

Chapter 4

The Ethical Producer

Robert Allinson

Man essentially is a being who pursues meaning and love. Socrates' speech in the *Symposium* well characterizes man as driven by Love, or Eros. In one of the two greatest Platonic dialogues, the other being the *Republic*, Socrates, expounding Diotema's Ladder of Love, explains that man is driven by the erotic impulse. Socrates' speech is the culminating moment of the *Symposium*, the dialogue in which a number of famous co-temporary figures including a physician, a tragic playwright, a comic playwright and Socrates himself, inquire into the nature of erotic love.

What is not fully recognized is that Socrates' speech is not only about love and beauty. It describes man as a being whose nature is such that man is driven by Eros in pursuit of beauty. And, it describes the attainment of the experience and creation in the beautiful as definitive of the highest good that man can achieve in her or his mortal career. The drive, guided by Eros, to the experience of beauty itself and to the creation of its products, is for Plato not only an adequate or sufficient motivation for living; *it is that which alone makes life worth living in the first place.*

It is true that in the *Republic*, Plato describes the good and not beauty as above all the Forms. The highest good in the *Republic* is Justice because he explains it belongs to the class of goods that is valued both for itself and for the results that it brings but primarily for itself. These are not exactly contradictions although they appear to be such and as such have plagued many scholars. In the sphere of interactions with one's fellow man, one should pursue what is just. In the sphere of orienting ourselves towards what is the highest experience and objective to obtain in our existence, one should aim at the experience of and creation in the beautiful. Knowing and being guided by this distinction would be an aspect of understanding the good (what is good or valuable to follow) which is why the good is placed above the other Forms. Understanding this distinction and thus knowing how it is both true that justice is the highest good and beauty alone is what gives meaning to life is wisdom. Aristotle chooses the knowledge that Plato describes in the upper part of the Divided Line as productive of the highest form of happiness for man and ethical action as the most

R. Allinson (✉)
Soka University of America, Aliso Viejo, CA, USA
e-mail: rallinson@soka.edu

sustainable form of happiness. The drive of Eros in the pursuit of beauty and its products seems to drop out of the picture for Aristotle.

Unlike his pupil Aristotle, Plato was a strong feminist. In his *Republic*, he provided equal opportunity for women including for the role of Philosophy Queen. His concept of love is one which he portrays Socrates as learning from Diotema, a female. Nowhere in her teachings does Diotema mention the concept of self-interest or maximizing profit as the essential nature of man. For Diotema/Socrates, the concept of profit does not figure in at all as the motivation for life. Plato's great student, Aristotle, argues against maximizing profit as an essential activity of humanity both in his *Nicomachean Ethics* and in his *Politics*. One reason Aristotle considers profit making wrong is because it is unjust: it advantages one man at the expense of another. One man's gain is another man's loss. Another reason he considers profit making wrong is because it misdirects man away from true human happiness. The pursuit of profit is like the pursuit of pleasure: it is a bottomless cup.

The ancient Athenians looked down on the ancient Egyptians and the Phoenicians because they loved money. The Athenians built the greatest civilization that the West has known including the Athenian Empire. They were not unfamiliar with money and trade. Plato himself came from a wealthy, aristocratic family background. And yet, they did not consider money to be the goal that should motivate human activity.

How is it possible that today, the concept of man as the rational economic man dominates the current human stage of thought? Why and how has this concept of man taken precedence over the Platonic description? What has made for the triumph of *Homo oeconomicus*? What has happened to the human race since money has vanquished beauty as the defining essence of humanity? What does it mean that Plato's ideas sound so alien to us now, so far-fetched, when to the Athenians, they made perfect sense? What does it mean that contemporary man would consider it to be absurd to define the motivating drive of the human being as being led by Eros to the pursuit of beauty when to the ancient Athenians it would be absurd to define the motivating drive of the human being as being led by the goal of the maximization of profit?

Is there a possibility that there can be a renaissance of spirituality? The Italian Renaissance was a re-birth, a re-naisance of Greek culture. The Italian Renaissance placed an incredible value on the production of beauty. The painting and sculpture of that era is unrivalled in Western civilization. Was this not a perfect illustration of Diotema's injunction to pursue the experience of beauty and to produce works of beauty? If there is to be a renaissance in the twenty-first century, we need to go back to the roots of Greek culture. What better place can we look than to the philosophy of Plato, the philosopher who was the inspiration of the Italian Renaissance, whose philosophy, according to Alfred North Whitehead, the teacher of my teacher, Charles Hartshorne, created such a rich philosophy that all philosophy that was to come afterwards was, "a series of footnotes to the philosophy of Plato".

It must be remembered that Eros for Plato was not Agape. Love for the Greeks was not to be identified with compassion. Love for the Greeks is Eros. Eros begins with the sexual impulse and as one develops in life one ascends on Diotema's ladder

to the love of Beauty itself and the creation of its products. But, it is nowhere depicted as compassion. Ethical action is taken care of under the form of justice.

For Aristotle, one is directed to become just by performing just acts. Compassion is not called upon. Ethics is not neglected. For Aristotle, ethical action is the defining sustainable essence of mankind. But, for this purpose, the Greeks did not need compassion. The concept of noble actions was for the Greeks the defining essence of humanity. It is not out of a pity for the suffering of others that one acts. It is from a sense that man's nature is to be aware of the fulfillment of her or his nature as an ethical being and to perform ethical acts.

For Aristotle, the majority of mankind could find satisfaction and could only find satisfaction in performing noble deeds. For Plato, this would not be sufficient. For Plato, the ultimate experience is the experience of beauty and the creative production that beauty inspires. In neither case is profit a motivator. In fact, in his *Republic*, Plato removed profit altogether from his guardians (soldiers and police) and his rulers. For the mass of citizens he sets a limit that the most that anyone can accumulate cannot exceed five times the amount of the poorest citizen.

All of Western civilization admires the Athenians. The Golden Age of the Greeks is considered the high water mark of Western culture. And yet, we have moved far away from its value system. How can we admire the Athenians and at the same time proclaim that their two great philosophers have misdirected mankind? Is this not a kind of intellectual schizophrenia? Their goals are what inspired their achievements. Is there not a way in which we can once more become comfortable with the goals they set for humankind? If not, it is not likely that we can rival their achievements.

