes back much further. Based upon the work of Watson and Crick on DNA, laboratory geneticists have found 98% of human DNA is shared by the slightly smaller African chimpanzees called bonobos (*Pan Paniscus*) and chimpanzees (*Pan Troglodytes*) which means that about 8 million years ago we had a common ancestor with these two species. Knowledge of DNA and the molecular clock provide a basis for such an estimate. Through this DNA analysis we can begin to reconstruct some of our direct ancestors, social behavior in order to better understand how our own behavior came to be what it is.

Thus all descendant species i.e., man, bonobos, chimpanzees and later gorillas, have certain characteristics our common ancestor must have had as well such as eating lots of plant food and meat and with the possible exception of bonobos stalking and killing their own species.

In case of bonobos rebellion against an aggressive leader often by groups of cooperating females was a new development in the practice of group social control "that set humans on the course to evolve a conscience". (p 113) "Having a conscience is all about personally identifying with community values, which means internalizing your group's rules. [...] You must connect with these rules emotionally [...] in a positive way that makes you identify with them [...] feel ashamed when you break them and feel self-satisfied and moralistically proud when you lived up to them." Boehm calls this "a modern definition of virtue" and notes that "individuals who better internalize their groups rules are more likely to succeed socially in life and thus be more successful in propagating their genes". However, in humans flexibility is the rule since the most effective ones could be those who ignore their conscience when competitions requires less ethical action to come out on top in contests between individuals provided loss of reputation is not too serious and one can stay out of trouble.

Professor Boehm's work with these apes convinces him they have no internalized morality but perhaps "building blocks" for it described by Flack and de Waal. Boehm was interested in finding out how "territorial" and xenophobic they were.

The first fossil directly in the human line is the Homo erectus who appeared about 1.8 million years ago with a brain bigger than any ape but only half the size of our own. They evolved in Africa to still larger brained Homo sapiens.

By 250,000 years ago large game hunting especially hoofed animals was routine and serious.

How can altruists enter into the gene pool if they give more than they receive? How are they compensated? War Heroes are rewarded with Medals of Honor for which they are likely to keep direct social benefits.

Enhanced reputation may be a benefit for potential partners in a future cooperative venture. It can also result in "beneficial personal alliances – social economic political" (p. 194).

There is also "a third potential pay-off for altruists" - it can "help one local group flourish in competition with other local groups". Thus these altruist peoples' genes will multiply faster in the gene pool as their local group prospers and grows larger compared to local groups who lose in intergroup competition. In addition, kin selection should favor altruists. Sexual social selections may also work in favor of altruists. Selection by reputation through gossip probably plays an important role. Altruists avoid lethal punishment, banishment, or ostracism by the group which evil alpha males, predatory characters, cheaters, social deviants and free riders often receive. Murder, sorcery or witchcraft, beatings, stealing, failing to share, lying, cheating, failing to cooperate, cheating as a group, and individual cheating are actions that resulted in punishment or social reprobation in the hunter gatherer groups.

There is also the possibility of "Moralistic Supernatural Sanctioning" i.e., the belief that God or other supernatural powers believed in by an individual will punish wrong doers.

Christopher Antweiler, a cultural anthropologist in the comment on Boehm's earlier paper in *Evolutionary Origins of Morality* writes "it is a piece of speculation but of careful and empirically founded speculation which is stimulating methodologically and empirically."

He notes "sharing (of meat) is understood here as procurement of goods conserved by others; respectively the

reciprocal transfer through pooling and redistribution of individual harvests." (page 103 of Katz's book).

He refers to studies that indicate even in egalitarian primitive societies based on ethnographic observation there is still regular cases of egotistical behavior which he writes "strengthens Boehm's argument that human egalitarian societies actively have to maintain their egalitarian structure through specific [...] leveling mechanisms to counter bully and other egotistic behavior." Jerome Kagan, a human development psychologist is skeptical of Boehm's theories. He writes in his comment that "animals have no conscious" intentions and feel no guilt for past failure to live up to internalized standards which they lack. Two other veteran primatologists are also skeptical of Boehm's theories.

However, in Boehm's judgment this difference is more a question of timing when moral judgment, the core of morality developed in primitive humans or in their animal predecessors, but it did happen at some point in the evolution man.

The above outlines the various hypotheses Professor Boehm so carefully explains. One has confidence in what Christopher Boehm has written due to the multiplicity and variety of sources for his research over long time periods upon which his working hypotheses are based. More knowledge and more careful research should generate more new ideas to improve our situation on earth.

Marc D. Hauser: A Dishonest Authority on Moral Minds

The case of Marc D. Hauser, a former Harvard Professor, in the psychology department for 19 years is interesting because he was considered by other scientists, researchers, teachers a leader of research and teaching. He also received teaching awards. His specialty was at the intersection of evolutionary biology and cognitive neuroscience in animals and humans. One should note this subject tends to attract speculation because there is

relatively little knowledge in it and results of experiments are not so easy to reproduce. Therefore, unlike physics or chemistry, knowledge is less certain. In his experiments his students discovered he was dishonest. He was found guilty of scientific misconduct by Harvard and the U.S. government office of Research Integrity after long investigations which found that he fabricated data, manipulated results and conducted experiments in factually incorrect ways. He resigned from the Harvard Faculty.

For more details and the history of this subject, see Google research papers, junk science, Pseudo Science, Science fraud, and Wikipedia on Junk Science. This subject of fraud in science has a long history beginning in the 19th century. There are many examples in different fields of science and pseudoscience where fraud and dishonesty has occurred.

A rather similar story of scientific misconduct including the wholesale creation of evidence occurred about the same time in Holland with Diederik Stapel, a distinguished well respected Professor of Social Psychology. This false evidence according to him was imagined because actual evidence was too often messy and unclear and Stapel was someone who loved order. So he decided what the conclusion of the experiments should be first and then he made up the results of the experiments themselves³⁸.

A recent article in Natural Health News & Scientific Discoveries by J.D. Heyes states: “Researchers say it’s still rare, but fraud in scientific research is climbing at an alarming rate nonetheless. [...] In 1976, there were fewer

³⁸ http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/28/magazine/diederik-stapels-audacious-academic-fraud.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0 - Google Diederik Stapel for information on him in a long New York and Times Article. See also the Financial Times for an article 22 – 23 December 2012 p. 2 Life & Arts. Simon Kuper “The eternal sin of bad science.” In this article Simon Kuper comments that in the dominant Dutch Calvinistic tradition of eternal sin is there is no forgiveness so his life is permanently ruined and finished with no hope for the future.

than 10 fraud retractions for every million studies published; by 2007, fraud retractions had grown to 96 per one million [...]”³⁹.

For a reader of Hauser’s book *Moral Minds – The Nature of Right and Wrong*⁴⁰ without knowledge of the above facts most colleagues and other readers were very impressed by his writing skills, his range of knowledge, the interesting hypothetical problems he used in his teaching and the quality of this and his other books. He also had articles published in the widely respected *Nature and Science* publications which are prestigious science publications of scientific research. Even after the above facts of his fraudulent experiments became known Noam Chomsky, a distinguished professor of linguistics at MIT, a coauthor of a book with Hauser, continues to believe he is a reliable leading scientist perhaps not necessarily based on his own experiments.

The reason I decided to discuss his writing is the intense interest scholars have in questions of Morality and Ethics, the much increased knowledge of animal behavior over the last century adding biological information on their ethical behavior, the differences discovered between humans and animals, a field in which Marc Hauser was very active, and the fact that he had problems himself with ethics in his own career.

Hauser’s book collects and summarizes very well writings of other brilliant experts writing on important aspects of the source of human morality and ethics. Therefore despite his shortcomings mentioned above I believe it is worth reading what he has written and learning his own story and his ideas. At least, they should be considered.

³⁹ http://www.naturalnews.com/041592_scientific_fraud_research_papers_junk_science.html

⁴⁰ Hauser, Marc D., 2006, *Moral Minds, How Nature designed our Universal Sense of Right and Wrong*, Harper Collins NY, NY.

Hauser in the beginning of his book cites Chomsky, an authority on linguistics as follows:

“Why does everyone take for granted that we don’t learn to grow arms, but rather, are designed to grow arms? Similarly, we should conclude that in the case of the development of moral systems, there’s a biological endowment which in effect requires us to develop a system of moral judgment and a theory of justice. If you like, that in fact has detailed applicability over an enormous range.”

Noam Chomsky

Hauser also writes about what role language and linguistics play in morality starting on the first page of the Prologue: Righteous Voices in his book, *Moral Minds*.

Hauser’s book on *Moral Minds* in its Prologue, adopts Chomsky’s theory that human nature has a moral instinct which feels what is right and wrong which comes from evolution and Darwinian selection drawn from another instinct – an analogy to language.

Knowledge of language, once learned, is automatic and complex so it needs to be analyzed by taking a small piece and using some simplifying assumptions.

Hauser gives examples of where moral instincts differ from practice: actions versus omissions. Consider drowning a nephew versus letting him drown so his uncle can inherit his wealth, and mercy killings compared to terminating life support by doctors.

He cites Henry Wadsworth Longfellow for the proposition that religion should be a “guiding light” for morality.

Disgrace – Charles Gross⁴¹

The story of Marc Hauser's downfall is told in Gross's well written article cited above blaming too strong a desire for recognition which results in scientific misconduct or fraud.

Gross writes that the history of science is full of misconduct going as far back as the Greek natural philosophers, Ptolemy of Alexandria (90-168) and even to Newton who used "fudge factors" to improve his data, as did Mendel relating to hybrid plants.

The first formal discussion of scientific misconduct was published in 1830 by Charles Babbage, who held Newton's chair at Cambridge and made major contributions to astronomy, mathematics and the development of computers. In *Reflections on the Decline of Science in England and on Some of Its Causes*, Babbage distinguished hoaxes (Piltdown man, missing link), forging, changing results of experiments to make them more convincing, "cooking" or the selection of data.

Surveys in recent decades of scientists asking if they had seen evidence of misconduct indicates that it has happened. Other books on this subject are: Horace Freeland Judson's *The Great Betrayal: Fraud in Science* (2004) and David Goodstein's *On Fact and Fraud: Cautionary Tales From the Front Lines of Science* (2010). These books reveal a pattern usually of a younger ambitious person often monitored by a respected senior scientist, who are sometimes their co-authors. These senior scientists tend to supervise only conclusions but fail to check the younger researchers' data. To counteract these problems and after serious scandals, the work of the House Science and

⁴¹ Gross, Charles, January 9/16, Books & the Arts, The Nation page 25-32. Professor Gross has taught scientific misconduct at Princeton and Berkeley and written a serious study of Marc Hauser's conduct and disgrace. Gross is a professor of psychology and neuroscience at Princeton University. In 2011 he was a biology instructor in the Prison University Project at San Quentin, California.

Technology Committee began in 1981. It is normal that government is involved because it finances many researchers.

“The serious involvement of the government in policing scientific misconduct began only in 1981, when hearings were convened by Al Gore, then a Congressman and chair of the investigations and oversight subcommittee of the House Science and Technology Committee, after an outbreak of egregious scandals. One was the case of John Long, a promising associate professor at Massachusetts General Hospital who was found to have faked cell lines in his research on Hodgkin’s disease. See *infra*, Section on Armand Hammer for the Gore family’s questionable actions.”

Marc D. Hauser: After Disgrace He Explains Evil

The organ theory of morality of Chomsky adopted by Hauser is very imaginative and interesting. It could be just interesting speculation but not science.

Also Hauser remains vague and does not prepare solutions to these different problems.

Since his departure from Harvard he has been working on a book which at first bore the title “*Evilicious: Explaining our Evolved Taste for Being Bad*” but finally bears the title “*Evilicious: Cruelty = Desire + Denial*”⁴². Hauser confirmed that while “*Evilicious* is not informed by any of his own empirical research, it is a product of his own ideas”⁴³

If one concludes Hauser was evil in his dishonest research activity perhaps he has special insight on how doing evil occurs by a person who is generally good.

⁴² <http://www.amazon.com/Evilicious-Cruelty-Marc-D-Hauser/dp/1484015436>

⁴³ Patel, Alexander H. September 27, 2013 Marc Hauser, former Professor found guilty of Academic Misconduct Publishes First Book since Resignation. The Harvard Crimson
<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=040dfc8817&view=pt&>

Another reviewer writes as follows:

Marc Hauser believes we all have the capacity to commit acts of violence.

Hauser writes in his: “Prologue: The problem of evil, quoting Freud:

“In reality, there is no such thing as “eradicating evil tendencies... [T]he deepest essence of human nature consists of instinctual impulses which are of an elementary nature, ... and which aim at the satisfaction of certain primal needs.”

Sigmund Freud

He notes that normal humans are able to torture and kill others.

