

## **THE LOST SOCIAL SUBJECT: EVALUATING THE RULES BY WHICH WE LIVE**

**John McMurtry**

*Department of Philosophy, University of Guelph, Guelph N1G 2W1, Canada*

**Keywords:** capitalism, civil commons, common life interest, competition, development, freedom, history, human nature, language, life-ground, life-value, life standards, life support systems, measure, mechanism, money sequence of value, needs, Nietzschean fallacy, obligation, onto-axiology, predator model, rights, rules, social subject, supply and demand, universal goods, validity, war.

### **Contents**

- 9.1. The Egocentric Circle: How the World Disappears in Philosophy and Economics
- 9.2. The Common Life Interest beneath Rule By Private Rights
- 9.3. The Life-Blind Logic of the Ruling Economic Mechanism and its Money-Right Holders
- 9.4. The Onto-Axiology of Competition: From Predatory to Common Life-Value Gains
- 9.5. Principles and Rules: The Underlying Social Subject Deciding How to Live
- 9.6. What is Good in History: Finding the Onto-Ethical Baseline
- 9.7. Social Rules and Their Validity: From Language to Universal Morality
- 9.8. The False Opposition of Individual Freedom and Collective Regulation
- 9.9. Principles and Rules Decide Evil: From the Military Institution to Will to Power
- 9.10. Above Public and Market Rules: The Money-Sequence System Disorder
- 9.11. System Regulators Determine What the Interests Are, Not the Other Way Round
- 9.12. The Ultimate System Choice
- 9.13. Inner Logic of System Blindness across Domains
- 9.14. Beyond Proxies of Well-Being: The Universal Principle of Life Needs and their Measure
- Glossary
- Bibliography
- Biographical Sketch

### **Summary**

Showing that neither the ethics of individual decision nor immutable laws can comprehend the social subject and its choice spaces, this chapter explains the deciding plane of the human condition as the rules by which we live and defines the ultimate principles of their evaluation and advance.

### **9.1. The Egocentric Circle: How the World Disappears in Philosophy and Economics**

The “egocentric predicament” is an age-old philosophical problem – namely, that nothing can be proved beyond one’s own conscious states. Solipcism and scepticism are philosophical positions which deny that there is any certain way beyond this circle, and philosophy has been haunted by the problem since the ancients. Even the

philosopher entering heaven asks, “How do I know this is not a snare and a delusion?”

Meta-tactics have developed to avoid the ultimate conundrum. Suspension of judgment becomes an unwritten standard of philosophical comportment, and philosophy tends to stay within meanings and relationships among words. In contemporary theory, abstract rational selves in a vacuum decide what is just, good or valid, while in practice, selves choose what they want in markets of commodities and politicians.

In all, a world-view develops in which *nothing is seen to decide but individual preferences, and there is no value but what they choose*. Other ways of understanding are alien - “collectivist”, “Marxist”, “deciders for others”, “ghost entities”, and so on.

### **9.1.1. A General Tuning Out of the World**

In contemporary moral philosophies and theories of justice, self-referential debates abstract out the world and build *ex nihilo* on themselves. That is, professional philosophers begin with interpretations of what the dominant theories have claimed, with what philosophers in central institutions say about them as reference body including what has been argued for or against them that is in fashion, and especially what has been said in response to them in secondary debates, *ad infinitum*. No life-ground ever emerges to view to constrain obligation to its requirements. That the internal mechanics of the arguments position themselves within the received debates is all that normally counts. It follows that when actual universal interests of humanity come to be directly threatened, there are no shared grounds to recognize the crises of the actual world or to steer out by life coordinates of understanding.

Outside of philosophy, a parallel autism rules. For example, professional economic understanding adopts technical and mathematical symbols in equations and graphs which become autonomous circuits of meaning that substitute for the material world. What does not appear within them does not exist to theory, for example, people’s actual life needs. Necessity is thus what follows from the given axioms, not what people require to live through generational time.

### **9.2. The Common Life Interest beneath Rule By Private Rights**

Despite this systemic disconnection from the life-ground by contemporary theory and doctrine, humanity’s underlying longer-term pattern of civilization has, in fact, been *life-protective norms developed across cultures* - for example, against depredation of common resources, letting the young or old die, attacking others at will, appropriating others’ homes, or sexual molestation or rape.