From Consumer to Producer

There is no question that man's most dominant appetite is hunger and that in that sense one could characterize man as the rational eating man. But, this would be recognized as an immature definition since satisfying hunger pangs is not sufficient to define the entire nature of man. The reason for this is that first of all man has other desires and that the desires for erotic satisfaction and meaning satisfaction better characterize the behavior of man once his or her appetite for food has been satisfied. Indeed, one's pleasure in eating is increased when one can share one's dinner with another and so satisfying simple hunger by eating is an insufficient characterization of the satisfaction of the appetite of hunger.

Of course, there are those who point to man as driven by a need for power and fame. But, as Aristotle has famously argued in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, as his teacher Plato argued before him in the *Republic*, power and fame are but means to an end, not so much the end of happiness of which Aristotle spoke in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, but the end that life will have been considered worthwhile or meaningful in the end. In the end, the need for meaning and value are the most powerful drives that motivate mankind. One satisfies the need for meaning and value in two essential ways. Both of these ways of satisfying the need for meaning and value are the result of following the impulse of love. One way is through seeking and accepting

the love that one can be given by others and the other is by giving the love one feels to others. But, these two ways are but two sides of the same coin. The way of receiving is the way of receiving the emotional support of others for one's own being and the approval of others for producing goods and services that serve others' authentic needs. The way of giving is through providing emotional support to others for their being and the production of beneficial goods and services for oneself and for others for one's own and for others' welfare. This production of beneficial goods and services can be for the sake of obtaining love and also can serve as an end in itself as in the products of art. This is no different from the characterization of man by Diotema except that the ultimate goal which drives man's activities is not so much the experience of beauty as it is for Diotema, as it is in the production of beauty. Ultimately, Eros or love is the most accurate description of man's nature as her or his nature is only satisfied in acts of love whether in receiving love from oneself or others as receiving love is also an act of love, or in giving love to oneself or others in the form of producing beneficial goods and services for oneself or others. The practice of accepting love in terms of accepting the emotional support of oneself or others validates the giving of oneself or others. The practice of providing emotional support to oneself and others validates the being of others and also provides motivation to the others.

To shorten our purposes, one may structure this essay to concentrate on the acceptance and the provision of beneficial goods and services to others. This depiction may be more acceptable to our current, utilitarian bent of mind than to focus on the beautiful per se. In so doing, we may consider that it is an ugly matter that human beings exist in the state of poverty and dire need. What would be beautiful would be to see all human beings in the state of fully meeting their needs and realizing their potentials. In the end, it would come to the same thing. But, for the purposes of our discussion, we may focus on the concept of the beneficial rather than the beautiful. When we do this we may keep in mind that a harmonious and therefore beautiful world is one in which there are no ugly spots. In this way, we can accomplish the experience of and the production of the beautiful, but in a way that is more amenable to today's utilitarian sensibilities. Once the beauty of what is produced becomes apparent to all, one may be able to move up another rung on our new ladder from the level of benefit to the experience of and the production of the beautiful.

One could argue that when one satisfies Eros that man finds happiness and that therefore happiness is the ultimate goal of man. But, despite Aristotle's surpassingly fine arguments, as he himself argues, happiness is too abstract a description to characterize the nature of humanity. Further, to the mind of the present author, to argue that happiness is the ultimate goal is to confuse the effect of following the proper goals of man with its cause, which is the following of the proper goals of man. Aristotle argues that "happiness" is too abstract a term and that it must be ultimately exchanged for just acts, but nonetheless his emphasis on the concept of happiness as that which is pursued for its own sake has misled readers ever since to focus on achieving happiness as the final goal and not the acts which lead to it.

The cause of happiness is the expression of the nature of man in the receiving and giving of beneficial goods and services to oneself and to others. Happiness is the effect or the natural result of receiving and giving through the production of beneficial goods and services. It is the production of beneficial goods and services that satisfies the need for Eros. To say that happiness satisfies the need for Eros is not precise. It is only through the production of beneficial goods and services that one reaches happiness. Eros is thus only satisfied through the production of beneficial goods and services. *If one characterizes the nature of humanity as driven by Eros to ultimately produce beneficial goods and services for other human beings, one possesses a more specific and a more accurate description of the nature of man.* It could be said that the production of goods and services are only a means to obtain happiness, but the happiness that is so obtained offers an imprecise and non-comprehensive description of the nature of man. In addition, to say that happiness is the end-goal of man is not to say how that happiness is to be obtained. It is more accurate and more fully descriptive of man's nature to say that while happiness is the natural result of the activity of producing beneficial goods and services, that the goal of man's endeavor is the production of the beneficial goods and services and not the good feeling that is thereby gained from the production. *To say that happiness is the end-goal of man is to mistake a natural result of an activity for the activity that satisfies the essential nature of man.* To say that happiness is the end-goal of man is to mistake the effect of carrying out the activity for the cause or the motivation for the activity, which is to satisfy the essential nature of man. Such a good feeling might some day be capable of being produced by electrical or chemical means and cannot therefore characterize the essential nature of man.

The production of goods and services is ultimately the way in which man satisfies her or his higher desire for meaning in life and thus demonstrates that man is primarily not an economic animal but a philosophical animal. One could say with Aristotle that one satisfies one's essential nature through the performance of ethical acts and it would not be false to say this. However, this too, is too vague a description. To say that one satisfies one's essential nature through the production of beneficial (or ethical) goods and services both includes the performance of ethical acts and specifies some means through which one can perform ethical acts that satisfies not only the nature of man to give but also the nature of man to receive. One means of expression of receiving love in the act of producing beneficial goods and services is the act of receiving a financial reward. Another means of the expression of receiving love in the act of producing beneficial goods and services is the satisfaction taken in seeing that one's production of beneficial goods and services has advantaged a disadvantaged population.

The activity of producing beneficial goods and services takes precedence over the consumption of goods and services, because if one focuses on the consumption of goods and services one thereby focuses on the appetite of hunger rather than the appetite of love. The appetite, or better expressed, the desire for love is a more basic motivation than the appetite for hunger since man will pursue love once her or his needs for food are satisfied and will not rest content with the satisfaction of the appetite of hunger. But once the needs of love are most completely satisfied through

the production of beneficial goods and services, man will not pursue another goal. It could be said that man may attempt to satisfy other higher desires such as the need for family, social, religious, intellectual or aesthetic satisfaction. To say this would of course be true. However, one must focus on how one satisfies these other higher desires or needs. Ultimately, these higher desires are more completely satisfied when one is involved in the activity of producing them than in consuming them. To be a lover is to experience love on a higher level and to love on a higher level than to be a beloved. This is Diotema's message but for somewhat different reasons. One is satisfied on a higher level when performing a noble deed than in being the recipient of one. This properly coincides with the fact that doing a charitable deed is a nobler act than receiving its benefits. One is more satisfied in the carrying out of a religious injunction than one is in listening to a sermon, which enjoins one to conduct oneself in a noble way.