He wrote “Evildoers have many personalities. Some are cruel for cruelty’s sake. Some believe that extreme violence is the only way to secure resources or defend sacred values. Some inspire other to do their dirty work. And some stand by and watch as others carry out horrific acts of violence, unwilling – though not unable – to intervene. You might think that these different behaviors require different explanations. I suggest that they all stem from a single psychological recipe that is part of every human mind but of no other mind in the animal kingdom. This is a stripped-down account of evil, one that explains how it grows within some individuals and how it uniquely evolved in our species”.

“(- - -) This perspective, I suggest, explains not just the pathology of the sadist or the sexual predator but the actions of “ordinary” individuals who perpetrate unimaginable cruelties. It also illuminates the evolution of our capacity for evil, which, I will argue, evolved as an incidental consequence of our brain’s unique design. This is an idea developed in somewhat similar ways by the philosopher David Livingstone Smith in his book *Less than Human*, and by the social psychologist Roy Baumeister in

his book *Evil*. Unlike the brains of other animals, where circuitry specialized for one function slavishly serves that function, our brain circuitry works in harmony to serve a variety of novel functions. Thus, when we dehumanize other human beings – thinking of them, say, as vermin or parasites – and then torture them without guilt, we have connected brain areas involved in recognizing objects, determining moral standards, and justifying actions with brain areas involved in emotion, reward, motivation, and aggression”.⁴⁴

By acts of violence, individuals can signal they have the power to perform them. “These displays sent credible messages of ongoing and impending terror to victims, freezing them in their own fear. This explanation for costly signaling, proposed by the evolutionary biologist Amotz Zahavi and developed in interesting ways by others, is one way of interpreting the paradoxical, gob-smacking episodes of gratuitous cruelty carried out by otherwise civilized people”.⁴⁵

To understand evil one needs to clarify its causes. In some cases, understanding entails recognizing that some people lack self-control or awareness of the pain of others. In some other cases, a perpetrator is of sound mind yet

⁴⁴ The difference between human and animal brains, and especially the distinction between dedicated modules serving one function and interconnected modules working to serve multiple functions, has been highlighted by other authors, including especially the philosopher Daniel Dennett, in *Consciousness Explained* (New York: Little, Brown, 1991), and the archaeologist Steven Mithen, in *The Prehistory of the Mind* (London, U.K.: Thames Hudson, 1996). These and other authors emphasize that language was essential in forging the connection between modules, but, as I will discuss in chapter 3, language itself is based on interconnected modules, including those dedicated to phonology, meaning, and syntax. It is thus more likely that the connections were in place before language, providing benefits in thinking that went far beyond the parochial style of other animals.

⁴⁵ See especially Amotz Zahavi and Avishag Zahavi, *The Handicap Principle* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997). On conspicuous consumption, see Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (London, U.K.: Macmillan, 1899). On credible threats, see Thomas C. Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960).

knowingly causes harm to innocent others and relished the act. Understanding an individual's character with the tools of science should make appropriate assignments of responsibility, blame, punishment, and what future risk there is to society.

The story told above with excerpts from Marc D. Hauser's writing is interesting and important for a number of reasons.

First, he was an intelligent man, expert in morals and ethical conduct who by some defect in character lost the respect of his fellow scholars. Why? He seemed to be unintelligent to think his able students would not see he was dishonest in writing up false results of his experiments. This would also imply that he had not acquired the habit of being honest or if he had it he lost it. This probably has some reason related to his ego and his desire if not compulsion to do better than others. He was admired by most of his students and colleagues. Perhaps he had too much ego and thought he could do no wrong when he acted dishonestly. Then he was caught. His reaction as a wrong doer after discovery was he had made mistakes. But still he hoped as a scholar he could make a positive contribution in researching and writing about evil since he acted evilly.

Hauser probably hopes that by relating his story and extracts from his latest book others can learn something about human morality and ethics by studying its opposite – Evil as Hauser sees it.

Is Ethical Conduct Better Decided by an Individual or a Group?

To analyze this problem, let us take two examples.

Sepp Blatter - A Dishonest International Association

Sepp Blatter, former President of the International Soccer Association, FIFA, defines his ethics as those he got from his family. He explained: “We have a principle in our family. The basic principle is to take only money if you earn it. Secondly, do not give money to anybody to obtain the advantage. And the third one is if you owe money, pay your debts. These are the principles I have followed since I was 12 years old. That is why I am claiming that my conscience, as far as money is concerned, I am totally clear and clean.”⁴⁶

With the lack of transparency relating to the huge sums transiting through and around FIFA and “shocking accusations of corruption and backroom dealings”, Blatter’s rules of conduct seem inadequate in this situation. Who decides whether Mr. Blatter earns his money since no one is sure how much money he has “earned”, how he received it, or other pertinent facts. US Attorney General Loretta Lynch announced indictments for criminal conduct against nine FIFA officials and five corporate executives for racketeering, conspiracy, corruption, buying and selling votes to deliver the World Cup to South Africa and soliciting kickbacks from sports marketers.⁴⁷ Recently it was disclosed that Sepp Blatter was paid at least \$10 million for each World Cup.⁴⁸ Blatter’s replacement, Gianni Infantini, will be paid less than half the salary of Blatter.⁴⁹

There seems to be no doubt that he has worked assiduously on building the FIFA organization. He has

⁴⁶ Moore, Malcom, Lunch with Sepp Blatter, « I am a Very Generous Man », FT Weekend 31 October-1 November 2015.

⁴⁷ See L.A. Times, May 27, 2016
<http://www.latimes.com/sports/soccer/la-sp-fifa-scandal-timeline-20150603-story.html>

⁴⁸ The Wall Street Journal, by Joshua Robinson, August 31, 2016
<http://www.wsj.com/articles/fifa-publishes-salary-information-for-president-secretary-general-1472668605>

⁴⁹ The Wall Street Journal, by Joshua Robinson, August 31, 2016.
<http://www.wsj.com/articles/fifa-publishes-salary-information-for-president-secretary-general-1472668605>

worked hard in promoting and organizing the participation of African countries including having the first African World Cup in South Africa. There is clearly a gap between what the outside world perceives of the FIFA's operations and Sepp Blatter's views. Not only does conduct need to be ethical but it also needs to seem ethical to others.

The Guardian's view on Blatter's interview was that "[FIFA] was "still rotting from the head." "FIFA stinks."⁵⁰

How Community Institutions Create Economic Advantages: Jewish Diamond Merchants in New York⁵¹

This section tells the remarkable story of how a close knit community of orthodox Jews through strict ethics has dominated a market for centuries, with little or no theft and no enforcement by public courts through a reputation mechanism by means of rules in an industry, family, religion and community so their children can inherit the benefits from their parents of the system.

The diamond industry has long been in the hands of Jewish merchants. This existed in the 11th century when two Jewish brothers, prominent bankers in Cairo, supplied precious stones to the Fatimid Caliph Empire. This continued in the Middle Ages when India was the biggest source of new diamonds. Diamond traders and cutters occupied the trade routes which included Egypt and the

⁵⁰ <http://www.the-guardian.com/commentisfree/2015/oct/28/the-guardian-view-on-blatter-interview-still-rotting-from-the-head>

⁵¹ This section is based on two versions of an Article in 2002 and 2006 by Barak D. Richman, *Law & Social Inquiry*, Volume 31, Issue 2, 382-420, Spring 2006. He cites and draws on two other articles of previous scholarship, i.e., Roy Kenney's and Benjamn Kleins « The Economics of Block Booking, the *Journal of Law and Economics*, 497 (October 1983) and Lisa Bernstein's «Opting out of the Legal System, Extra Contractual Relations in the Diamond Industry», *Journal of Legal Studies* 115 (1992). The earlier version had a slightly different title: «Community Enforcement of Informal Contracts: Jewish Diamond Merchants in New York, JEL Classification K12, L14, L22.

Southern European shores. Sephardic Jews, who fled the inquisition beginning in 1492 in Spain and Portugal, ran the world's largest diamond market in Holland and acquired a monopoly in this business. In the 17th and 18th century, Jews in Hamburg in the royal courts of Europe became important. When in the 18th century England became a world power, business people of Jewish origin were important. Finally, the Jewish De Beers family syndicate handled close to 100 percent of the world's uncut diamonds and still today controls 65 percent.

Jewish diamond merchants' predominance has lasted up to the present in the important diamond centers of Antwerp, Tel Aviv and New York where diamond cutting and brokering is important.

Orthodox Jewish influence is dominant in the industry. Its philosophy dominates the rules and practices. This shows that culture dominates ethical rules.

Possible reasons for this predominance may be the exclusion of Jews from many activities, past dependence or a product of this history, or a theory of available human capital (know how developed), or they learned that cooperation increased their efficiency and their income.

Other parts of this article deal with details on the following subjects: "The Challenge of Enforcing Diamond Executory Contracts" in a \$60 billion dollar business, diamond thieves (one who stole \$100 million dollars worth of rough diamonds), why intergenerational participation is important (Infinite Time Horizons), and possible excommunication by a rabbinical court, exclusion by religious leaders of participation in daily prayer or ability to arrange marriages.

The 2006 version also gives information on Mumbai, India, a diamond market beginning in 800 BC, Antwerp starting in the 14th century, Israel/Palestine where significant growth since World War II occurred. The 2006 Article is well documented with four pages of references.

The temptation to be dishonest in dealing with diamonds is high. They are easy to steal and hide and are of great value. The industry functions through many who possess diamonds on credit who have not paid for them. If someone in the ultra-orthodox Jewish community acts dishonestly he will be excluded from the community. Being part of this community is very important to members for many reasons, so maintaining one's reputation is a matter of life or death.

Games Primates Play – Dario Maestriperi

Dario Maestriperi is described as a leading primatologist in the cover to his book "Games Primates Play: An Undercover Investigation of the Evolution and Economics of Human Relationships"⁵². This book cover also indicates his official title of "Professor of Comparative Human Development, Evolution Biology, Neurobiology and Psychiatry and Behavioral Neuroscience" at the University of Chicago.

The cover has a picture on it of what appears to be a chimpanzee playing chess with a girl about seven years old. Professor Maestriperi's amusing, engrossing and sometimes surprising writing demonstrates most interesting comparisons of how human's often have social behavior like primates. He also describes where it is different. This is an imaginative comparative approach which is often revealing.

⁵² Maestriperi, Dario 2012, *Games Primates Play – An Undercover Investigation of the Evolution and Economics of Human Relationships*, Basic Books, A Member of Perseus Books Group NY, NY. Copyright licence # 3870850502483 granted to Wallace R. Baker by Perseus Books Group for material from page 66 to 86.

In this respect the author shows his remarkable curiosity and impressive trans-disciplinary background knowledge of existing research. He "finds analogs in surprising places" and corrects errors of other scholars to explain human nature.

The cover continues "A particularly intimate form of bond-testing in baboons illuminates why lovers kiss. Trapping two macaque monkeys in a cage shows why we are so uncomfortable riding with a stranger in an elevator. And primate nepotism can explain why Italian military service is only bearable for the well-connected. Why? The codes that govern our behavior are the result of millions of years of evolution, predating the emergence of modern humans. As Maestriperi shows, everything from how we jilt lovers to how we climb the corporate ladder is marked by our primate roots."

In this introduction he points out that our social relationships with others are all different "good or bad, strong or weak, symmetrical or asymmetrical and everything in between." The title to his book is a take off from best seller 1964 book "Games People Play" by Psychiatrist Eric Berne who showed people interact in specific patterns (games he calls them) usually characterized by predictable outcomes which stem from "our tendency to assume particular social roles in relationships whether family members, friends, coworkers or strangers. Subsequent research in psychology and psychiatry has shown "that our behavior in social relationships is the result of complex interactions between our genes and our environment and the effect of these interactions on our brains. In analyzing the complexity of human relationships he writes that researchers appear to have lost interest in their general underlying patterns."

The author thinks we need to "take a good look into other life forms and their behaviors, i.e. get to escape from limiting our study to human psychology and go into

biology". This is because "patterns of underlying human relationships developed through evolutionary processes and these same evolutionary processes have produced similar patterns in other animal species." The author as an evolutionary biologist concludes that many of the games played by people are also played by other animals." In the last fifty or sixty years there have been many meaningful new studies of animal behavior to enrich this subject. This book is especially interesting because he compares, not only how monkeys and human's act but how Italians act compared to other nationalities.

Although humans are not necessarily the most complex animals they do have the largest brains, which began in our primate lineage long ago.

Primates and humans and some insects also contrary to most other animals live in groups and have one or much more common characteristic: sociality. They both depend upon "behavior of conspecifics", i.e. conspecific means belonging to the same species. Disappearance and death of an individual has important consequences for the group in primates and humans. This characteristic enhances survival and reproduction.

"Chimpanzees and humans live in highly competitive societies. Instead of fighting all the time, individuals establish dominance hierarchies within their group."

"These behaviors, the legacies of our primate past, do not lie hidden – they play out on the surface of our lives yet are so instinctual, so "natural" to us that we don't notice them." But what makes this book extraordinary is the author notices them.