Yet all of these actions are freely permitted in Nature’s competition for survival which evolutionary and economic theories adopt as their model of reproductive success. It is as if the very basis of humanity’s civilization and difference from the brutes was being blocked out by the ruling value syntax of thought.

### 9.2.1. Market-Era Amnesia of the Civil Commons

Transcultural laws and customs defending human life are elements of the long-developing but generally unseen civil commons discussed in the prior chapter - that is, *all social constructs which enable universal access to life goods*, from language and life-protective laws to public life spaces, libraries and parks, and supportive care when helpless. Civil commons, however, are not widely recognized in philosophy or the sciences, including Marxian varieties. Although its structures differentiate humanity from the natural struggle for survival in every case, these evolved community support systems and their historical actualization of the common life interest are screened out of even theory which focuses on “the commons”.

For example, Elinor Ostrom’s *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action* (1990), for which she received the 2009 Nobel Prize in Economics, examines only small-scale commons organized and governed by individuals in the private sector, without government funding, or legal enforcement, or life-value criterion. Civil commons at the system-wide level remain without a known name even as battles are fought in the street for their particular forms (e.g., government protection of ecological commons, labor rights, application of international law against war crimes, public programs for life security of all kinds, enforced rules against bio-piracy and seed contamination, and so on).

The evolution of civil commons underlies humanity’s civilization itself, as this analysis explains, but their formations have been increasingly invaded, defunded and enclosed in bits – most poignantly in fee-privatization of public infrastructures of primary education and healthcare in Africa so as to pay compound interest to foreign banks.

### 9.2.2. Against the Grain: Recognizing the Social Subject and Civil Commons

What is not recognized is not defended or extended. The substance of humanity’s ontological development - what John Stuart Mill called “the permanent interests of mankind as a progressive being” – may be acknowledged in resonant phrases, but not criterially defined. The closest Mill comes, as we know, is the utilitarian principle - maximization of happiness and minimization of pain. Yet these interests are subjective, impermanent, and not necessarily progressive as we have seen in *The Transcultural Idea: The Good as Happiness and the Bad as Pain*.

The methodological problem is that what transient *selves* want or decide as individuals or aggregates cannot recognize what has been left out – *what societies in fact choose by the rules its members live by*. The social subject is not recognized. The system-deciding rules we live by dissolve into the given. Society’s rule-governed self creation is not examined as a moral system. Civil commons are not even named.

Failure to conceive humanity’s *shared* life and life foundations is endemic to ruling doctrines through history. Even universal water and sewer systems so basic to common life today had to be struggled for underneath policy and theory by London women over a century ago in the face of industrial squalor and cholera epidemics, and are now themselves under money-privatization pressures across the world. Instead of further

advance on the strength of what societies have won by universalizing life goods and standards, there is a reverse tendency whose philosophical frame is the self-maximizing market individual. Indeed lead advocates of this global market revolution, F.A. Hayek and Margaret Thatcher, have claimed “there is no such thing as society”.

### **9.2.3. The Common Life Interest and Civil Commons Undefined By Marx and Polanyi**

Karl Marx’s historic work in understanding wage-workers as representative of humanity’s universal interests is a major step in modern philosophy in recognizing collective subjecthood, even if not yet formed. Yet Marx’s conception fails to define any common *life* interest beyond “food, clothing, dwelling, etc”. No criterion or measure of their need or indication of what the “etc” might include is provided. Marx emphasizes the historicization of human needs and their goods instead – even counting commercial tobacco a need if habitually smoked. As we have seen, there has been mainstream theory avoidance of the organic life-and-death baselines of the human condition over 2500 years. Marx goes deeper towards this baseline than his predecessors, but he still theoretically erases this level of analysis in positing productive force development as the ultimate base of society with no need criterion for its increasingly unnecessary products. At the same time, even he ignores the civil commons infrastructure of society’s life as a parameter of human development. Overall, he abstracts it out a-priori by:

- (1) reduction of all social organization to class structures of division and oppression, and
- (2) reduction of all non-human life to resources for capitalist development.

One can understand why Marx does this. The village commons of Britain had been brutally cleared over centuries to build the world’s leading socioeconomic model, and a capitalist factory system consumed natural and human life in feeding cycles of ever wider world control.

It all started with “the sheep eating men” described by Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516) in the midst of the great clearances of the village commons for the transnational wool trade centuries before. No commons at all seemed to survive, and no common life interest seemed to be protected. Karl Polanyi almost a century later implicitly identifies Marx’s failure to recognize this infra-class community plane in his *The Great Transformation* (1945). Yet Polanyi never provides any regulating principles of this “social and natural life substance” which he invokes.