In the case of certain exceptional experiences such as extraordinary aesthetic experiences, the difference between giving and receiving or producing and consuming becomes narrower. This is in light of the fact that in higher order aesthetic experiences, the recipient experiences the same inner state of the artist when the artist produced the artistic work and thus is virtually on the same level as the artist when the artist was involved in the act of production. It could be argued that such elevated pleasure is nonetheless a species of consumption rather than production. However, such consumption does not reduce the good that is consumed, but makes it more available to be shared with others and in this respect has more in common with production rather than consumption *simpliciter*. The listener of Mozart's *Requiem* may become so enraptured that she or he encourages others to listen with her or him. Her or his pleasure grows even more when she or he is in the chorus or orchestra and is involved as an active producer of the music. In fact, it should be noted that these exceptional aesthetic experiences gain by being shared so that one achieves a higher satisfaction when attending a musical performance with others than when one listens to music by oneself.

How and why aesthetic pleasure is produced is a separate question that requires a separate treatment. Suffice it to say for the present that the more comprehensive the harmony and thereby the disharmony that is resolved, the greater the pleasure. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is great and produces great pleasure because it "resolves" the greatest of disharmonies, the disharmony of injustice and is inclusive of all points of view including the most murderous, the most bawdy and the most elevated. This is true even of ostensibly disharmonious works such as Picasso' cubist paintings since their level of organized disharmony is harmonious while at the same time "resolving" or giving objective form to and thereby validating the social disequilibrium felt by the artist. The artist can transcend external chaos by giving it artistic expression and thereby transforming chaos into order. The aesthetic criterion of harmony can be applied to the good in that the world is in harmony when all of its parts, man and nature are productive and flourishing. The resolution of the ugly and disharmonious state of the world with its oceans polluted by poisonous chemicals, its forests laid bare, its peoples with their children's swollen bellies crying out in hunger, would bring about a beauty unparalleled.

It could be said that the *description of man as the producer* is a recognition that *creativity is the fundamental activity of mankind and the fundamental aspect of the phenomenon of Eros*. Ultimately human beings wish not only to produce beneficial goods and services, but also to create goods and services, which implies that the ultimate wish of humanity is to create new beneficial goods and services rather than to simply reproduce existent beneficial goods and services. Thus, the most accurate description of the human being is that man is essentially the innovative animal or the entrepreneur. If, however, one simply states that man is the entrepreneurial animal, one may miss out of the ultimate purpose of entrepreneurship which is the production of beneficial goods and services for human beings and especially disadvantaged human beings, not simply the creation of new businesses as an end in itself. Novelty provides satisfaction because it satisfies the creative desires of Eros. When the new goods and services can provide an improvement to humanity, the higher desires of Eros are even more satisfied. This improvement can take the form of wider distribution of beneficial goods and services, a more equitable distribution of beneficial goods and services or a higher quality of the beneficial goods and services that one produces. Advances in medicine and nutrition are obvious examples that improve the lot of mankind.

However, if it is argued that the production of beneficial goods and services or the innovation and improvement of beneficial goods and services best describes the nature of humanity, it could be argued that all such activity is for the sake of obtaining meaning and value in life so that the urge or the need for meaning and value is the ultimate motivating force in life. While this is not incorrect, it is too limited a description as it does not reveal *how* one is to obtain this meaning and value. Thus, the description of man as a philosophical animal, while a correct description, and a description, which leads one in the right direction, is also incomplete. It also runs the danger of identifying one's life activities with purely intellectual activities, which are congruent with isolated intellectual contemplation. If such contemplation takes place apart from the production of beneficial goods and services, such as the writing of books or teaching, it cannot satisfy the nature of man.

In the end, the best description of the nature of man is that man is ultimately driven by Eros to be a creator and producer of goods and services that serve the whole of mankind by providing a better and more beautiful way of life. While "better" could be specified more fully in terms of being more labor saving, more ethical, more equitable, less harmful to the planet, more supportive of continuing a quality life on the planet and so on, such a specification is to be understood, otherwise one's definition will become too bulky. The element of beauty must be included since the production of purely utilitarian goods and services does not satisfy the nature of man. With this new definition of man, since the outcome of the production of goods and services is to create a better way of life, the need to continue to describe such goods and services as "beneficial" is not necessary as it is already understood in such a definition. Both the terms "creator" and "producer" are to be used because "creator" calls attention to the need to produce new and genuinely better products and services while "producer" must be retained since some of the nature of man will be satisfied in the production of goods and services for others. Such an essential

definition of man may be taken to be the most accurate specification of the operation of Eros in the life of man. It is to be understood that the life of creating goods and services for the welfare of others, especially deprived and deserving others, is the only way in which a sense of lasting meaningfulness can be gained in life. Thus, the ultimate purpose of following the urges of Eros is the obtainment of lasting meaning and value. However, as is said above, the description of man as the philosophical animal will be too abstract. Thus, while it is to be understood that man is driven by Eros to find ultimate meaning and ultimate value, such a description is too vague to be useful. The most accurate description of the nature of man which explains how man is driven by Eros and how man obtains meaning is given by the definition offered above.

The Origin of the Concept of the Rational Economic Man

If all of the above is the case, how is it that the concept of man as the Rational Economic Man has come to be accepted as a correct description of the essential nature of man? The concept of man as the Rational Economic man is a characterization of man that comes closest to describing man in terms of hunger rather than in terms of love. The model of the Rational Economic Man is a model that is based on fear rather than a model that is based on Eros. It is a model that recognizes that man is driven by hunger in that the appetite for money is essentially an appetite for the means to provide for a more secure and comfortable survival and is essentially a motivation based on fear, a fear of not having enough to ensure a secure and comfortable survival. The adding on to the concept of the pursuit of money the concept of a maximization of profit, that is, the pursuit of as much money as possible, is an indication of a greater degree of fear. One never knows how much money will be necessary to ensure one's secure and comfortable survival. Of course, it can be said that some large amount is surely enough and such an explanation of the maximization of profit in terms of satisfying the needs of hunger is therefore not completely accurate.