"To detect the "games" people play in every day social interactions, it is necessary to become an excellent detective: one must observe human interaction not only closely but without being too overt or obvious. To understand the rules of primate games it is also necessary to

know the scientific principles that animal scientists (ethologists), psychologists, economists and other behavioral scientist have discovered ..."

Just because we no longer live in a jungle but in modern cities or modern environments does not mean we do not "act out age old rituals, making the games that human primates play more arbitrary perhaps, but no less powerful.

"Dilemmas in Elevators – The Cavemen's Legacy"

In his first chapter, he opens up the subject by imagining what happened if a male cave man suddenly encountered another one in a cave. That's bad news – violence. The way our minds react to potentially dangerous situations like chimpanzees do is very old. It is not one of our mental abilities which appeared more recently like "abstract reasoning, language, love, or spirituality."

Being in a confined space evokes a reaction from others of fear of the risk of aggression. A previous hypothesis that every animal fought to keep his own territory to itself according to the author is wrong.

Its greed to want to hang onto our territory; not the fear one feels when he suddenly finds another in a confined space.

The author believes confining two male monkeys who did not know each other in a small cage – would probably result in a fight to kill each other. He did experiments with 25 pairs of female macaques⁵³ about half of whom knew each other.

When they knew each other they first showed tension when placed in the cage but then became friendlier by

⁵³ Macaques are the most widespread primate genus found from Japan to Afghanistan and North Africa and Gibraltar. Only human primates are more widespread inhabitants of the world. There are twenty-two species of macaques. Some have tails while others do not. Their social life is intricate and hierarchical. They carry viruses potentially fatal to humans, See Wikipedia, Macaques.

grooming each other by picking parasites off the others body and eating them.

The behavior of other pairs was at first puzzling but the author concluded that they were playing the game of Prisoners Dilemma which according to the author explains the exchange of altruistic behavior between two unrelated individuals.

In the prisoner's game if both cooperate and refuse to incriminate the other in a crime they committed, they get a mild sentence of one year in jail. If one confesses and incriminates the other, he gets no jail time and the other gets a five-year sentence. If each incriminates the other both prisoners will be sentenced to three years.

If the game is played only once with a stranger and if there is no reason to expect cooperation the best strategy is to incriminate the other.

But if the game is played repeatedly there is an opportunity to keep track of the other players previous moves and to act according to how the other prisoner acts. Axelrod in 1970 by computer simulation proved that a strategy of "tit for tat" when the game was repeated was a winner. The first player cooperates then the second player cooperates (copies what the first player does) then they are nice. If player number two incriminates the first player, then on the next round player one retaliates. He forgives if the opposite player cooperates even if there was a previous incrimination.

Kinship can alter the dynamics of this game. Mothers groom their daughters with no hope of reciprocal grooming.

Dominance can alter the relationship. The subordinate is willing to behave altruistically toward the dominant party "not for reciprocity in the same currency, but in exchange for safety or protection."

According to the author the Prisoners Dilemma is a model to "explain the exchange of altruism not only among people but among monkeys as well."

The author notes that lowering tension in elevators by human beings is not always necessary. This is because time in elevators is short and silence is usually enough. On the contrary the monkey experiments lasted an hour. However, even in elevators, avoiding eye contact, which can be a threat, is common as is smiling. Often talking is a remedy, sometimes lots of it for extremely insecure people. These are the things noticed by the author in his own building to relieve tension in a confined elevator.

Obsession of Dominance

In his second chapter the author takes up "The Obsession of Dominance" in human relations. At various places in this chapter the author refers to RHP which means resource holding potential which is defined later in the next chapter at page 66 in discussing nepotism and how people build up dominance through nepotism, friendship and political power.

As an example of dominance he analyzes e-mails. He notes his students write long e-mails to him while he writes shorter ones to them since he is in a dominant position.

Boy children can fight for dominance to impress other children. Girl children usually prefer to spread nasty rumors to damage the reputation of potential rivals. They can make friends with others who might be their allies who simultaneously attack the child they want to dominate. The author concludes that these "Machiavellian strategies are similar to those used by other primates to achieve and maintain dominance over their group members. Once Mother Nature has found something that works well in one species she is happy to use the same trick in other organisms as well."

"Dominance in romantic or married couples is an important but under-appreciated phenomena."

Some marriages have a dominant spouse who makes all the decisions and the other is willing to pay a disproportionate share of the price unless the dominance becomes abusive when the cost to the subordinate partner becomes unacceptable.

Couples break up over who is in charge which is not an unimportant or small issue. Unresolved dominance is inherently unstable leading often to constant disputes.

A change in dominance can have a catastrophic effect on a relationship as illustrated by a 1935 novel *Auto-Da-Fé* cited by the author where a housekeeper subordinate marries her employer, beats him up and kicks him out of his apartment and sells all his books. "They feel prey to the dark survival instincts of our own minds."

In all our relationships we don't always notice who is dominant or subordinate but if asked one can usually name one or the other and figure out who plays each role.

The author cites savanna baboons who have a dominant or subordinate relationship with everybody else in the group. One practical aspect of dominance is priority of access to "a piece of food, an attractive mate, or a spot in the shade on a hot summer day."

Dominance hierarchies need not be linear but can be triangular or contain loops. Primates kept in captivity with plenty of food seem to have less hierarchy than those in nature where "high ranking animals survive longer, reproduce better, and generally live a healthier more comfortable less stressful life than low ranking members".

The author sites Richard Coniff's books "The Natural History of the Rich" and "The Ape in the Corner Office" as evidence.

Dominance and hierarchies exist also in bees, chickens (pecking order) and other birds and animals.

Some have believed primate dominance is caused by stronger members while others thought that some individuals were weaker and more fearful. Others think that "dominance should be considered a property of relationships not of individuals".

The author also notes that dominance and anxiety are intervening variables although some scientists doubt whether all dominance is real or simply recognizing assumed dominance. E.O. Wilson and others think there are different kinds of dominance depending on context. Territoriality, where you are, can matter. Rebecca Lewis proposes dominance should be called a power relationship and in some cases leverage.

But the author calls on game theory to help explain this subject. This theory was pioneered by John Maynard Smith in a 1970 article "The Logic of Animal Conflict" which considered how two individuals decide how to settle an agreement by fighting or establishing dominance. The decisions are not based on rational thinking in animals but are products of natural selection which give them a predisposition to "behave adaptively" (in a way that increases the benefits and reduces the costs of their behavior" without necessarily engaging in complex thinking or being aware of consequences of their actions."

Once two persons or animals decide they are more likely to win something of value in competition with another their dominance relationship is established. Establishment of a dominance relationship can happen right away or after some fighting. If fighting continues no dominance is established. Establishing dominance is important to both parties: the subordinate cuts his losses by not fighting and by being patient can wait for a day when he can be dominant should things change. There are also asymmetries if one is bigger. Differences in size are not the only factor

but also willingness in using their bodies and take risks. In territorial species, intruders can have fear if in the others' territory. One can get enraged if he loses his territory since this can mean a very great loss – nest, food and precious resources, mates and offspring. This emotion can enhance his "aggressive motivation".

The Palestinians think immigrant Jews have invaded their territory so there is great loss and real trouble for large numbers of Palestinians refugees forced out of Palestine to other countries.

Real life adds another complication if two opponents often don't have "accurate information about asymmetries and relative probabilities of winning or losing".

"Behavioral displays" indicating supposed superiority in rank help build dominance although one can't be sure they are honest.

"Communicating resource holding potential (RHP) and motivation through behavior referred to as agonistic (competitive) confrontations tell us we are dominant or subordinate."

Natural selection has favored and awarded the tendency to bluff as well as be skeptical to detect bluffing.

If subordination is a learned response dominant parties periodic aggression "refreshes subordinates memories".

Are there born leaders and losers? Not just relationships count but also an individual's physiological and psychological characteristics contribute to their RHP (resource holding potential). Persons with low levels of serotonin in their brains tend to be impulsive or aggressive; testosterone makes them competitive and driven to succeed. So body chemistry plays an important role.

Predispositions to act dominant or subordinate don't involve only emotions and physiology but also cognition and social and political intelligence.

"Humans and some other primates are obsessed with dominance, although not necessarily at a conscious level. Dominance is so entrenched in human nature that thinking we can have social relationships without it is unrealistic. "We can't prevent dominance but we can teach dominance which comes with responsibilities.

Dominance has leadership duties since subordinates pay the price for leaders' success. Dominants must make it easier on subordinates by being tolerant, generous and forgiving. After all dominance is not forever – we must be ready to step aside when the time comes."

As we have seen in Boehm's book some human communities have adapted a theory of equality among members of these communities that according to Boehm can provide a basis for ethics among equals. But everybody knows there is seldom equality in nature so this idea of equality is somewhat theoretical but serves to lubricate the good relationships among humans and avoid conflict by trying to establish dominance.

This idea is important for democratic theory of government so everybody has a theoretically equal chance to become a leader – to become more dominant.

But in the U.S. constitutional system the elected president is subject to checks and balances since the founders wanted to escape absolute dominance by one individual – a common pattern with monkeys.

We are all Mafiosi

In chapter 3 with the above title the author turns to nepotism which he defines as favoritism toward kin at the expense of non kin. This "altruism" does maintain one's own DNA by helping a relative especially where resources are limited. The author starts this chapter with a quote from Adam Bellows, "In Praise of Nepotism: A Natural History". This quote starts with the phrase "Nepotism is something we can hardly do without. For one thing, nepotistic concern for

the welfare of children is the engine of the capitalist system; take that away and you destroy the main incentives for innovation and the creation of wealth. [...] pure meritocracy is inhuman [...] nepotism is a profoundly moral relationship [...] in short nepotism works [...] it feels good and it is generally the right thing to do."

Then the author explains the situation when a young man is drafted into the Italian army if he has a recommendation (*raccomandazione*) or an order to subordinate from a general one can get a cushy office job with short hours. Favorable treatment for the recruit can also be secured by continuing gifts to non commissioned officers of meats, groceries or pharmaceuticals from parents who are butchers, grocery store owners or pharmacists. Failure to get favored treatment results in very unpleasant army training in a far away army base marching during the day with the risk of sexual abuse by older soldiers like in prisons.

This nepotistic corrupted system is also found in Italy relating to becoming a professor in universities. Hierarchies of powerful professors are part of this mafia which rigs entrance exams to graduate school and avoids competition on merit.

Professor Maestriperi writes that this system is the reason he left to teach in the United States since he did not have someone who could give him a good *raccomandazione*. He also notes that in animals nepotistial behavior started long before Adam and Eve and then he goes to compare how this differs in animals and humans.

In rhesus macaques nepotism is mostly female work because males do not stay with their family. With humans since men usually have more power than women it is mostly a function for men to provide nepotistic support. In addition humans extend nepotistic behavior to non kin through marriage, through patronage and nepotistic alliances to increase political power through groups that cooperate which increases the size and power of their families. Non

relatives or strangers are thus accorded the advantages of kin relatives and are expected to reciprocate. The mafia is a good example. The head of the family is the Godfather to the children of his associates.

"The popes in Rome instead of playing by the rules and appointing people to offices based on merit and qualifications, hired their illegitimate sons whom they described as "nephews" hence from which word the term nepotism comes?" This fraud is "the beast of the crimes [...]. Millions of people have been killed as a result of nepotistic behavior of ruthless dictators bent on advancing the interests of their family members at all costs. The author cites Saddam Hussein as an example and his two sons Uday and Qusay Hussein in whose benefit their father killed hundreds of Iraqi citizens.

The author concludes that the U.S. has seemed to practice the best meritocracy seen so far but nepotism, he writes, "has reemerged stronger than ever". Could it be that the longer a country exists successful families and organization get more and more entrenched and dominate the circles of power. The United States started out with waves of immigrants mostly poor who had to work hard to survive in a pioneer society.

Climbing the Ladder

In this next chapter after concluding we are all Mafiosi especially with regard to helping our children get ahead he discusses the various skills needed to move up the ranks of citizens and organizations. He explains different strategies for climbing the ladder that both humans and male macaques use, under what circumstances each is effective and when coalitions are advantageous. These models combine evolutionary biology with economic cost benefit analysis.

He starts with the good citizens, then the young Turk, and Machiavelli's theory for humans. For monkeys he starts

with The Unobtrusive Immigrant, The Challenging Immigrant, The Challenging Resident before discussing different models of ladder climbing strategies.

The author's conclusion is that in any kind of social organization in all the situations he evokes, it is highly important to "acquire and use social knowledge to form effective political alliances [...]. Humans are political animals but their societies are more complicated than other primates".

One needs to know that political alliances, social knowledge and skills and dominance status are intimately interconnected and are necessary for strong relationships. It is also important to be attractive enough to others to secure their cooperation – to be able to charm and lead others (charisma) in addition to having high resource holding potential (RHP) and self-confidence.