In short, no generically defined common life interest or civil commons base emerges in the two greatest critiques of private money-capital rule over a century.

### **9.2.4. The Dualism of Rights: For Private Property versus Human Life Means**

This great aporia in human thought is not resolved but diverted from by “individual rights” – the preoccupation of social and political philosophers today. Despite the great reliance on the rights of the individual for both social morality and justice, another unseen substructural problem has developed since John Locke defended these rights in

his canonical *Second Treatise on Government* (1689) – published the year following the English revolution against monarchical right and feudal control of land.

These new ‘Lockean’ individual rights conferred and enforced exclusive titles to private property in ever more forms and across national borders since. But what is ignored in the glorification of these individual rights against royal power is that these rights *do not secure people’s right to the means of life required to exist*. Consider, for example, the famed “right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness” of the United States Constitution in the context of tens of millions of citizens malnourished and without medical health-care. Yet such life-and-death distinctions rarely arise in philosophical discourses on individual rights. Ronald Dworkin’s contemporary classic, *Taking Rights Seriously* (1978), argues indeed that these rights “trump” all other evaluative considerations. Common life interests and support systems are bracketed out a-priori.

Beneath the undercurrent pull of theory and practice into atomic rights with no life-ground runs a fatal disconnection. Abstraction away from common life support systems screens out their cumulative destabilization *by* these individual rights - in particular, by the private rights of global corporations polluting and degrading environments across borders. Private consumers with money rights supplanting citizens’ needs complete the life-blind rights system. We may pose an unasked question - what *other* rights now count in the world?

### **9.3. The Life-Blind Logic of the Ruling Economic Mechanism and its Money-Right Holders**

Common life support systems have no place in capital accounts or measures of goods production, and do not factor into contemporary philosophical treatises on rights and justice. Since the ruling paradigm of value-adding knows only reversible and qualityless sequences of exchange-value yielding private profit or priced products, common life interests simply do not compute. Thus stocks of forests, fish and fossil energy are blocked out of international trade treaties even as they are visibly stripped. At the deepest level of ruling doctrine, the second law of thermodynamics itself is suspended by neo-classical assumption of the modern market mechanism as “a perpetual motion machine” – an underlying assumption which physicist and economist Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen long ago exposed in *The Entropy Law and the Economics Process* (1971). “According to this new discipline” of neo-classical economics, he trenchantly writes, “a pile of ashes may very well become capable of heating the boiler. Also, a corpse may resuscitate to lead a second life in exactly the reversed order of the first.”

Since growth of the system and its money-right holders alone count, not even unbreathable air and weather destabilization register within the ruling mechanism. As it is universalised across the globe, three primary principles of money-right growth regulate beneath accountability to common life requirements and life standards.

- (1) Nothing that exists is ruled out as a site for global market waste or exploitation including the atmosphere, air and water as corporate waste sinks.
- (2) Whatever is not a priced product for profitable exchange is made to become one as

the condition of its future funding, including public health and higher research.

- (3) Whoever or whatever is an effective barrier or adversary to the system is represented as an enemy of market freedom and prosperity.

### **9.3.1. Universal Life Supports Abolished From View**

If life standards do not govern to stabilize climate, air and atmosphere systems, soil mantles and organic nutrients, ocean and aquatic ecosystems, forest habitats and migratory routes, biodiverse seeds and species, supplies of non-renewable energy sources and natural waste sinks or other social and natural life support system - all in precipitate decline - no extreme destruction of shared life conditions is ruled out. Cumulative collapse follows predictably.

Contemporary philosophy assists in the unseeing. Mainstream philosophical theories of “intersubjectivity of human communication”, “postmodern difference”, “contractarian morality”, and Rawlsian “rules of justice” do not conceive this disorder, nor the evolved common life infrastructures it selects against.

### **9.3.2. Regrounding Obligation in Objective Life Bases**

Once human reason moves to reconnection to our shared life ground and requirements, on the other hand, a self-evident imperative clearly follows. The common life interest obliges all human action to be consistent with the protection and advance of common life support systems for them to be sustained. Yet since no existing normative theory or system of validity grounds in these life foundations, none deduces the life-and-death obligations they impose across public differences and private rights. Theory and practice, rather, proceed oblivious to their ground.