In order to fully explain the description of the maximization of profit one needs not only to appeal to hunger as an ultimate motivator, but to greed as well. Greed, however, when properly analyzed, reveals itself to be a mixture of hunger and fear. This still does not seem to be enough, because such a definition that includes hunger and fear still does not seem to account for the behavior of such multi-billionaires that continue their quest to make more and more money. While it could be said that greed has no limits and thus approach an explanation of this phenomenon in this fashion, it could also be explained in terms of a lack of having pursued the correct goals in the first place. If the multi-billionaire pursues the making of more and more wealth as a means of obtaining meaning in life, then this would explain the continuing of such behavior as the need for obtaining meaning cannot be satisfied by such behavior, and thus would explain why such behavior does not come to an end. If the multi-billionaire were to understand the real motivation behind his or her behavior, he or she would put an end to the endless acquisition of wealth and would pursue meaning in some other forms. This is occasionally noted when the multi-billionaire becomes

a philanthropist. Such behavior is inexplicable from the standpoint of the description of the nature of man as the rational economic animal.

How does what has been said above apply to macroeconomics? With respect to the situation of the world today, it may well be said that the two major understandings of economics that have been attempted on a large scale have both resulted in failures. The first of these systems is that of capitalism; the second of these systems is that of the planned economy or the welfare state. Capitalism, usually described as market economics, which is but one aspect of capitalism, is based on the model of profit maximization, which has proved itself to be a failure in two major ways. First of all, and most primarily, capitalism on a world scale has not ameliorated the way of life for a huge portion of the world's population, which lives in woeful economic conditions. Secondly, capitalism seems inevitably to result in the business cycle. When the mass of economic agents in the developed countries buy or sell products purely for the sake of making profit without regard to whether such activity produces sound economic conditions, inflation and ultimately a bubble economy is produced. Such a bubble must eventually burst and thus a cycle of depression ensues. The most unfortunate aspect of the business cycle, which is the inevitable result of market economics is that when a market no longer exists for the goods and services that can be produced, then an artificial market must be created for goods and services. Due perhaps to a combination of the lack of demand, a limitation of imagination, fear and the desire for domination, the market that is normally created is the market for military goods and services. In order to create a market for military goods and services, the condition of the world must be changed from the condition of peace to the condition of war. This is not to say that mankind purposely creates wars in order to alter economic conditions, but rather that economic conditions created by a depressed economy are conditions which are ameliorated in the short term by the production stimulated by war. Therefore, economic conditions can create a favorable environment for the development of war.

Both of these problems, the inability to care for the underdeveloped world and the inevitable consequence of the business cycle and its unfortunate corollary of war, are the result of following the model of man as the rational economic animal in which profit is pursued with regard to maximization without regard to whether the goods and services produced are really productive of social value. Capitalism, or market economics can thus be said to be a failed system.

The opposite of capitalism or market economics is a planned economy with a welfare state. This system has also proved to be a failure. When practiced on a national scale, an economy cannot be solely planned to achieve social benefits for that nation or the underdeveloped world, because it must participate in the world economy, which is a market economy. Thus, there has never been a trial of a world planned economy or a world welfare state. As a result, planned economies such as state socialisms or state capitalisms suffer from the same defects as market economies (the lack of care of undeveloped nations and the business cycle). These defects, however, are not due to the defectiveness of planned economies; they are due to the fact that the world is based on a market economy.

Apart from these defects, however, planned economies and their welfare states have proved to be failures within their national boundaries. It appears as if the

planned economies with mixed socialist and capitalist systems result in economies that are inefficient. Unemployment and budget deficits seem to be the ultimate result of the attempt to put planned economies into operation. In the end, even in more heavily weighted capitalist states, the aspects of the states that are planned, e.g., pension systems, eventually are at risk because they become economically unfeasible to support. In addition, if such pension systems are funded by unethical economics, they too are doomed to fail when the greater economic system of which they are a part fails.

The planned economy suffers from the same defect as the unplanned or market economy in that it is also based on the concept that man is a rational economic animal. The only difference is that there is an attempt in the planned economy to decide what goods and services man should produce and more of an attempt to take care of man when man is no longer capable of producing goods and services. But, the model of man as a consumer has not fundamentally changed. The system itself possesses some improvements but its philosophy has not been properly explicated.

It is not completely fair to be as critical of the planned economy as one is of the unplanned economy since the world's economy is not a planned economy in the proper sense. While, with this proviso in mind, it nonetheless could be said that the internal failure of planned economies and welfare states is at least partially due to the view of man that does not take into sufficient account the role of profit in the motivation for behavior. If within the planned economy, one is still motivated by profit making, a tension is present which cannot be completely resolved. One cannot satisfactorily plan an ethical economy which is still based in part on a set of motivations which are motivated by profit making. Thus, it can be said that the failure of planned economies and welfare states is the lack of an ethical or spiritual component in the expectation of economic behavior. For, if an ethical or spiritual component is included, as in the production of goods and services that enhance the value of all of mankind, then a motivation has been included for the production of goods and services that does not depend solely upon a profit reward. But, if the profit motive is simply removed without being replaced with a different incentive, then an insufficient motivation has been supplied for economic behavior. What is needed is a motivation that is in not a state of dialectical tension with the ethical goals of the overall planned economy.

The solution to the problem of what kind of macro-economic system to employ cannot be fully realized until the institution of the nation-state has been replaced by a world system. Until such a time, it is appropriate to attempt to function with the market economy system in terms of interacting with a global market, but to work towards the elimination of artificial markets and to work towards the production of goods and services that fulfill genuine human and constructive human needs or create new genuine and constructive needs to be fulfilled. On the level of a nation-state or a union of nation-states into larger units, the construction of semi-planned economies or partial welfare states must also be contemplated. The failure of such mixed systems in the past is at least in part due to the lack of supply of a sufficiently motivating model of contrasting human behavior to replace the "rational" economic model of human behavior.

Man as the Guardian of the Planet

Ultimately, the model of man as the producer of goods and services that benefit all of mankind will be the only model that will be conducive to world survival. One must utilize this model to underlie existing systems and build new systems that rely upon this model for their motivational support. Rather than the image of man as the Ultimate Consumer or the Maximizer of Profit, the planet can only survive with the model of man as the Guardian or Trustee of the Planet. This model does not rule out the result (not the pursuit) of profit for the individual for the individual is part of the planet of which she or he is the trustee. Thus, all behavior need not be altruistic.