Cooperate in the Spotlight, Compete in the Dark

To start this chapter, the author cites an experiment at Newcastle University in England that tended to prove if people thought they were being watched by others they were more honest and cooperative. Voluntary payments into money boxes for coffee even worked much better when no real person was watching but when pictures of eyes were posted close to the money box rather than pictures of flowers.

Another game relating to giving away money to another player showed when stylized eyes were posted in front of the players the giver was more generous. The author concludes that images of eyes "automatically activate brain responses that unconsciously influence the level of cheating, cooperation and generosity even "if they barely notice the eyes".

The first part of this chapter shows that when people think their identity is known they tend to help others, cooperate and are trustworthy.

In the second part of this chapter the author demonstrates that anonymity influences decision making. Many economists assumed that "people always made natural choices to maximize their gains, and that they make choices in isolation from their social context, without regard for the consequences of their behavior. However, the gap that still separates economic and biological evolutionary explanations is closing.

The Altruist in the Spotlight

The choice of trustworthy partners is necessary for cooperation. Family members often make good coalition partners. The Bush family members is a good example.

Reputation for generosity influences other members of a group or society to be like minded. In games such as Prisoners Dilemma if one knows how the other player has previously acted that can affect a players move. Haley and Fessler's Dictator Game deciding to share money and how much demonstrated how much reputation influences outcomes.

In Cambridge University Redouan Bshary experiments with small fish who cleaned the teeth of bigger fish also exhibit how behavior is influenced by reputation but within certain limits and by the particular factual situation. Sometimes big fish swallowed cleaner fish and sometimes cleaner fish bit and ate gums of larger fish they were supposed to service.

Why it's so Difficult to Protect the Environment

Those who don't cooperate are not punished in a public goods game. As Garrett Hardin described the situation in 1968 the "tragedy of the commons" [...] "the individuals private interests usually prevail over the public ones and in the end everyone loses". Paying taxes is the same i.e. failure to punish cheaters encourages wide spread cheating.

One of the reasons why Italy is always bankrupt is because there is rampant tax fraud. There is also "tragedies of the commons" in other life forms like parasites - over exploiting and killing the host will lead to death of all parasites.

In order to better understand how a good reputation helps, some scholars refer to "indirect reciprocity". "Evolutionary biologists distinguish between direct and indirect reciprocity. If one cooperates altruistically with another he can expect to receive a reciprocal benefit and both parties benefit. In indirect reciprocity a third party not the original recipient returns the benefit when all three are members of the same cooperating group. In this situation reputation is built for those reciprocating for the one unable to reciprocate even though he has not received a benefit. Game theorists call this "positive image score". Recognizing charitable gifts by charities announcing amounts given tends to enhance reputation.

Moralistic malicious gossip is a form of punishment for defectors who don't cooperate. Honking drivers are another form of criticizing driver wrong doers. Cheating on spouses has caused hurt spouses to publicize this conduct to destroy a husband's reputation with other women.

Cooperation avoids punishment. Competition can go the other way pushing non cooperation or encouraging cheating. Competition has benefits if success is admired provided cheating is not known or not done.

In a New York black out in 1977 of 24 hours there was a huge crime wave – lots of stealing, looting, robberies and shootings on the street occurred. Four thousand people were arrested. But the number of crimes committed by those who were not caught was probably much larger. The same phenomena occur when natural disasters happen or when soldiers invade another country. The author quotes an Italian proverb "Opportunity turns man into a thief" which he notes implies that "the world is not divided into bad and good

people [...] but rather that given the right circumstances anybody can turn into a thief or even a murderer.

The poor and less well educated fill our prisons for the most part because they profit most from crime and more often believe society has not given them a fair deal. But the author does not think education or wealth changes the way these people act but their situation is different.

Love – Economics and Evolutionary Biology

In this chapter the author suggests that economists and evolutionary biologist can explain why love marriages break up.

According to economist Gary Becker⁵⁴ we choose mates who best promote our material interests and then remain in the relationship as long as the benefits outweigh the costs. A break up occurs when circumstances change and the benefits of being together aren't enough as the costs of the relationship begin to outweigh the benefits and the relationship ends. For him "love is merely an afterthought." Other economists such as Robert Frank⁵⁵ believe love is important. Like Becker he believes romantic relationships are cooperative ventures in which two individuals choose to stay together to pursue joint goals – such as raising children, accumulating property or producing movies together like Brad Pitt and Jennifer Aniston did after they met in 1998, married two years later until Brad met Angelina Jolie on a movie they were doing together. He fell in love with Angelina and separated from Jennifer on January 2005 and was divorced in October with Angelina already pregnant with Brad's child.

"Economists tell us that long term cooperative relationships pose what they call a commitment problem."

⁵⁴ Becker, Gary 1991 A Treatise on the Family Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.

⁵⁵ Frank, Robert 1988 Passion within Reason: The Strategic Role of Emotions Norton, NY.

Circumstances change and according to Frank love is a solution to commitment problems in romantic relationships; thus to do well one needs to behave irrationally by remaining strongly in love and ignore costs and benefits and be truly altruistic.

Maestriperi has several problems accepting this theory such as: (i) Isn't "a relationship motivated by irrational thinking (i.e. love) more subject to mercurial whims? (ii) If love solves the commitment problem how long does the solution last? It should be stronger the longer the relationship lasts but the opposite is more often true. (iii) Love is often about the pursuit of a relationship sometimes with an object of desire. The author cites the story of a big nosed unattractive Cyrano de Bergerac. Cyrano courts Roxane who has told Cyrano she loves his younger brother for whom he has written Roxane love letters. But she discovers the real situation when Cyrano recites his own words in the dark to Roxane after his brother Christian has been killed. Roxane then discovers the truth and realizes she loves Cyrano who has been mortally wounded and dies. The author concludes that neither Becker nor Frank's economic theory explain Cyrano's feelings and behavior so he turns to biology to see if he can find a better answer to explain romantic love.

He writes "like many of our other psychological, physiological and physical traits the human ability to love probably evolved by natural selection. That being said, traits that evolve by natural selection to serve a particular function can occur later on in contexts that have nothing to do with the original function."

Pair Bonding – Raising Children

In apes including those most similar to us sexual attraction, sexual intercourse and reproduction are similar to humans but only the mothers take care of the off spring. "They are raised by single moms [...]. There is no

attachment or bonding or anything remotely resembling romantic love between mates".

"In a few primate species the fathers help is either necessary for infant survival or can make a difference between a bad life and a good life."

In a research project analyzing a large body of scientific literature results show that animals where the two parents are pair bonded they had extensive physical contact, proximity, separation distress and provided mate guarding.

Such pair-bonded animals also provided parental care. All this resulted in longer life for these animals and the period of offspring development was longer and slower.

If fathers help with the family they provide important advantages when they cooperate with mothers, i.e. help in feeding children, and to "protect them from danger, give them money, teach them all kinds of useful things, push them and support them and get them out of trouble."

The two main reasons humans are different from most other primates is the extent to which children need their fathers. First they have bigger brains and take a long time to grow up. Brain growth continues after birth.

The second reason is human societies are so competitive young people need all the nepotistic support they can get. Therefore receiving nepotistic support from the two parents rather than only one parent can be of great importance.

Breaking the Bond

The U.S. Census Bureau statistics show after seven years of marriage "divorce is most likely to happen". This corresponds to the times necessary to raise children through the risky infancy period.

Human infants have a high risk of infant mortality compared to older humans.

Another world wide study found single child marriages break up more often after four years – about "the minimum amount of time necessary to raise one child together."

The author concludes that because human children have a longer time to develop than other animals, they need work and care by both parents. He believes natural selection plays a role here since giving outstanding care by both mother and father probably means more families and children survive over generations. The fathers became more like mothers and husbands grew more bonded to their wives and children. The author believes neural circuits similar to the ones developed between mothers and children, such as those involving oxytocin and endogenous opioids, also developed in the father and also became involved in bonding between adults.

Human males produce less testosterone than apes so the author claims there is less promiscuity. The author also believes more intercourse plays a role in increasing human fathers to be more integrated into the family than other animals. This increases survival.

Long Lasting Happy Marriages

A feature of a long-lasting happy marriage according to Katchadourian⁵⁶ is serious commitment and belief in the value of a good marriage relationship in addition to romantic and sexual attraction. Another characteristic is spouses' ability to talk and discuss freely their opinions and problems as good friends who feel they are close and intimate. To reinforce and keep alive such a relationship over time friendship and romantic love should be maintained by demonstrating love by words and deeds in interesting ways. All of these elements reinforce the commitment. Children brought up in such an environment probably live longer and happier and are the object of

⁵⁶ Katchadourian, Herant, A Lecture in France. See also his book Human Sexuality with Donald T. Lunde Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc. 1972.

natural selection compared to children brought up in broken families with one or more parents maladjusted to life especially where the parents are violent which often means producing maladjusted, delinquent and violent children.

Maestripieri writes "One major feature of emotions (romantic love) is to energize motivation."

"Sexual desire and orgasm exist to make sure persons are highly motivated to engage in sexual intercourse and produce children, regardless of their opinions on the subject."

Even celibate priests have difficulty controlling this powerful urge.

The author argues that "Romantic love evolved [...] to motivate men and women to form pair-bonds."

Birds have been pair-bonded longer – probably for millions of years – long enough for natural selection "to sculpt birds' brains and provide the necessary wiring to support the psychological and behavioral adaptation for pair-bonding [...] human pair-bonding is an evolutionary novelty."

It wasn't an easy evolutionary step to transform a sexually promiscuous, aggressive, and misogynistic chimpanzee like ape to become the socially monogamous female loving male.

This rapid transformation presented a special evolutionary problem which required a special solution which was probably adaptation of the infant mother love and closeness transferred to man woman romantic love and increased closeness not usually found in apes.

Selfish Children

It seems that some ethics come from nurture not nature although nature is involved. Research shows that sharing doesn't come naturally to small children.

"Sharing is a skill that children must be taught, even if they understand the concept. Researchers found that children between ages 6 and 14 lack the impulse control to master sharing. 'Just because the brain is that way doesn't mean it can't be changed. Education and setting a good example can have an enormous impact', said researcher Nikolaus Steinbeis."⁵⁷

However, a conversation with a skilled professional teacher of young children reveals that initially selfishness may be predominant. It appears that young children soon consider their social integration into groups of their contemporaries important so selfishness is reduced. This could also be part of human nature and not solely a "learned" behavioral pattern.

Larger Communities: Less Enforcement of Ethics

The problem of ethics became more acute when humanity passed from a hunter-gatherer society, with fewer individuals in one community all in direct relationships, to an agricultural society and gathered in larger communities together. In this new type of society, ruled by chiefs or kings, individuals accumulated more property. This development provided more occasions to steal from those who accumulated property than in a society of hunter-gatherers where property was scarce due to the wandering nature of humanity and good relations with all others in your small community were essential for survival. Mutual assistance in sickness and danger was a top priority. In this respect, small was beautiful.

Scholars have observed and learned through experiments that cooperation among humans occurs among

⁵⁷ This is a part of an E-mail sent by Robert Silsbee referring to a study by Nikolaus Steinbeis of the Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Science in Leipzig, Germany, reported in a Scientific American article entitled *Young Brains Lack Skills for Sharing – An Underdeveloped Prefrontal Cortex makes sharing difficult for young children*. According to a comment to this article the original more detailed report is found at:
t [http://www.cell.com/neuron/Abstract/S0896-6273\(12\)00077-3](http://www.cell.com/neuron/Abstract/S0896-6273(12)00077-3).

a large number of unrelated individuals. This cooperation has been defined as "individual behavior that incurs personal costs in order to engage in a joint activity that confers benefits exceeding these costs to other members of one's group"⁵⁸. This cooperation seems to occur more easily in groups of a limited size. For meerkats, this limit is about fifty. Individuals in very large groups may be unwilling to incur costs to help the group since their share in the benefit to the community is reduced. This is especially true in the groups where individuals are selfish and there are too many free riders benefiting from contributions by others who never contribute anything for the benefit of the whole group. In groups, especially smaller ones, with strong social links, these members can be punished or excluded from the community.

Religion

A majority of individuals brought up in a monotheistic cultural background –Jews, Christians and Muslims– even today– apparently believe that standards of ethical conduct come from God by revelation. For example, according to the Christian and Jewish religions, God gave Moses the Ten Commandments on a mountain top. For Muslims, Muhammad's experienced revelations from Allah which were later written in beautiful prose and poetry in the Quran (Koran). This belief helped individuals to follow the religious rules which they believe came from a divinity who loved them and they loved and believed would punish them if they transgressed these rules. Thus these religions reinforced the community in which they lived and were probably an important element in increasing the likelihood of the group's survival, even though many of its members did not follow prescribed ethical rules particularly with their relations to those outside their community.

⁵⁸ Bowles, Samuel and Gintis, Herbert, *A Cooperative Species: Human Reciprocity and Its Evolution*, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, 2011.