In foundational contrast, life-value onto-axiology adopts this ground as ultimate value base, and recognizes civil commons as its evolving practice of realization.

## **9.4. The Onto-Axiology of Competition: From Predatory to Common Life-Value Gains**

The universal human life goods and necessities defined in the next chapter explain the framework of life means involved, and regulators consistent with life support systems become the grounding normative deciders. The rules and principles whereby individuals and human societies live - consciously or pre-consciously, well or badly - are throughout the underlying ultimate choice space for or against humanity’s survival and advance.

Behind this deciding framework of ‘how to live’ is humanity’s rule-following nature which has distinguished the species’ evolutionary successes and failures from the beginning. *Homo regulator* supersedes the immediate body of instinct by social rules across individuals. The system of social regulators continuously decides life or death for many, but this onto-axiological meaning is gathered only in glimpses. Instead system rules have been normally presupposed as natural, optimal or divine – as in “serving

one's lord, king and God" or "competing in the global market to survive".

#### **9.4.1. The General Onto-Ethical Frame**

At the terrestrial level, we may summarize what secular philosophy has learned since Plato and Confucius. At the highest level of abstraction, the thought field's concepts and images provide human action with the organizing ideas that mediate the outer world into intelligible forms and means of conscious projects. The felt world, in turn, is the subject's feeling side of these interacting fields which motivates as "the will" to enact felt ideas in outer form. Action itself completes and informs these inner fields of life by material engagement with the world to manage and overcome its limits – mainly, at the highest levels, by reduction of desires to necessity and fulfilment of the most coherently inclusive ideals that can be conceived and lived.

This is a many-faceted dark glass yielding all the diverse aspects and emphases of competing thought systems examined in this study. Underlying all are humanity's universal fields of life and their interaction in an ultimately elective process of social regulation. The rules by which a society lives is the most important generic choice space within which its people *decide* how to live: typically by *forms of competition* which human beings institute as '*the rules of the game*' which may be *life-enabling or life-disabling* in quality.

#### **9.4.2. Privatized Competition versus Civil Commons Overcoming**

The role of 'the commons' in this meta-framework of society's life is both repressed and confused. When received commentary speaks of them, as the *Economist* does in its September 2008 issue, we find the conventionalized blocks to understanding both the commons and beneficial competition which have long bedevilled the world. The *Economist* argument is crystallized for clarity.

Scientists find proof that privatising fish stocks can avert a disaster. - - Most fisheries have an annual quota of what can be caught - - But this can result in "a race to fish" the quota - - which can lead to overfishing: a classic tragedy of the commons. - - Fishing can turn into a race so intense that the season had shrunk to just two to three frantic days - - Privatisation halts the collapse of fisheries (pp. 97-8).

What is not recognized is that the rules of the original situation here are *not* those of a commons, but of a contest for private appropriation of fish where the quotas assigned exceed the capacity of the fisheries to yield them. The "frantic race to fish" occurs because the fisheries are not regulated as a *civil* commons - that is, with open-access goods *organized to reproduce and develop them*, the defining criterion of a civil commons structure and its logic of life-value gain.

##### **9.4.2.1. The Magic-Thinking Panacea of Privatization**

The market proposal of "individual transferable quotas", in contrast, merely privatizes fish-stocks further, with rights to sell their former public good for private profit. Consideration of those without privatized quotas is elided. The long track record of

private corporate looting of society's natural resources is sanitized as "individual" and "private", and there is no regulatory protection against more depletion of the stocks over time.

We may observe here the magic-thinking invested in the ruling logic of privatization and competition as the global panacea of economic organization. Good results are assumed to follow automatically with no cause-effect connections shown. In fact, the "tragedy of the commons" cannot be resolved by private appropriation of public stocks which has produced the tragedy in the first place. Only resource-protective rules *not permitting any subtraction from the reproducing resource* can do this – the civil commons resolution. The private exchange of quotas for money profit only reiterates the failed privatization regime at a higher level. Its "solution" assumes a correlation of this rule to the best of possible worlds as a system dogma or superstition.

#### **9.4.2.2. Private Profit versus Civil Commons: Facts in Place of Superstition**

Two examples provided by Raj Patel in *The Value of Nothing: Where Everything Costs Much More than We Think* (2009) report the world of fact as distinguished from doctrinal superstition.