It is important to understand the idea of profit in a good sense. First of all, when one is considering profit, one is not considering making more money than someone else or winning over someone else. Making profit must be a win-win situation. For example, suppose there are two restaurants in competition for customers. One way in which both can win is for both to be open at different days, hours (sharing the optimal days, hours equally). In this fashion, managers and employees of the different restaurants also gain in terms of having more time off.

Secondly, one must consider one's intentions. One's intentions for example may be to express one's creativity in cooking and to share one's ideas of nutrition and good taste with others. This would be an example of a spiritual motivation. Spiritual need not only be understood in the sense of being abstemious or religious. It can be understood in the sense of wanting to express signature strengths and wanting to create beauty. What is absent is the material motivation, that is, to increase one's material goods. When profit is realized, it is as a side-effect, not as a result of an intention. One's goal is not to make money. One's goal is to express one's signature strengths (say, a talent for cooking or music) and at the same time increase the quality of life for humankind. The advantage of this spiritual economics is that it removes the materialistic motivations and thus creates an avenue for the ethical man to replace the economic man.

The proviso for the endorsement of profit making is that it is the result of the production of beneficial goods and services that do not create disvalue. On the other hand, all behavior need not be based on the market conditions of supply and demand. One can work towards producing genuinely needed and productive goods and services and consuming genuinely needed and productive goods and services. For example, if one produced telephones such that everyone on the planet gained better communication, then there would be no harm in making profit from the manufacture and sale of telephones.

This is only the most rudimentary inkling of what a new economics can be like. It would require to be filled in with enormous detail such as a limit on the absolute ceiling of wealth acquisition by an individual or a corporation (thus incorporating a feature of a planned economy) and worldwide systems for taking care of the needs of the elderly and the infirm to mention only a few, salient details. However, such details are plainly derivative from the basic principles of a system, and once the basis of a system has been fully understood and appreciated, it will be natural to consider what specific measures need to be implemented.

In the meantime, the task that must occupy the present is how to more fully develop the idea that a new definition of economics can be elaborated. In other words, how can one take the definition of man as has been elaborated above and apply it to a strict definition of economics. The concept of man as a rational economic man is incomplete and inaccurate as has been demonstrated above. However, the above definition of man as being driven by Eros to be a creator and producer of goods and services that serve mankind by providing a better and more beautiful way of life is too philosophical to be completely useful to the economist and in any case is not specific enough to provide a concrete definition of economic behavior for the layman to follow. In what follows below an attempt will be made to specify a definition of economics, which is based on this philosophical definition of man. *The attempt is to replace the view of man as dominated by rational self-interest which provides a philosophical justification for the profit motive.* If one removes the concept of rational self-interest which is a euphemism for maximization of profit, one no longer has a philosophical foundation for economic behavior that ultimately harms oneself, others, future generations and the planet at large. The first step is to provide a philosophical foundation for ethical economic behavior. Once this is in place, the details of how to put such motivations into practice can be developed. The foundation is needed first. Without such a foundation, even well meaning systems such as welfare states, may founder.

Up until now the world has been dominated by the Smithian concept of self-interest as the foundation of the good of mankind. But, there has been no proof that this concept is viable. No one has seen any evidence of the Invisible Hand. There has been no logical argument or empirical evidence to suggest that profit making for the individual ultimately conduces to the good of mankind. In fact, there is evidence that the gap between rich and poor is widening. This would imply that while the poor may seem better off than before, they cannot be because the cost of valuable goods and services are further removed from their purchase power. In fact, a close examination of Smith's works shows that in order for his concept of "rational" self-interest to flourish, a gap between poor and rich must always exist. In Book V, Part II of his *Wealth of Nations*, Smith writes, "Wherever there is great property, there is great inequality. For one very rich man, there must be at least five hundred poor, and the affluence of the few supposes the indigence of the many. . . . It is only under the shelter of the civil magistrate that the owner of that valuable property . . . can sleep a single night in security." While it may well be that Smith was not happy with this state of affairs, the problem is that it is a necessary state of affairs under the economic system of capitalism. Smith himself acknowledges this. One need only analyze the idea of profit to see how it is a necessary truth. If one man's profit is another man's loss, then for a man to obtain very great wealth, it must come at the expense of his fellow men. It has to come from somewhere. As Smith as said, "the affluence of the few supposes the indigence of the many".

The rational economic man, the human, who, as soon as she or he divines what is in her or his self-interest, acts to maximize that interest, is a model of the human being that demands to be superseded. While it may describe some or even the majority of human beings, the question is, is it an accurate description of the deepest

nature of human beings? The answer to this question as given above, is no. If it is objected that such a model of man is nearly all pervasive, and how can it possibly be nearly all pervasive unless it is accurate, the answer can only be that human beings, by and large, have become victims, so to speak, of Adam Smith's concept that all human beings are selfish creatures. Once nearly everyone on earth thought that the earth was flat. It certainly appeared to be flat. However, that everyone thought that the earth was flat and that it looked flat did not make it flat. There is such a thing as a self-fulfilling prophecy. We need to move on from Adam Smith. And, a new view of man will in turn prompt new behavior.

Is endless consumption to be equated with rationality? Why is it rational to pursue the goal of endless consumption? One does not thereby obtain personal happiness and one does not thereby improve the lot of the plant and its inhabitants. On what basis, then, is this a definition of rational economic behavior? Is it rational to pursue a goal, which is compatible with, if not a cause of internal dissatisfaction and the widening of the gap between the haves and the have-nots? Is it rational to pursue a goal that is compatible with if not the contributing cause of the general deterioration of the life systems of the planet and the general aesthetic environment? Is it rational to pursue a goal that is compatible with if not the contributing cause of selfish behavior? When profit-making is the main goal of life, one ultimately is driven to compete against each other for a finite supply of desired goods and services. As a result, the consequences of a life driven by competition for a finite supply of goods and services is an unethical life.