Whether or not God revealed ethical rules, it is certain that religious faith has stimulated and motivated religious scholars –Jewish, Christian or Muslim– to expend enormous efforts on religious and ethical studies. Consider the Talmud and contributions of religious scholars of all faiths.

Buddhists believe that Buddha found the proper way to virtue and to respect others through meditation without the direct intervention of a monotheistic god.

Religious fervor can be a deep and highly effective motivating factor for some individuals to act ethically and can bring stability to one's personality and be an inherent part of it. Religion is often a help for imperfect humans and used as a guide and helps build confidence, especially when an individual is a part of a religious community which provides support through life's difficulties. Without such faith and the comfort of belonging to a group, many human beings would feel more helpless and without hope in a chaotic, unfair, unreasonable, often ugly world. The support of religious faith helps them gain stability and to resist temptation from evil actions. Such faith gives them a drive and optimism very useful in life. A significant majority of those living in societies with a generally monotheistic culture have faith in one god and also believes that their values have universal application. It appears that a large majority of the people in the world have religious or religious like beliefs which seem to be a basic human need for a majority of humans.

Religion Necessary for Survival - Malraux

According to Fr. Michael Van Aerde in a 2003 conference, André Malraux declared (which some doubt the veracity) "Le xxi^e siècle sera religieux ou ne sera pas" ("The twenty-first century will be religious or it won't exist")⁵⁹. According to this speaker, he said atheism has bitter fruits

⁵⁹ André Malraux was a distinguished and prolific novelist and writer, art theorist, and Minister of Information (1945-46) and Culture (1959-69) appointed by Général de Gaulle whose greatness was celebrated in France by his burial in the Pantheon.

like Nazi, communist or ultra-liberal secular "religions". The speaker cited Regis Debray: "Those who do not believe God believe in much worse things".

One's view on this issue determines her or his answer to the nature and origin of ethics.

One should not forget that many scientists believe in the past that communities with strong religions were better at surviving through the ages. Could this be true for the future too?

Religious Extremists and Violence

Unfortunately, on the other side of the coin, some of those who have religion, especially religious and extremist leaders in all religions, at different times, have contributed to religious and racist hatred, violence and killing. In addition, adherence to absolutist rigid principles and intolerant attitudes create unnecessary tensions between diverse groups which are often a causal factor in violence.

It is also true that good conduct on each holy day is not necessarily maintained during the remainder of the week.

Religion and Insanity

An American author⁶⁰, a recovered victim of a serious mental disease who became an Episcopal minister, noted in one of his studies that there were many similarities in the way some religious believers and people suffering from mental illness view the world.

Religious Faith – Stability or not?

Religious faith can be and is often an element of stability in the life of some individuals since the need for a spiritual life is widespread. On the other hand, especially if in a more extreme form of some types of religious belief, it

⁶⁰ Boisen, Anton T. 1936. *The Exploration of the Inner world –A Study of Mental Disorder and Religious Experience*. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, New York. Mr. Boisen became research associate in psychology of religion and chaplain at the Elgin Illinois State Hospital. He taught at the Chicago Theological Seminary.

can accompany a form of instability that resembles insanity. Some would say that terrorists who sacrifice themselves to tell others of their religions are insane or simply criminals.

Religious Persecutions

In China some forms of Western religions and newer religious sects are not considered ethical but politically and morally dangerous, and therefore they are not tolerated and are suppressed. The same is true in France to a much lesser extent where some newer unconventional churches in the United States are categorized in France as "sects" and subject to popular and official opprobrium.

Some believe the Devil is a very clever fellow able to infiltrate and spread his evil ways into religions. If this is so, religious leaders must be very careful not to take actions in the name of their religion which is not in the best interest of humanity⁶¹.

Spinoza

Spinoza, when he was young, left his family's Jewish community and religion in Amsterdam to write his theological-political treatise in 1670. This work expressed his view that the "Bible was a source of moral guidance rather than a fountain of philosophical or scientific truth, a view contrary to prevailing religious teachings. Later in an unfinished work, *Political Treatise* (1677), he expressed his devotion to freedom of thought. Spinoza's skill as a craftsman (he was a lens grinder) which afforded him a modest but independent economic status. As a philosopher, he gained so much international attention that at 45 he was offered the chair in philosophy at the University of Heidelberg which he refused in order to maintain his

⁶¹ For a description of the evil actions of the Christian Church in the 1st to 3rd century, according to one Christian author, see Harpur, Tom. 2004. *Recovering the Lost Light, the Pagan Christ*. Thomas Allen, Toronto.

In his book, a leading ethologist, Richard Dawkins, has gone much farther in writing that religion is a very "evil force in the world". See Orr, H. Allen. January 11, 2007. *A Mission to Convert*. The New York Review of Books, p. 21.

solitude and "intellectual freedom." Spinoza wrote that experience had "taught him that all the usual surroundings of social life are vain and futile..." For Spinoza the ordinary objects of desire, riches, fame and sensual pleasure should not be an end in themselves. However, fame which he secured and a steady but modest income were useful means for his reaching his higher goal which was to increase his knowledge. His conception of god, according to Leibnitz who visited him, was a strange mixture of god and nature. God was the basic substance in the universe. Such beliefs caused him to be expelled from his synagogue and considered a non-religious materialist. However, his ethical and philosophical ideas were celebrated by philosophers a number of centuries after his death⁶². Jefferson's deistic views seem to resemble to some extent Spinoza's beliefs. His devotion to freedom as the highest virtue resembled that of Erasmus.

Catholics and Jews

The Catholic Church and Judaistic religious leaders have conducted a useful dialogue since WWII which helps to resolve some of the existing hostility and strong tensions between these two religions despite the resentment on the reality of the Shoah. More dialogue, tolerance and cooperation, and rapprochement between all religions would be useful to reduce racism, religious hatred and evil in the world. A large part of Christian thought and other is derived from the Jewish religion. Jesus was a Jew and Saint Paul was a converted Jew. One could think that hostility between Jews and Christians is not reasonable. But schisms or splits in a religion especially between similar or closely related religions often results in very strong hatreds. Consider the ongoing violence between Sunnis and Shiites in the Muslim religion. This also reflects power struggles between two groups which fuels the fire of violence. In

⁶² Nadler, Steven, *Spinoza: A Life*, Cambridge University Press, 1999

Europe the violence between Catholics and Protestants took centuries to end.

Competition between churches should be reasonable, ethical and non-violent to avoid generating hate as much as possible.

Natural Law as a Source of Ethics

In contrast, some legal scholars have thought natural law governs moral behavior. It flows out of what are considered natural rights like liberty and free speech. This concept of law comes in theory from nature. It is not law made by human beings nor does it flow from a religious source. Its source is reason.

Behavioral Economics – Cooperation – An Economic Basis for Ethics

In the new field of behavioral economics research at the Santa Fe Institute, Professors Bowles and Gintis and others have recently made interesting progress. This field of inquiry emphasizes actual human conduct rather than the theories developed in neo-classical economics where assumptions are made which facilitate the use of mathematics but are often unrealistic.

In a 2011 book entitled "A Cooperative Species – Human Reciprocity and its Evolution"⁶³ Bowles and Gintis

⁶³ Bowles, Samuel, Gintis, Herbert, 2011, *A cooperative Species: Human Reciprocity and its Evolution*, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford which includes some of the following topics of the papers cited below:

Bowles' and Gintis' article cited in footnote 8 for an example of an article on behavioral economics and other articles:

- Bowles, Samuel; Gintis, Herbert. 17.08.1998. *The Evolution of Strong Reciprocity*. Santa Fe Institute

- Bowles, Samuel; Gintis, Herbert. 12.12.2000. *Social Capital and Community Governance*. Santa Fe Institute

- Bowles, Samuel; Fong, Christina; Gintis, Herbert. 24.05.2001. *Reciprocity and the Welfare State*. Santa Fe Institute

- Bowles, Samuel; Gintis, Herbert. 24.07.2002. *The Origins of Human Cooperation*. Santa Fe Institute

- Bowles, S.; Gintis, H. Nov. 2002. *Social Capital and Community Governance*. In *The Economic Journal*, 112:483, F419-F436

have updated papers they have written and added new writing.

Technical material in this book has been presented in verbal and mathematical form.

According to the introduction, two propositions are advanced in this book.

People cooperate not only for self-interested reasons but also because they are genuinely concerned about the well-being of others. They value ethics for its own sake and punish those who exploit the cooperative behavior of others. Such action evokes satisfaction, pride, even elation and even failing to do so causes a feeling of shame or guilt.

Groups of individuals who cooperated and upheld ethical norms tended to survive and expand and out compete more than other groups.

These "moral sentiments" were noted by Adam Smith, who wrote⁶⁴:

"How selfish so ever man may be supposed, there are evidently some principles in his nature, which interest him in the fortune of others, and render their happiness necessary to him, though he derives nothing from it, except the pleasure of seeing it."

In order to foster cooperation there must be ethical conduct on the part of cooperating parties. Otherwise there would be little cooperation. Like trust, cooperation depends upon ethical conduct of the parties involved. Therefore the studies of behavioral economists of cooperation are very relevant to the subject of ethics. They are like the other side of the same coin. See page 265 in this book for other

- Boyd, R.; Gintis, H.; Bowles, S.; Richerson, P.J. 2003. *The Evolution of Altruistic Punishment*. In "Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America", 100:6, pp. 3531-35

- Bowles, Samuel; Gintis, Herbert. 2004. *The Evolution of Strong Reciprocity: Cooperation in Heterogeneous Populations*. In "Theoretical Population Biology", 65:1, pp. 17-28.

⁶⁴ Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (2000[1759]) Chapter 1, p. 3.

research on this subject done at the Harvard Business School.

Paul Kurtz's Secular Ethics

A contemporary philosopher, Paul Kurtz, has recently written a book about the ethics of secularism or humanism as it was referred to by Julian Huxley⁶⁵. Professor Kurtz has organized groups working together, somewhat like religious communities, who believe that promoting ethics as a part of a religion is less efficient and less reliable and has failed to improve ethics in society after thousands of years. Religions generally divide people rather than unite them into one human family, i.e. a single human community with basic common values which should be easier and less divisive through secular ethics. Members of each religious group often believe or imply their group's religion is the best or the "true" religion, superior to all others, allowing or encouraging those in such a group to feel superior to or look down on others outside their group which leads to ill-feeling, hatred, and sometimes to violence. In addition, they are often based on purported revelation from supernatural events which are unverifiable and seem to be more unreliable methods of finding truth compared to rational and scientific inquiry based on the careful observation of facts or experience, subject to verification by experiment. Religions use stories, miracles and mysticism based on sacred texts often written long after the events described by promoters of the religion in question. They are often products of the imagination rather than based on real world solutions. On the other hand, unethical conduct and violence are not always fueled by religious fervor. In addition, science is teaching us more about human nature as it progresses. Professor Kurtz believes ethics should focus on actual situations rather than on abstract or theoretical ideas -the

⁶⁵ Kurtz, Paul. 2008. *Forbidden Front. The Ethics of Secularism*. Prometheus Books.

For a complete bibliography of Professor Kurtz, Columbia PhD in philosophy, see also <http://en.wikipedia.org/wild/PaulKurtz> (viewed 24 Nov. 2009).

ones that come up in real life and are often complex, where the best solutions are usually not evident nor totally satisfactory. There are usually difficult trade-offs and compromises necessary in arriving to the best but not perfect ethical solution to practical problems.

Neuroscience: Ethical Conduct and Generosity Gives Pleasure in Brain

Neuroscientists Moll and Grafman at the U.S. National Institute of Health have been scanning brains and a recent article reported "that when the volunteers placed the interests of others before their own, the generosity activated a primitive part of the brain that usually lights up in response to food or sex. Altruism, the experiment suggested, was not a superior moral faculty that suppresses basic selfish urges but rather was basic to the brain, hard-wired and pleasurable. Their 2006 finding that unselfishness can feel good lends scientific support to the admonitions of spiritual leaders such as Saint Francis of Assisi, who said, 'For it is in giving that we receive.' But it is also a dramatic example of the way neuroscience has begun to elbow its way into discussions about morality and has opened up a new window on what it means to be good⁶⁶." So, this adds another possible explanation to where ethics come from. This research suggests another possible source for ethics, i.e. the origin is physical and not a cultural trait learned by living in a society –or both. Would a brain scan also reveal pleasure in acting destructively and being evil which also lights up the same part of the brain when experiencing pleasure and sexual delight?

Brutality and Violence

Unethical anti-social violent conduct seems to be learned in situations where young people are brutalized, where they learn to be belligerent and experience violent

⁶⁶ Vedantam, Shankar. May 28, 2007. *If It Feels Good to Be Good, It Might Be Only Natural*. Washington Post, p. A01.

performances until such conduct becomes virulent. These people are not, according to Richard Rhodes, mentally ill, brain damaged, monstrous, anomic or genetically or subculturally determined, i.e., not categorically different from the rest of us⁶⁷.