"After a quota system failed, the government [of Chile] collective rights over specific traditional fishing grounds that they'd known and fished for generations. Enforcement was devolved to local fisher people's unions. It worked. The fisheries recovered - - - [On the other hand], the European Union's 'transferable quota' system [for private companies] has resulted in millions of tons of fish being thrown away, 88% of fisheries being over-exploited and the cost to the public being far greater than the value of the catches" (pp.106-7).

In fact, the evidence is systematic in showing the ecocidal effects of private commodification of natural resources in general, as resource scientist Jack P. Manno demonstrates in his *Privileged Goods: Commoditization and Its Impact on Environment and Society* (2000). He shows in documented detail that the measure of money-value efficiency is anti-ecological by its nature.

#### **9.4.3. Civil Commons versus Predatory Forms of Development**

From a life-grounded standpoint, competition for self or group at others' life expense is a lower-value order in principle - the "predatory" logic of war, oppression and tragedy across cultures and times. This is what Albert Einstein (1879-1955) says in glimpsing the repressed alternatives: "Nowhere have we really overcome 'the predatory phase' of human development - - - Science, however, cannot create ends - - Many human beings, half-unconsciously, determine the slow evolution of society".

We might say that the 60 years since Einstein wrote these words in a 1949 essay, "Why Socialism?" have enabled clarification of humanity's social evolution. This clarification is provided by the history of social democracies within which no-one is allowed to starve to death, remain homeless without means of existence, be unable to access tools of learning, or have no access to health-care when ill. These are the still-holding lines of

civil commons advance.

#### **9.4.4. The Generic Form of Predatory Competition**

All predatory competition, in polar contrast, is governed by a defining common principle in which the aim of group or individual competitors is for *some exclusionary payoff to self which is won at the life-cost of others* – “ripped off” to use the colloquial expression expressing the predatory dimension. If we apply this inner principle of competition to any of its myriad forms or to the works of those who presuppose its meaning as a life universal - for example, Friedrich Nietzsche whose “will to power” is treated elsewhere in this study - we find the italicized criterion identifies the exact nature and measure of predatory competition across cultures. How much is *taken* and how much others are *deprived of* constitute the measure of the predatory exchange. For contemporary example, clearing tropical rainforests for cash-crops whose profit is private and taken elsewhere has one unifying goal - “*competitive returns*” to private corporate money sequences (the winner’s *take out* in money-value quantity); while at the same time dispossessing all who live in the rainforest of their habitats with revenues so extracted not regulated to enable the life capacities of any (the losers’ *deprivation* of their life and life means). The same logic of *money-value take* and *life-value deprivation* applies to all cases of this predatory form of competition.

#### **9.4.5. The Generic Form of Civil Commons Overcoming**

In contrast, civil commons competition is a form of action whose goal is an overcoming of opposing limits to *win a life good for all* - for example, the scientific competition to break the code of a lethal disease by discovery of a public, non-patented medicine to treat its victims.

The obstacles overcome in such competition can include past rule-systems as well as limits of nature, and they are civil commons breakthroughs of human evolution with lasting life-gain for all – *competition at its highest level*. When goods for all of the life community are achieved, not just for one side as in predatory competition, humanity wins. Those who lead the fight for the common cause are the heroes of the civil commons. They are found in myth and legend where the hero stands for the life of the whole people against alien monsters and invasions. Historical victories of the civil commons are richer and more mature in quality – from the abolition of slavery to the winning of universal life security and infrastructures in modern times. Forces of predatory competition always oppose them.

In Canada, the greatest hero by open polls was the founding father of universal healthcare – an example of heroic civil commons struggle and overcoming led by an individual. At the most basic level there is a unifying logic of all contesting: *the sustained intention or goal of its participants to overcome a limiting condition whose outcome of struggle is undecided*. What distinguishes civil commons struggles is the goal of a common good, not a private gain for one side. This is the moral evolution of competition which is not yet distinguished in received theory or recognized in social policy. All emancipatory history expresses this inner logic of civil commons struggle. Consider the long and sustained battles against every kind of dehumanizing force and

oppression in which this overcoming to universal life good provision has *won* - against diseases, slavery, racism, sexism, superstition, illiteracy, corruption, imperialism - the list is long. What human good or social advance can we agree upon that has *not* been fought and won in accordance with this underlying logic of struggle? That it remains unrecognized by any known category or name indicates to us how submerged in private competition and gain human thought has been.