It is clear that by defining the rational economic man as the man who pursues the maximizing of profit that one is identifying rationality with selfishness. Is it rational to be selfish? If it is rational to be selfish, then this also entails that one believes that the nature of mankind is to be selfish and thereby greedy. If the nature of man is selfish and greedy, then it follows that it may be rational to attempt to satisfy that nature of selfishness and greed with the maximization of profit. But, it is important to recognize that the equation of rational economic behavior with the maximization of profit is based on a view of man that man is inherently selfish and greedy. It not only is based on such a view of man; the belief in and the acting out of this concept tends to produce such a human being. If one is motivated by attempting to gain for oneself and one's family the most goods and services possible, it is inevitable that one will be in competition with one's neighbor or neighboring country. Instead of being driven to share with one another, one will be inevitably distrustful of one another since one would imagine that each other person is also motivated by taking as much as possible for themselves. The result of being motivated by personal gain is that one is distrustful of the motives of other human beings. This places family relations, friendship with fellow man and fellow nations at extreme peril. The notion of the rational economic man is a recipe for distrust and unethical relations. Such is the power of a philosophical concept.

If we alter our philosophical conceptions, we will have paved the way towards altering our economic behavior. This in turn can conduce to improving ethical relations among family, friends and nation states. What better goal can we have than this? It is difficult to argue that men should be kind to each other while holding onto

the paradigm of increasing one's personal profits. It creates a tension that is difficult if not impossible to resolve. A more efficient method to alter economic behavior is to replace the philosophical concept of the human being as selfish with the philosophical concept of the human being as a seeker and creator of beauty. Proper economic and ethical behavior will follow from this return to Plato's definition of the human being.

The paradigm of the "rational" economic man is one, which suggests that the fundamental human motivation is self-aggrandizement, or to translate this into business terms, the maximization of profit. If one considers that profit is the accumulation of money, then it becomes evident that the pursuit of monetary accumulation is ultimately an activity of consumption, because when one accumulates, one is storing for consumption whether real or symbolic. But, this means that human beings are ultimately defined as consumers. However, this cannot be the case. Consumption is a means, not an end. One consumes in order to survive, but survival is not an end in itself. One survives in order to do something, to accomplish something, to make the world a better place when one leaves it than one found it when one entered it, not in order to continue the activity of consumption.

Perhaps, the current dominance of the concept of consumption over production is due to the over-emphasis on fear as a dominating motivator for humankind. The influence of Darwin's concepts of the struggle for survival and the survival of the fittest cannot be overestimated. The economic parallel to this is the idea of economic competition, a version of Hobbes' "war of everyman against everyman" and the accumulation of profit so as to guard against future contingencies. This attitude is based on fear: fear of others and fear of the future in a society in which no one can be trusted since every man is out for himself at the expense of every other man.

After all, money-making may be understood as the economic counterpart of hunger. One consumes in order to satisfy hunger, a drive which is necessary for survival. The motivation of love, the desire to satisfy others and in turn also win their approval, has not yet arisen. We are, as a society, still in a state of infancy in terms of psychological development. We are all in the condition of the infant whose every need cries out to be satisfied. But, infancy is an inappropriate model for a mature civilization. Parenthood or guardian hood is the model appropriate for guiding and directing social development. Parenthood is a state in which we produce and provide for others. Infancy is a state in which we consume for ourselves. Spiritual economics is simply another way of saying that human beings need to have an adult philosophy to guide their lives.

Moving into the model of spiritual economics is to understand humankind as a family of man. Trust replaces mistrust as the attitude one takes towards others and towards one's future. Of course, this requires the redirection of economic resources as a result of the redirection of the intentionality of the human being. What is important to note is that the fruit of such a redirection of both intentionality and resources is a state of trust among mankind. Such a result is a major alteration in human development. Competition is replaced by cooperation. This is the mature phase of humanhood.

The Primacy of Production over Consumption

All human beings want to leave their mark on the world; they want to make the world a better place to be than when they entered the world. All human beings want to change the world, to make it a better place. But, to change the world, to make it a better place is to produce something, not to consume something. All human beings are essentially producers, not consumers. Of course, there is the example of the Garden of Eden where fruit can be eaten from the trees. But in general, one needs to perform some labor to produce some product such as a fishing hook and fishing line to catch fish, before one can consume. From the standpoint of economics, production is the primary activity; consumption can only take place after production has occurred. *One must produce first in order to have something to consume. Production, not consumption, is the fundamental economic activity.*

Production is also the fundamental philosophical activity. If one sorts activities in terms of their value for the general meaning of life, it becomes apparent that the depiction of the human being as essentially a consumer is to mistake the means for the end. A penultimate end of the human being is survival. Survival takes precedence over consumption as an end-goal of life since from the standpoint of biology; one consumes in order to survive. One does not survive in order to consume. Such a truth finds its expression in the popular saying, one eats in order to live; one does not live in order to eat. If one lived in order to eat, one would be mistaking the means of life for its end. From a philosophical standpoint, that is, from a standpoint, which inquired into the meaning of actions, such an inversion of reality would be pointless and futile. Hence, maximizing consumption cannot be a defining formula of human motivation. One would only need as much consumption as was required to live; there would be no point to maximize consumption indefinitely.

Furthermore, it was said earlier that survival was a penultimate goal of existence; survival itself cannot be a sufficient motivation for living. For survival only entails that life, with all of its pain and suffering, both physical and mental, be preserved. But, for what end? To what purpose? With all the suffering and injustice that human beings must undergo, it cannot be that the ultimate purpose of life is to simply continue on to experience and witness birth, sickness, loneliness, meaninglessness, failure, humiliation, betrayal, loss, rejection, aging, infirmity and ultimately, solitary death. A life the end goal of which was simply survival would be totally unconscious, masochistic or absurd. Human beings are meaning craving animals. One's life can be rendered meaningful only if it can serve in some way to ameliorate the suffering that is humankind's lot. Production of means through which the alleviation of the suffering of life can be furthered is the only sufficient motivation that can sustain one throughout one's mortal career.

If the human being is made *imago Dei*, and G-d is ultimately the Creator, then the way in which human beings imitate G-d is through creative, productive activity and not through the activity of consumption. If it is true that we are made in the image of our creator, then we should imitate our creator just as we desire that our children imitate our good behavior. We cannot create the world. But, we can create a better world.

It can be shown that even in the most conventional formulas of economics that underneath the categorization of the human being as a consumer one can discover that the underlying economic activity of the human being is production and essentially a production of economic values, that is social goods and services. The satisfaction or happiness or fulfillment of the human being lies in the production of satisfying goods and services that contribute to the greater welfare of human beings as a whole. That human beings receive profit for their production of these goods and services is an additional satisfaction, but it does not and cannot be the underlying reason for economic activity for such a description would result in a human life the whole purpose of which was to survive which as is stated above is either futile and/or absurd.