Different individuals and different groups have varying degrees of prosocial emotions such as shame, guilt, empathy, and sensitivity to social sanction. "Without the prosocial emotions, we would all be sociopaths, and human society would [...] not exist. [...] Sociopaths have no mental deficit except that their capacity to experience shame, guilt, empathy, and remorse is severely attenuated or absent. They comprise three to four percent of the male population in the United States, 20% of the prison population, and between 33% and 80% of the chronic criminal offenders⁶⁸."

Moral or ethical conduct is considered by some philosophers, like Hume, to be based on emotion rather than reason. An example of emotion is the guilt felt by Adam and Eve when they were expelled from the Garden of Eden.

Consider how female Bonobo apes control male violence more successfully than in human behavior. are by nature biologically less brutal (see page 21 above).

Cyrulnik's Good Guilt

One French scholar, Boris Cyrulnik, "feels that there is a 'good' kind of guilt, through which we try to avoid causing harm because we can empathize with others. This is probably the basis of morality". This is contrary to Freud's

⁶⁷ Rhodes, Richard. 1999. *Why they Kill, the Discoveries of a Maverick Criminologist*. Random House, New York, New York. In this book the author writes about Dr. Lonnie H. Athens, a criminologist who, he believes, has established a solid scientific foundation to build a program of violence prevention.

⁶⁸ Bowles, Samuel and Gintis, Herbert. June 20, 2002. *Strong Reciprocity. Origins of Human Cooperation*. Background paper for Dahlen Conference on Cultural and Genetic Origins of Cooperation, Berlin and Mealey, Linda *The Sociobiology of Sociopathy An Integrated Evolutionary Model*, Special Issue 03, September 1995 pp 323-541, Cambridge Journals, September 1995. See also Peter Hammerstein. 2003. *The Genetic and Cultural Origins of Cooperation*. MIT Press, Cambridge

idea that guilt causes neurosis and unhappiness. Cyrulnik believes the Nazis and terrorists lack empathy so they can believe it is good to kill innocent people, if different from them. He thinks hate and fanaticism can be manufactured in a school curriculum. Young people are often anxious about the future and some never "made it through adolescence into adulthood. [...] The moment you submit to a master, [...] you become a fanatic. [...] Submission is a good way for them to get rid of their anxiety"⁶⁹.

Another example is through sympathy and compassion displayed when a child is injured and one provides generous help. By contrast, Kant thought morality or ethics was founded on reason and universal principles.

William Perry's Study – Effect of Education on Ethics

Another aspect to be considered is the effect of education on ethical opinions of young men. In a 1970 study at Harvard College, William Perry describes how students' conceptions of the nature and origins of knowledge evolve and how their understanding of themselves as knowers changes over time. He depicts a passage through a sequence of epistemological perspectives that he calls "positions". Initial positions are basic dualism right/wrong, black/white, we/they, good/bad. Passive learners are dependent on authorities to hand down the truth –right from wrong is taught. The students gradually become aware of diversity of opinion, multiple perspectives and, as a result, dualistic faith in absolute authority and truth is shaken. Dualism gives way to multiplicity. Since doubt comes to them, they realize that they may not have the right answers and knowledge and ethics becomes more a question of opinion and taste. The students grow beyond dependency and trust in external authorities and carve out their own territory of personal freedom. Truth, including truth in ethics, needs evidence,

⁶⁹ Cyrulnik, Boris. November 2001. *Surviving the Trauma of Life*. An interview by Sophie Boukhari in The UNESCO Courier. http://www.unesco.org/courier/2001_11:uk/dires.htm (viewed 1 Dec. 2009)

i.e. the students require a more analytical evaluative approach probably induced in great part by the education they receive.⁷⁰

Improved Position of Women in Society: Less Discrimination

According to Lionel Tiger, in human society, women are taking firmer control of their destinies and men are losing their ancient position of dominance because of effective contraception, more working women and more higher education. Men's attitudes toward women have become more civilized and respectful. They also have different voting tendencies⁷¹ which indicates that women's ethics may be different from men's. It is therefore reasonable to hope that more participation by talented women in top management positions in business, government and politics should yield better results because discrimination by men against women limits choice of the most talented persons. This is not intelligent or ethical.

There are also large and important networks of women working to stop discrimination and get equal treatment for women. Three of such networks are as follows.

The first is the Professional Women's Network. This group is a global federation of more than 24 professional networks started in Europe. The purpose is to give women the tools, networks and support resources they need to assume leadership positions. This comes through sharing knowledge through on line networks linking thousands of business women and men. This group wants gender balanced decision making to accelerate the pace of change.

⁷⁰ This paragraph is drawn and adapted from Belenky, Mary F.; MClinchy, Blythe; Goldberger, Nancy R.; Tarude, Jill M. 1986. *Women's Ways of Knowing the Development of Self, Voice, and Mind*. Basic Books.

⁷¹ From a review of Tiger, Lionel. 1999. *The Decline of Males*. Golden Books in Scientific American, January 2000, p. 84

This group impacts families, corporate partners and incorporates best practices to break down barriers to women's progress.

Women's Forum Inc. of New York was founded in 1974.

There are 66 women's forums on 5 continents through the International Women's Forum formed in 1982 based in Washington DC.

This organization is a network of leaders in the professions, arts, and business of many very distinguished and talented women leaders.

Another important organization promoting interests of women is headed by Irene Natividad of Philippine origin, Founder and President of The Global Summit of Women. The web site of this organization notes that: "Irene Natividad is a recognized national leader for women in the United States & Chair of Corporate Women, Directors International which promotes increased participation of women on corporate boards globally. She also runs her own public organization Globe Women based in Washington DC. A sought after commentator whose views are heard nationally on PBC called "To the contrary": an all women news analysis series in which she has served as a regular panelist for over two decades."

These organizations play an important role in improving the situation of women in society.

Even more progress could be made if men who have most of the power in society began to act as more mentors for more women in the professions and business.

Sexual Ethics

Ethics relating to sex is as difficult as it is important and an important biological factual situation that can't be ignored. One author points out that "the most difficult task of romantic life is getting Like, Love, and Lust all in one

relationship"⁷². Arriving at a proper mixture of open honest communication (intimacy), trust, commitment, enjoyable sex and working to maintain a loving relationship for a solid long term marriage is not easy.

In some cultures, mutilation of young females' sexual organs is considered proper. This is a good example of Campbell's "false knowledge". Different "false knowledge" exists in most if not all cultures and needs to be removed.

Many people believe there is an ethical problem in procreating children if they do not have a good solid family structure to educate and bring them up well. Unfortunately a very large part of the world production of children occurs under bad conditions and women do not participate enough in the decision making relating to the size of their family.

In this field such human behavior is probably much more refined than in primates where the male at the top of the hierarchy just takes the female or females he prefers and females are probably more submissive except perhaps with the bonobos where the females cooperate to secure co management of their societies.

Leaders and Ethics

More cynical observers believe that the leaders and those who hold power in a society formulate ethical rules (does this mean "might makes right"?). This view is consistent with the fact that leaders have often considered themselves to be sacred (divine right of kings), claiming to be representatives of God or other divinities. This practice tends to reinforce their power. If it is true that leaders can help improve the level of ethics for each individual in the group they manage, then this bodes well for upgrading ethics in large organizations where leaders can propose or impose high ethical codes of conduct on subordinates, or simply lead by example, especially if their personal ethics

⁷² Gini, Al. 2008. *Why It's Hard To Be Good*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, NY - London. P. 192.

are an inspiration for others. One prominent example today of an ethical leader is Christine Lagarde, the present director of the International Monetary Fund.- She was France's first woman Minister of Finance and the Financial Times choice as the best Minister of Finance in Europe. Before this public service, she successfully led one of the largest multinational firm of lawyers for five years with thousand of partners and employees in more than forty countries. One of the reasons for her success was she developed great skill in listening to what others said. This skill leads to friendship, trust and close relations and allowed her to help others come to agreement. Listening carefully to others is a sign of great respect.

Henri Hude is director of ethics and deontology in the research centre at Saint Cyr Coëtquidan, the French school for military officers where he teaches that the best introduction to the existence of ethics is to rediscover how important good citizenship is. It is the key to the way to a peaceful world through ethics. There is also a course in ethics taught in France's leading military school⁷³.

Love your enemies?

In all the monotheistic religions, love plays a central role. First there is emphasis on the duty to love God. As a corollary, one should also love his neighbor. Jesus said we should even love our enemies, an extremely high level of ethics or nearly impossible goal, which poses a problem when the enemy is trying to kill us. But good ethics seem naturally to flow out of love for God and other human beings. The most practical way to solve the near impossibility of loving one's enemy is not to have enemies. This means working to improve relations with everybody.

⁷³ See Hude, Henri. 2004. *L'éthique des décideurs*. Presses de la Renaissance, Paris. Page 12.

Levinas – The Divine in Interhuman Relations

Emmanuel Levinas, a philosopher and scholar in the Judaic religion, wrote that "The true correlation between man and God depends on the relation of man to man where man assumes full responsibility as if there were no god⁷⁴." According to Roger-Pol Droit, he "places the divine in inter-human relations. For him, the 'other person' comes before all⁷⁵."

Atheistic Ethics

A recent novel⁷⁶ explores ethical conduct of an atheist. The reviewer of this book notes "Lili is a welcome and timely reminder that atheism is not just an inevitable result of teaching evolution in schools but a valid moral alternative, arrived at by observation, reason, and a desire for morality unencumbered by guilt or visions of the next world." Perhaps this reflects a distillation of Judeo-Christian ethics into one's conscience without religious beliefs.

Ethics by Public Opinion?

One could also consider ethics to be formulated by public opinion, through reaching a consensus resulting from discussion at international and other conferences leading to such statements as the 1997 Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights and earlier similar declarations on human rights and duties. These soft laws are often confirmed in constitutions and by legislators to become "hard" enforceable laws.

However, this way of deciding what ethical norms is very difficult or impossible in different communities and cultures.

⁷⁴ Emmanuel Levinas quoted in "Dossier Emmanuel Levinas", Le Monde, Friday 6 January 2006

⁷⁵ Roger-Pol Droit in "Dossier Emmanuel Levinas", Le Monde, Friday 6 January 2006, p.6.

⁷⁶ Martin, Valerie. February 18, 2001. *A True Nonbeliever*. The New York Times, Late Edition –Final, Section 7, Column 1, Page 31 [Review of: De Witt, Abigail. May 2000. *Lili*. Northwestern University Press].

In Asia Ethics exist Without a Monotheistic God

One must also bear in mind that a great number of people in Asia –Buddhists and others– think that it is possible to live as a saint without believing in the uniqueness of a monotheistic god.

In Ethics Culture Counts – Ruth Benedict

The conclusions of Ruth Benedict, a leading sociologist who wrote a landmark book, *Patterns of Culture*⁷⁷, indicates that ethics vary widely in different societies. She studied Indian tribes in the United States and primitive cultures in Pacific islands. For example, in the Dobu Islands, in the Entrecasteaux group off the southern shore of eastern New Guinea in the Pacific, very poor people live who are considered to be dangerous, and in whose society ill will and treachery seem to be considered virtues. Before white men came, several generations ago, they were cannibals.

Cartoons depicting Mohammed

Problems often become even more acute if different cultures are involved. We have recently seen a cultural and ethical conflict when, in the press, cartoons of Mohammed enraged some Muslims, posing a conflict between free speech and the respect for someone else's religious views.

Whistleblowers

Another example is found in the U.S. Sarbanes-Oxley legislation, where an employee can complain to his company about other employees' or executives' conduct if he believes it illegal or unethical. In France, denunciations are not favored because of their unfortunate reminder of the Vichy government and the Nazi occupation of France. Cultural differences in ethics also can be seen in part of the

⁷⁷ Benedict, Ruth. 1950. *Patterns of Culture, An Analysis of Our Social Structure as Related to Primitive Civilizations*. Mentor Book.

French population's distrust of genetically modified foods – health concerns collide with economic freedom.

Conflicts – Legal Ethics

Other complications occur when, within the same culture, there is a conflict of ethical principals. For example, a tragic conflict arose when lawyers Frank Armani and Francis Belge defended Robert Garrow who was accused of a murder and suspected in a number of other crimes including rape and murder. The accused revealed the place where his victims' bodies were buried to his lawyers who planned an insanity plea. To verify his story, they personally investigated and found the bodies. The rule governing a lawyer in this situation is that he must keep incriminating information confidential when defending a client. The lawyers followed this rule. Robert Garrow was sentenced to life imprisonment. His lawyer, Francis Belge, was criminally prosecuted, but found not guilty for failure to report a dead body and failing to provide a corpse with a decent burial. However, despite a not-guilty verdict for the lawyers, they were ostracized by the community. Robert Garrow escaped but was found and killed, based upon what Robert Garrow previously told Armani, his lawyer, that his strategy was to hide close to the prison from which he escaped until the police went away. This insoluble ethical dilemma was between an ethical rule binding a criminal lawyer to keep confidential information given by a client and a duty to the victims' parents and society to reveal the truth – a general rule of ethics⁷⁸.

⁷⁸ The author is grateful to Frank Morrissey, his former partner, for informing him of this case and the publication cited below. Frank was a leader in introducing an examination on legal ethics as part of the Bar examination in many U.S. states.

Zittrn, Richard and Langford, Carol M. 1999. *The Moral Compass of the American Lawyer – Truth, Justice, Power, and Greed*. A Ballantine Book, New York, NY. Pages 1-26.

Ethics vary depending upon Place and Time

In Alain Crémieux's *L'éthique des armes* (Ethics of Weapons) which includes questions of manufacture, sale and use, he states that with regard to defining good and evil, it may be clear in one place and time but it varies a great deal with geography and it has changed enormously in different times⁷⁹.

Different Genders, Different Ethics

There is also evidence that gender affects what is thought to be ethical. Four psychologists have written an interesting book in which the following passage appears.

Women's solutions of ethical problems revolve around a feeling of responsibility and care of other people perhaps resulting from many women's educating young children more than men.

According to some other authors who have studied the development of moral reasoning in young men, it centers around a "rights morality" applied by "blind justice" and applying abstract principles not taking into consideration the personal situation of the persons involved.

Women prefer to consider the context to resolve disputes rather than the general principles. Women prefer to form opinions inductively from the experience of the parties involved.⁸⁰

Conflict of Sexual Ethics: A Moroccan Suicide

Amina El-Fitali, a 16-year old girl who was forced to marry a man who had raped her twice, committed suicide by swallowing rat poison. This conflict of ethics between genders in a Muslim country led to a public demonstration.

⁷⁹ Page 23 of *L'éthique des armes* by Alain Crémieux, 2006, Aegus, Edition du Bicorne, Paris.

⁸⁰ This paragraph is drawn and adapted from Belenky, Mary F.; MClinchy, Blythe; Goldberger, Nancy R.; Tarule, Jill M. 1986 *Womens's Ways of Knowing the Development of Self, Voice and Mind*. Basic Books.

Article 475 of the penal code protects the rapist if he marries his victim until a judge annuls the marriage⁸¹.

According to a report by Aljazeera, nearly a year after the event the Islamist government, Justice Minister announced plans to change the law. The President of the Moroccan Association for Human Rights said:

"This was a good thing but it doesn't meet all of our demands. The Penal Code has to be totally reformed because it contains many provisions that discriminate against women and doesn't protect women from violence. A comprehensive law combating violence against women has been languishing in parliament for the past eight years"⁸².

Public opinion driven by women forced legislation to be enacted which changed the law to remove protection for a rapist under article 475 of the Penal Code if he married his victim.

"The Trust Molecule"

"Why are some of us caring and some of us cruel, some generous and some greedy".

This is the subject that Paul J. Zak of the Claremont Graduate University has tried to answer by applying "the new science of morality". His questioning continues with "Why are some people trustworthy, while others lie, cheat and steal? [...] and why women tend to be nicer and more generous than men? [...] Could a single molecule – one chemical substance – lie at the very center of our moral lives?" The Oxytocin or Pitocin (the synthetic version) is known primarily as a female reproductive hormone used in inducing contractions during labor. Is this chemical the substance that lies "at the very center of our moral lives"?

For over ten years Paul Zak and his colleagues have conducted experiments which tend to show that when the

⁸¹ <http://www.lemonde.fr/afrique/article/2012/03/24/le-suicide-qui-bouleverse-la-societe-marocaine>, 25 mars 2012

⁸² <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/africa.2013/01/2013123225637555571.html>

amount of oxytocin goes up in a person, he or she responds "more generously and caringly even with complete strangers".

Someone who becomes more trusting who deals generously with another makes this other person more trusting in turn – sort of a chain reaction. This feedback or forward loop creates what might be called a "virtuous circle". Theoretically all of the society affected could be made more trustworthy and virtuous. This reminds one of the Golden Rule of doing unto others what you would have them do unto you.

Paul Zak did a test before and after a friend's wedding. The bride was feeling very happy and her level of oxytocin rose 28% and her mother's 24%. However, the father of the groom rose only 18% and the groom 13%. Why were the men so low? The groom's testosterone surged by 100%. Testosterone is a steroid hormone. In males this hormone plays a key role in reproductive tissues such as testis and prostate and is primarily secreted in the testicles of males. Both males and females have each of these substances although males produce much more testosterone than females, and their level varies and their interplay is highly complex (see Testosterone – Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia).

Testosterone "is one of several other hormones that can interfere with the release of oxytocin, and the groom's testosterone level, according to our blood test, had surged 100%! As the guests admired Linda in her strapless bridal gown, he (the groom) was the alpha male".⁸³

⁸³ Zak, Paul J., *The Trust Molecule*, The Wall Street Journal, The Saturday Essay, April 27, 2012, Interview by Gary Rosen

Edelman “Trust Barometer”

The Edelman company⁸⁴, Public Relations specialists, claims their 13th annual Trust Barometer is “our largest exploration of Trust, to date, and the largest survey of its kind”. It included 31,000 respondents in 26 markets around the world. It measured their trust in institutions, industries and leaders.

This Company manages an online survey, a general public survey and informed public’s survey.

Several examples of conclusions in retrospect of the Trust Barometer are as follows:

2013 Crisis of Leadership, Financial and Banking Industry Deep Dive, Lower Trust among General Population than Informed Public

2012 Fall of Trust in Government

2011 Rise of Trust in Authority Figures

2010 Trust is now essential in business

2009 Young influences have more trust in business

2007 Business more trusted than Government and media

2006 “A person like me” emerges as credible spokesman

2005 Trust shifts from “Authorities” to peers

2004 U.S. Companies in Europe suffer trust discount

2003 Earned media more credible than advertising

2002 Fall of Celebrity CEO

2001 Rising Influences of NGO’s.

According to Edelman trust is important to a company’s long term success and it can “leverage

⁸⁴ Edelman and Associates was founded in Chicago in 1952 by Daniel Edelman, a newspaper writer. His son Richard took over as President in 1985. It has 67 locations, 600 people in its digital division, and over 4,500 employees.

reputation” which says something about values. In short, Trust is essential to corporate positioning in the market and the way a company communicates is the key.

The success of the Edelman company and its message testifies to the strength of Trust as a business weapon. This is a long term strategy which does not try to earn profits from short term unethical policies some of which may if not most companies go for. If a company accepts Edelman’s advice and adopts the principal that Trust Matters, Edelman, a PR company, has originated more ethical business. It is a source of ethics.

Do Universal Ethics Exist? Yersu Kim’s UNESCO Study

At UNESCO, Professor Yersu Kim led a most interesting study begun in 1997, *Prospect For a Universal Ethics*⁸⁵. According to Professor Kim, there is an urgent need to make progress in defining and promoting ethical conduct, and agreeing on basic rules, because the Western synthesis of ideas is no longer providing a reliable guide to progress and survival. He cites the historian Hobsbawn, who wrote that the last part of the 20th Century was "an era of decomposition, uncertainty and crisis", after a period of major wars and more killing than in any previous century.

As globalization occurs and we are hopefully moving toward a global community, a system of global ethics will better fit and serve the global community.

UNESCO's study attempts to identify basic ethical principals which are common to major religions and cultures. For example, this study has found that the golden

⁸⁵ Kim, Yersu. 1998. *Prospect For a Universal Ethics. Report on On-Going Reflections, Preliminary Report, Part I*. UNESCO.

See *Problems and Prospects* relating to the Universal Ethics Project (<http://www.unesco.org/opi2/philosophyandethics/pronpro.htm> (viewed 26 March 2007)).

See also *Prospects of a Universal Ethics. Reporting on Ongoing Reflections* by Yersu Kim, The Universal Ethics Project Preliminary Report: Part 1 (1998) which contains an annex listing documents consulted containing information on ethical values.

rule of "doing unto others as you would have them do unto you" is common to many religious teachings and cultures; it is almost a universal theory. This can be compared to Kant's view that ethics should be based on principles that are universal.

It would be most useful if UNESCO as well as other organizations or international associations could continue to try to formulate some general rules and induce people to actually integrate basic ethical principles in their lives through education in the home and in schools. Professor Kim's preliminary report notes that the Western synthesis -individualism, rationalism, scientism and progress- now has lost adherents. Something else is needed.

Professor Kim wrote in "Problems and Prospects" under Chapter 1 "Feasibility" that "[...] while most members of the member states of UNESCO executive board showed strong support for [the Universal Ethics Project], a small number of countries have made their opposition equally clear. Just as diversity in culture should be respected, said these critics, "so should diversity in ethical matters be respected." He also notes that some leading philosophers do not believe in the concept of universal ethics. Aside from the study of ethics by philosophers, the social scientists, as well as natural scientists, have been engaged in researching the new ethics of sustainable development which include intergenerational ethics. For interesting research on this subject, see "Sustainability and Social Sciences. A Cross-disciplinary approach to Integrating Environmental Considerations into Theoretical Reorientation." This book was written by fifteen international scholars and results from an international project of UNESCO (MOST), financed by the German Federal Ministry of Education. UNESCO's scientific partner was the German Institute for Social Ecological Research (ISOE).

Recently, one of the most challenging problems in biology -why metabolic rate scales as the $\frac{3}{4}$ power of body

mass— appears to have been solved by transdisciplinary work. It occurred at the Santa Fe Institute, where physicist Geoffrey B. West, former President of the Santa Fe Institute, and biologists James H. Brown and his student Brian Enquist worked together for three years. An even more revolutionary transdisciplinary cooperation that resulted in a revolutionary breakthrough was the discovery of the double helix by Crick, a physicist, and Watson, a biologist. So, it is clear that attacking problems from different perspectives can result in fresh ideas and a more rapid understanding which leads to solving problems. This is more than ever true with research on ethics.

Public Opinion on Universal Ethics – Adrian van de Staay

Adrian van de Staay has prepared a report on public opinion and global ethics in one third of the countries representing about one half of the world's population which indicate that values and trust among the different communities vary and are not homogeneous depending upon the status of a person in society (i.e. is he or she wealthy or poor, educated or not). Other factors include the wealth of the country in which that person lives, the geographic location and the culture and the religion of the individual. The variation in the values and amount of trust given to people outside the family reflects a difference in ethics and how much people work together to create wealth⁸⁶.

⁸⁶ Van der Staay, Adriaan. 1998. *Public Opinion and Global Ethics: A Descriptive Study of Existing Survey Data*. World Culture Report: Culture, Creativity and Markets. UNESCO Publishing. Chapter 16, pp. 252.

For other interesting research papers on universal ethics, see Kim, Yersu. 1998. *A Search for Common Values*. World Culture Report: Culture, Creativity and Markets. UNESCO Publishing. Pp. 254-255.

Kim, Yersu. 2000. *Regional Experts Meeting on Universal Ethics from the Nordic Perspectives; Lund, Sweden; 1999*. UNESCO Publishing.

Kim, Yersu. 1999. *A Common Framework for the Ethics of the 21st Century*. UNESCO Publishing.

It is interesting that the people with lower income are the most distrustful and intolerant in society which tends to prove the value of education, since educated people usually are better off economically (http://www.unesco.org/culture/worldreport/html_eng/wcr4.shtml (viewed 26 March 2007)). Does this poll mean that there are no universal ethics? Or that people think problems of immediate concern in daily life are the only ones that merit attention and ethics is not included? The Universal Ethics Project was a most interesting one because it implicitly posed the question of whether universal ethics exist or, if not, can a consensus be reached on what universal ethics should be. The work done on this project indicates that much research remains. One conclusion can be drawn from this work: if there is to be one or more international communities working for peace in the world, there needs to be more agreement on what the basic ethics and values are to be shared. Then the young should be educated in these values.

Universal Declaration of Human Genome and Human Rights

Despite the results of the above report on Public Opinion and Global Ethics, UNESCO succeeded in securing the above declaration and having it approved by the UN General Assembly. It prohibits reproductive cloning so this principle seems to be universally accepted.

Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1948 and Adoption in 1966 – Individualistic Culture vs Duties to Community

Gandhi thought that the rights of man had no other purpose than to fulfill man's duties. While not going that far, René Cassin⁸⁷, a former President of the European Human Rights Court, wrote that rights and duties are related

⁸⁷ This section is a translation and summary of René Cassin's article *De la place faite aux devoirs de l'individu dans la Déclaration Universelle des Droits de l'Homme* (the place made for duties of the individual in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of Man), 1968. *Mélanges offerts à Polys Modinos*, Editions Pédone, Paris.

(correlatifs) and thus human rights vis-à-vis his fellow men are the logical counterparty of the beneficiary of these rights toward other men individually and with regard to society, i.e. nations and other social groups.

In reading the declaration there is no mention of duties in it.

Declaration of the Rights of Man – No Duties?

But Article 1 does mention that human beings should act towards one another in a sort of brotherhood – a moral obligation.