In order to show that ultimately human beings are producers and producers of social value, one may examine some standard definitions of economics that appear in arguably the most famous and influential textbook of economics in the United States. For the purposes of this examination, one may make reference to the work of Paul A. Samuelson, the economist who revolutionized economics at MIT and together with Robert Solow, turned MIT into the institution that best embodied mainstream economic thought for some three decades. The gifted Samuelson, though firmly in the Keynesian camp, was able to unite a century's worth of economic insights into a single, coherent theory – the neo-classical synthesis – that dominated economic discourse from the 1950s through the 1980s. His textbook provided the basic education in economics of the present author among many others. Samuelson offers six definitions of economics all of which are considered by him to be representative and thus presumably satisfactory. The first definition of economics that is given by Samuelson is the following. “Economics is the study of those activities that involve production and exchange among people.” (Samuelson and Nordhaus, 1980: p. 4)

The first definition possesses the comparative advantage of listing production as one of the primary economic activities rather than consumption. Exchange is listed as the other primary economic activity as well it should since it reflects the fact that any individual person is finite and needs to exchange what she or he produces in order to gain a more complete set of goods and services. The first definition possesses the further comparative advantage of referring to people as the obvious agents of economic transactions without whom economic transactions would make no sense, as there would be no one to produce goods or services and no one to exchange them and no one to receive them. It all but comes out and states that economics cannot be defined without a reference to social values or needs. However, without an explicit reference to the fulfillment of social needs or the creation of social value, it is incomplete as a definition of economics since it does not refer to the motivation or end-purpose of economic endeavors. By referring to production and exchange a glimmer of the mechanisms of economic activity is offered. It lacks a reference to a motivation for the production and the exchange of goods and services and that motivation is to enhance the quality of life for both the individual producer and the other.

The second definition offered is: “Economics analyzes movements in the overall economy – trends in prices, output, and unemployment. Once such phenomena are understood, economics helps develop the policies by which governments can affect the overall economy.” (Samuelson and Nordhaus, 1980: p. 4) This definition loses some of the advantages of the first definition by making the reference to the producers of goods and services and the recipients of economic transactions nearly non-existent. However, its reference to unemployment is unwittingly people oriented. Everyone psychologically fears unemployment and the use of this word in a sentence makes it strikingly apparent that it is people who would be unemployed. It also possesses the unique advantage of referring to the behavior of governments since government monetary policy, for example, obviously effects human economic behavior. However, how and why movements in economy take place remains shrouded in mystery and hence this definition is perhaps even less adequate than the first definition which at least makes reference to production and exchange.

The third definition offered is: “Economics is the science of choice. It studies how people choose to use scarce or limited productive resources (land, labor, equipment, technical knowledge) to produce various commodities (such as wheat, beef, overcoats, concerts, roads, missiles) and distribute these goods to various members of society for their consumption.” (Samuelson and Nordhaus, 1980: p. 4) This definition is without doubt the best so far. Like the first definition, an explicit reference is made to people as both the producers and the distributors of economic actions. The mentioning of specific commodities such as overcoats makes it very obvious that economics is involved in providing value for people and by extension possesses social value and for the same reason is involved in fulfilling social needs without which it would serve no purpose whatsoever and in fact would not possess any reason for being in the first place. By making explicit reference to the example of concerts, this definition of economics makes it very clear that economics cannot be defined without reference to higher values, that is, values that are not simply survival values. It only lacks an explicit reference to the function of economics as a provider of social needs and a creator of social value to be more complete on the ethical side of economic activity and an explicit reference to the basic forms of economic activity such as capital investment, labor, rent and trade to be more complete on the business side of economic activity. It is important because it highlights the element of choice. Economics is not the study of the behavior of human beings governed by some conditioning forces. It is not the study of economic laws that human beings follow willy-nilly. It is the study of the choices that human beings make. And, to modify Samuelson, it can become the rationale and the outline of the choices that human beings can make.

The fourth definition of economics that is given is the following: “Economics is the study of how human beings go about the business of organizing consumption and production activities.” (Samuelson and Nordhaus, 1980: p. 4) This definition possesses the advantages of the first and the third definitions of explicitly referring to people or human beings. It also possesses the distinct advantage of referring to

business, thus displaying the important feature of economics that economics cannot be defined without reference to buying and selling, renting or trading. The mention of consumption and production is advantageous because it only requires a moment's thought to realize that it is human beings who need to consume and benefit from consumption and that consumption cannot take place without production (of either goods, services or labor). It is incomplete on the business side since the mere mention of production does not offer a hint as to the mechanisms of production.

The fifth definition that is given is the following: "Economics is the study of money, interest rates, capital, and wealth." (Samuelson and Nordhaus, 1980: p. 4) While this would seem to be the most technically correct definition so far and resembles in this way the technical though limited correctness of the fourth definition while possessing the obvious advantage of economy of expression, it possesses the disadvantage of concealing that it is people who set pay scales or interest rates and people who risk or lose capital and people who accrue wealth. The reference to wealth, however, does possess the advantage of making it very obvious that economics is concerned with the creation of value. In this case it is monetary value, which is indicated. Again, some of the main instruments of the production of revenue such as manufacturing, trade, labor, rent, and sales are omitted from the definition.

The sixth and last definition offered appears to be an effort to summarize the variations of definitions that can be offered: "Economics is the study of how people and society choose to employ scarce resources that could have alternative uses in order to produce various commodities and distribute them for consumption, now or in the future, among various persons and groups in society." (Samuelson and Nordhaus, 1980: p. 4)

This summary definition possesses the advantages of comparative comprehensiveness and economy while making explicit reference to people and society, thus displaying that it is people and society who are the producers, distributors and the ultimate recipients of economic activities. It also possesses the advantage of explicitly stating that the purpose of economic activity is the production of commodities for people, thus making it abundantly evident that people are the end users of economic activities and that it is thus social needs and social values that are being filled. While none of the above definitions explicitly refer to social needs or social values, social needs and social values are implied by all the definitions of economics that are offered thus suggesting that it is impossible in principle to define economics without taking into account social needs or social values in the first place. The means of production are not referred to in this definition and thus how production and distribution take place and why they take place is not shown.