These classical human rights arose from the conflict between individual subject and their sovereigns and governments demanding freedom and guaranties (vertical rights).

One does find in Article 29:

"In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society."

Individuals also get protection from abusive action from their fellow citizens i.e. horizontal protection in addition to vertical protection from abusive action from the sovereign or their government.

There are no related duties of individual subjects to the State mentioned. This was logical. The purpose of the Declaration of Human Rights was to protest the monstrous violations of human rights during the Second World War. Mrs. Roosevelt, President of the Commission, said it was not the purpose of the Declaration to enumerate duties of citizens.

However, constitutions usually enumerate the role of citizens and their duties relating to service in the armed forces, paying taxes, etc. Socialist States have also added social, economic and cultural rights as rights of man, such as a right to work, social security and the right to education. These rights need to be written into legal form in constitutions, laws and regulations since they were considered inappropriate in the Declaration of Human Rights and the Commission was not willing to include these new rights formulated by socialists or communists.

G.W.F. Hegel's opinion as to human duties can be found in a summary for a first year course in Philosophy he gave in 1809 to 1811 in a Nuremberg Lycée (comparable in some respects to a good high school in the U.S.).⁸⁸

Hegel's duties

Hegel spelled out in paragraph 40 of this summary that individuals belong to a natural group, a family, are a member of a State, and are in relations with other human beings. Then he writes his duties are divided in four categories (1) duties to himself, 2) duties with relation to his family, 3) duties to his nation and 4) duties to other men).

Duties to oneself

His duty to himself is double – he is unique (singularité) and has a universal self.

His duty to himself as a consequence, on one hand, is to conserve himself physically and to raise himself to the level of his universal nature and to educate himself.

He wrote, to clarify, the human being is essentially a natural creation and as a result he acts arbitrarily and fortuitously as an unstable subjective being. He does not distinguish the essential from the unessential. Secondly, he

⁸⁸ Hegel G.W.F., 1809-1811, Arguments 20, *Propédeutique Philosophique* (Beginning Philosophy), Les Editions de Minuit, Collection Arguments, translated from German into French by Maurice Gandillac, Paris.

has a spiritual and reasonable essence. In this respect he is not naturally what he should be. An animal has no need for education because it is by nature what it should be.

Family Duty

The education one receives allows a certain behavior. The first relation with others is with the family. This relation is conditioned by the disposition of a moral attitude, love and trust.

Duties to the Nation

The natural group which constitutes the family is enlarged to include a nation within which the individuals have an autonomous field of action. But the individual has a duty to follow the law and he needs to conserve the citizen's spirit. The Nation produces a unified moral order as a moral community, education, and a universal way of thinking and behavior while recognizing each's spirituality.

Duties to others

These duties are legal obligations necessarily inseparable from the desire for justice. Also included is the obligation to treat others as equals not only as abstract persons but in each as individuals as well as to consider his happiness and unhappiness yours and to prove it by helping the other. The respect of law and observing the strict duties to others is the primary duty, the basis for all the others.

Thus, although classic human rights in the Declaration reflect an individualistic culture they indirectly serve the community in a vertical sense protecting them against the State and horizontally affecting their relations with their fellow citizens, who must respect these rights. They are like the two sides of the same coin.

The Impossible Universality of Human Rights⁸⁹

The author of the above article makes a distinction between "universalité", "universalisme" and "universalisation" in his article.

He notes that on account of the Western origin of Human Rights certain cultures are reticent about accepting them, in particular he cites Islamic culture. One could also probably add Asian countries.

Since in the West these rights are stated to apply to everyone regardless of race, religion, the place of residence or nationality, they have an intrinsic universal character in their conception.

They also have a certain dynamic nature i.e. universalism, an element, also intrinsic, which is part of them. It is for that reason that the principal draftsman, René Cassin, of the declaration insisted on the word "Universal". Thus it is more like a universalist political religion.

One must recognize the considerable progress in universalizing or internationalizing these human rights after World War II, especially in international agreements and texts which reflects the idea of citizens of the world.

However, certain countries like the U.S. and France are accused probably rightly of being selective in the application of these rights when their interests are affected.

But there is respectable opinion to the effect that in fact it is impossible that the first generation human rights can be applied everywhere because article 14 prohibits discrimination against those who are different. Another text, Article 1 of the two International Pacts of 1966, provides all people have the right to be themselves ("disposer d'eux-

⁸⁹ Pararas, Petros J., Former Vice President of the Greek Council of State and Emeritus Professor of the Democritus University of Thrace. January 2011, *L'Impossible Universalité des Droits de l'Homme*, Revue Trimestrielle des Droits de l'Homme; Bruylant, Bruxelles (Belgium).

mêmes") and freely determine their political rules ("statut") and freely assure their economic, social and cultural development.

In other words in our post-modern times we claim the right to be different and equal at the same time. If Human Rights do become more universal it would seem to lead to a more uniform culture, and reflect an intellectual European civilization profoundly influenced by Christianity i.e. for values that are not necessarily acceptable elsewhere. For example Saudi Arabia did not agree to Article 18 freedom to changing religion or the right to marry without restriction as to race, nationality or religion as provided in Article 16.

At the U.N., Iran declared that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights could not be applied by Muslims because it does not correspond to this country's system of values.

Islamic terrorists to some extent illustrate the refusal and non application of the Universal Rights Declaration. Other Universal Cultures draft conventions often emphasize their religion and other values rather than those of the West.

The treatment of women is a clear example where the values in the Charî'a are incompatible with those of the European Convention of Human Rights. It seems clear also that the rules in the Declaration of Human Rights cannot be imposed in Muslim countries ruled by Muslim religious law. However, this is not the only place the universality is "relative" since even in the West the death penalty and euthanasia in the opinion of many do not coincide with values embodied in the declaration of Human Rights.

Ethics in Asia

Henri Tsiang⁹⁰ notes that traditional values in Asia come from Taoism, Confucianism and Buddhism. Although

⁹⁰ Henri Tsiang. 2006. *Valeurs asiatiques –Mythes ou réalités*. Passages, 10 rue Clément, 75006 Paris, France.

not strictly speaking religions in the Western sense of the term, they also promote frugality, hard work, the importance of education, the respect of others and good conduct in society. These rules of conduct are not unlike those that have been recommended in some Western societies.

In Asia, Man is considered as totally integrated in nature like any other living organism or natural thing. In nature, there is no equality. In contrast, in the monotheistic cultures, Man is separated from nature by his superiority and elected by God to have dominion over all other living things. In addition, in the West, the concept of individual human rights has developed over many centuries which weakens the idea of absolute rule by an all-powerful sovereign. The individual's interest in the West has taken on an overwhelming importance compared to the Asiatic view that advancing individual interests can be considered egotistic, irresponsible and anti-social. Therefore, in the East the emphasis is to favor group action. Historically, the theory of a virtuous emperor who makes decisions in the public interest which are followed by an obedient population has been the pattern.

Confucian Self – K. H. Pohl

Professor K. H. Pohl has pointed out that "the Confucian self is relationally self defined through social institutions and relationships, characterized by interrelatedness among family, friends, communities, countries and the universe, and is marked by a sense of mutuality, responsibility, and obligations"⁹¹. This way of looking at ethics resembles to a certain extent feminine views as distinguished from the western man's views of ethics as described above in the section entitled *Different Genders, Different Ethics*.

⁹¹ Pohl, K. H. 21-22 September, 2000. *The Confucian Tradition*. Report, Ethics for the 21st Century Expert Meeting. UNESCO Publishing. P. 15.

Thus, there are similarities between ethics in the East and in the West but there are also significant differences due to cultural differences in values.

Tu Weiming – Combine Western and Eastern Ethics

Tu Weiming suggests a way to broaden the Western enlightenment mentality when he wrote⁹²: "The modern West's dichotomous mode of thinking (spirit/matter, mind/body, physical/mental, sacred/profane, creator/creature, God/man, subject/object) is diametrically opposed to Chinese habits of the heart."

He explains that a radically different set of ethics or a new system of values different from those values growing out of the enlightenment is highly unlikely in the Western world.

However, Tu Weiming suggests trying to broaden the scope of Enlightenment values "by deepening its moral sensitivity [...] as a world view for the human community as a whole".

He underlines the "conspicuous absence of the idea of community" including the global community in Enlightenment ideals.

Although fraternity is mentioned as one of the important values of the French revolution "Freedom, Equality and Fraternity", it is not a guiding principle in modern ethical thought in the West.

The nature of Fraternity (brotherhood or sisterhood of men and women) is different from freedom and equality which are rights. Fraternity is an obligation and relates more to the idea of a good community rather than individual rights. See *Liberté, Egalité Fraternité*, in Wikipedia for the

⁹² Tu Weiming. 1998. *Family, Nation, and the World: The Global Ethic as a Modern Confucian Quest*. Carfax Publishing Ltd., Social Semiotics, Vol. 8, Nos 2/3. Tu Weiming was born in China, raised in Taiwan, educated at Harvard where he was a Professor. He has written many books including his book co-authored with Ikeda Daisaku, (2011), *New Horizons in Eastern Humanism: Buddhism, Confucianism and the Quest for Global Peace*.

origin and history of these ideas and the interpretation of these words.

He notes the modern ethics in the West tend to tolerate inequality and have faith in the self interest and “aggressive egoism”. This poisons a kinder global ethical system of global stewardship different from the enlightenment ideas.

Human Rights But Don't Forget Duties

There is much work to be done to increase the universality of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to broaden and better embrace the views of ethics in all cultures and to reinforce the idea of duties to others and the community⁹³.

We have given examples in this part which illustrate that new ethical rules need to be developed when new needs arise i.e. when the environment urgently needs protection. Ethical rules in society change in time and are different in different cultures, genders and different kinds of people in each culture.

Crusaders Killed Muslims

Many of the Crusaders were Christians who followed the ethical teaching of Saint Bernard. However, in order to recover the Holy Land, which could open to them the gates to Heaven, they killed many Jews and Muslims. They did not consider their conduct unethical.

Muslim Terrorists Kill Christians

Some Muslim extremists today seem to adopt a similar course of conduct with their Holy War, the "Jihad" against Jews, Christians and secular governments in countries with Muslim populations. History teaches us that violence, war and terrorism do not necessarily have religion since they are practiced by religious believers as well as those without

⁹³ See Franck, Thomas M. Jan./Feb. 2001. *Are Human Rights Universal?* New York, Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs.

religion. Plundering others by the powerful has often seemed easier than acquiring wealth by working. Racial hatred, social discrimination and conflicts over territory are often a contributing factor to war and violence.

Ethics In-Groups and Out-Groups

One seems to find more ethical conduct practiced among in-groups, like families and members of the same community, where ethical conduct is taught and enforced, rather than toward outsiders and foreigners. Outsiders and foreigners are often hated because they do not have the same religion or culture and are sometimes seen as trying to impose their will on a community or compete for the same territory. However, one should also note that violence within families, and sometimes among former friends or lovers, is also often encountered in our societies. Some parents by their belief and actions do great harm to their children.

In practice, ethics are respected, ignored or changed, often depending upon who one is dealing with. To have a more ethical world, situations that cause conflict will need to be eliminated so that more consistent ethical rules can be applied to everyone. "Love your enemy", so one can even treat enemies ethically, doesn't seem to be working very well, so it is better not to have enemies.

The Origins, Nature, Definitions and Development of Ethics Probably have Many Sources

For the purpose of this analysis, the source or sources of ethics whether flowing from emotion, reason, human nature or something else is less important than discovering the right rules for each case. Some solutions can evolve with time. However, since many are a product of evolution, traditional ethics could in some case be more robust than new ones we might generate.

It is interesting to note that Aristotle's writing on ethics has not become outdated as most of his scientific writing

has due to remarkable progress in science. Does this mean that there has not been much improvement in human nature and most of his ethical principles remain solid?

As we have seen from the above discussion, there are many possible sources of ethics, evolution of the humans who have survived, growing knowledge of biology, religions, public opinion in the community and culture. So it is likely that many sources have contributed to ethical conduct in different individuals up to the present.

5. DOES CONDUCT CONSIDERED ETHICAL VARY DEPENDING UPON THE TIME AND CIRCUMSTANCES OR THE CULTURE, GENDER, NATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PERSONS INVOLVED?

Environmental Ethics – A New Challenge

Beginning in the last half of the 20th Century, the human race has become aware that some of its economic activities on Earth are causing major threats to our environment, to our health and survival as well as to life on our planet.

Some scholars and businesses, but not all, have recognized their ethical duty to take action to lead society to sustainable social and economic goals where harmful economic activities are damaging to our environment.

One must recognize there is respectable and serious opinion that one aspect of the environment, i.e., global warming, is not occurring or is occurring at a non-dangerous rate. Opinion polls seem to confirm that few people in the world are worried about global warming.

This issue like much of the opinion worried about the environment seems to be a left or liberal point of view with less concern by conservatives, although top scholars are on