It is interesting to note that in the third and in the sixth definition offered a reference to scarce or limited resources is indicated. This most likely is the influence of the tradition of economic thought, which can be traced back to such figures as Malthus. Theoretically, one could approach economics as the study of abundant or over abundant resources. This would appear to be a question of circumstance, not principle. However, the reference to scarcity does seem to presuppose an ethical value, which is either thrift, or the value of distributive justice. The question,

which is left unstated is, how does one manage production and distribution when the resources are limited? The question seems to imply that some attention in economics must be paid to making sure that resources either do not completely run out or that they are equitably distributed. Some concern is being shown for either the future of economic pursuit or the equity of its distribution or both. In either case, the reference to scarcity seems to suggest that some ethical value is at stake even if it is only meant that the ethical value is one's egoistic survival.

It is of interest to dwell for a moment on the concept that in the past economics has been an economics of scarcity rather than an economics of abundance. (Take note for example of Samuelson's third definition of economics above). It must be kept in mind that a resource may be abundant, but unequally distributed, e.g., oil. In an economics of abundance, one must consider even more carefully the concept of what to produce, how to produce it, and how to distribute what is produced. The basic concept of an economics of scarcity is that goods and resources are scarce and therefore one must garner more and more of them for oneself. The basic concept of an economics of abundance is that goods and resources are abundant and therefore one must consider both how to distribute them more equally and to consider if they should be produced at all. If one adds to this an economy of care, one also would consider the ethics of production.

For example, if the advance of technology and the mechanization of production have now made it possible to produce an enormous quantity of soft drinks, is it appropriate to produce such a product on such a vast scale and distribute it to consumers unable to make educated choices? How does this affect the state of the teeth of the uneducated consumer? With such means of production and both the quality and the quantity of nutrients now available, is it appropriate to continue to produce more and more soft beverages? Is it appropriate to continue to produce more and more automobiles? An economics of abundance creates a different set of questions than an economics of scarcity. If automobiles are to be produced, then where should they be distributed? If automobiles are produced, one result of that production is the increase in carbon dioxide. If wooden houses are built, then one result of that production is the decrease of natural forests. With an increase of carbon dioxide and the reduction of the plant life that require carbon dioxide for their survival, the result ultimately is the raising of the temperature of the planet, the melting of the ice caps and eventually a possible flooding of the planet. The causes of these problems, e.g., global warming is a result of not attending to the economics of abundance, of over-production of certain products that are unhealthy. The focus of economic theory on the economics of scarcity takes attention away from the problems of an economics of abundance.

It seems to follow from this lengthy analysis that it would make sense to include the idea of social value and or social need in the definition of economics as well as it is important to include the mechanisms of business enterprise in order to provide a complete and accurate definition of economic activity. Any useful definition of economics should include the major forms of the production, transmission and distribution of wealth just as any complete definition of economics should make reference to the major mechanisms of wealth production. One might venture a

definition of economics, which includes a direct reference to the how of production and consumption (thus satisfying the technical needs of the definition), which at the same time refers directly to the motivation, or the end-purpose of economics in the first place. While it is certain that the following definition is by no means problem free, it possesses the advantage of making the concept of social value and the means of creating that social value explicit. Economics may be defined as “the ownership or use of capital investment, labor or land to produce a product, or to provide a service that fills some existent social need, or creates a new need to be filled, or creates some social value which generates revenue for the owner or owners without at the same time creating a disvalue which is proportionately of greater harm than the good that is produced. The more that the good or service contributes to the social value of the underdeveloped world, the greater the value of the good or service that is produced”. For a non-profit business, that portion of the definition specifying that the revenue is to be generated for the profit of the owner or owners may be omitted. This definition of economics is more user-friendly than the definitions of economics that appear above because it both explains how products or services are produced and states that such a production fills social needs (whether pre-existent or created) and fills these social needs by creating social value. It also possesses the decided advantage of making a direct reference to the production of revenue or profit without which economics could and would not exist in the first place unless one considered a pure barter economics which would create and depend upon the existence of human needs and human values, but which would not necessarily require that individuals would derive additional profit from such bartering.

Unlike all of the previous definitions of economics, it takes into account the extension of the concept of social value to the underdeveloped or the have-not world. At the same time, unlike all of the previous definitions of economics, it takes into account an economics of abundance by specifying that certain kinds of goods and services, those that represent a disvalue to the planet, are not to be produced in addition to specifying what kinds of goods and services are to be produced.

An obvious example of preventing disvalue would be not to drill for offshore oil since the possibility of the consequences for the planet being disastrous would outweigh the need for particular companies to profit. The advantage of the practice of spiritual economics in the first place is that such a consideration would have been taken into account before any drilling would have taken place.

Spiritual economics is not based on the distribution of scarce resources. Love, as the poet Dante has said, differs from material resources in that the more that it is given, the more that it grows. A spiritual economics based on the concept of the caregiver is a recipe not only for building prosperity and justice; it is a recipe for the reformation of the human being. Human beings can become ethical beings. An ethical environment of trust can be developed in which human beings cooperate rather than compete for a healthy, safe and beautiful environment. Spiritual economics does not mean an economics of self-denial, of abstemiousness. It is an economics of abundance. The abundance of which one speaks is the abundance of energy at one's disposal when one does not operate out of fear and mistrust. Consider the Italian Renaissance. The ceiling of the Sistine Chapel was not created from the prospect of

monetary rewards. The state of David was not created because of material rewards. And yet, these monuments remain. They point to the idealization of humankind, properly motivated.

It might seem crass to speak of abundance when so many peoples of the world are living in the direst of economic circumstances. One need only look to sub-Saharan Africa to find an example of poverty that makes any human being who has ever complained about their lot in life feel insignificant and humble. But on a world level, it is not scarcity that is the problem here. It is the improper use and distribution of resources. The horrific oil spill in the Gulf which its attending consequences of ruination of one of the most special eco-systems in the world was not a result of scarcity. It was a result of the overabundance of resources and their improper use.

What is most lacking today is a philosophy of economics. We are in desperate need of a guidance system to replace an outworn and harmful philosophy of motivation based on greed and fear. It is not enough simply to cut down on satisfying our material needs and wants. While it is always good to be modest in one's desires, it is extremely important to be motivated by the desire to share value producing goods and services in an egalitarian fashion to all peoples of the world. In order to accomplish this, a new definition of economics is necessary. It is to be hoped that this essay constitutes a beginning step in that direction. One cannot continue on with the old outlook of the war of every man against every man. A new outlook is needed to cooperate in the building of a family of mankind in which every man is for every man. Such a harmony that would be produced would indeed redound with beauty.

Reference

Samuelson, P.A. and Nordhaus, W.D. 1980: *Economics*. McGraw Hill, New York, NY.