#### **9.4.6. Good and Bad Forms of Competition: The Unexamined Choice Space and Measure**

In the distinction between good and bad competition lies the onto-ethical choice space which decides the nature of human society and humanity itself. “Human nature”, we may see here, is not a given, but a choice space which can be regulated one way or the other. The ruling value-syntax, in contrast, *presupposes* exclusionary competition as the given, and so too the “human nature” it forms. Many now see a problem with predatory competition, there are laws against specific gross forms of it, but what it is in principle and how it is overcome remains obscure.

With competition as all else, the *measure* of goodness, or badness is to what extent life is enabled or disabled by its regulating form. Even the self can contest its own limits in an enabling or disabling way. This is the “interior competition” of the human condition. Here the winning self overcomes constraining blocks, habits or fears or, on the other hand, submissively closes to wider horizons by repression – the basic structure of choice at the social level as well.

##### **9.4.6.1. What All Know: A Moving Line of Human Advance**

An ultimate form of civil commons overcoming is “what everyone knows” in their daily life with other human beings, the “moral knowledge” of the civil commons – not to strike, but to discuss, not to ignore, but to respond, not to butt in, but to take one’s turn, not to despoil, but to steward natural life, not to dump waste, but to recycle or deposit, not to lie, but to speak truly, and so on. In this sense, corporations and governments lag far behind the moral knowledge already governing people’s daily lives – the opposite to the official story of society’s “leaders”.

Note that every one of these everyday rules is an expression of the life-value principle, and observe that not one is found in Nature, the dominant model of competition. All are civil commons victories within a society’s life and any people’s intrinsic development is told by them.

Yet all of this is untold in official culture, not named by theory, not valued in public accounts, and not extended by state funding to enable the civility of life that civil commons build. This is why the much proclaimed “war on poverty” has been only words masking the underlying reality - trumpeted more loudly as the civil commons themselves continue to be unfunded, defunded or reversed across borders for the “new global market competition”. With no change in the rules by which the impoverishment is produced, predatory competition continues to produce more. Absurdly miniscule money-value gains are made to substitute for lived facts of deprivation (e.g., one dollar

more in the city replacing an ancestral rural livelihood counted as a major standard-of-living gain). So long as the civil commons form of development is ignored blocked, defunded or attacked in provision for basic life goods, mass impoverishment and suffering predictably deepen.

#### **9.4.7. Life-Conscious and Life-Blind Forms of Competition Decide History**

The most dominant competitions - for market and military gains - are meanwhile presupposed with their life costs built into their rules. The pattern of life-blind competitive forms persists through even the falls of societies pursuing them. On the other hand, civil commons victories or advances are won in the longer haul and show the capacity of a society to develop. Consider, for long-term example, genocidal group conquests for the prize of ruling-system booty and expansion made illegal under international law since 1945 if only beginning to be enforced. The civil battles against such predatory forms are long and painful, and succeed so far as they establish new rules to effectively criminalize them, as rape and armed robbery have been at the domestic level. This is civil-commons rule formation in process. Societies can follow either direction, but require life-value bearings to desubmerge from and combat the ruling competitive forms of life destruction which are invariably represented as virtuous - mass homicidal war as “patriotic”, deprivation of foreign peoples’ resources as “development”, and so on.

Whichever way the social subject chooses by the rules it follows, all follow *some* rule-governed design which is always open to decision in its construction, its extension or its modification. Even Genghis Khan’s hordes were governed by strict rules of absolute command, horsemanship, mass attack, looting and slaughter – all presupposed as inevitable and self-validating structures of action. The rules were objectively evil to the extent of life and life-means destruction, but not questioned by those bound by them, and indeed depicted with awe by historians. Human society in the microcosm or macrocosm is decided by its rules, and when the rules are bred, enforced and followed without question, we find the human equivalent to mindless instinctual program without natural function.

#### **9.5. Principles and Rules: The Underlying Social Subject Deciding How to Live**

What are our rules are, that we become. When they follow from principles of more inclusively enabling life than without them, as in literacy and health-care victories of development, society’s regulators have moved beyond mere value program to form a *moral social subject* – the still unarticulated form of human advance. The meaning and legitimacy of the common good is decided by life-value principle, as all lasting human advances show from humanity’s long conquests of disease and tyrannies to hard-won structures of public provision and common civility in everyday life. Only the unifying principle has not been deciphered.

*Homo regulator* can always go bad as well as good. That is the species’ ultimately distinguishing nature, its bonding intelligence, and its tragic flaw. Humans may also only come to internalize rules by conditioned responses to rewards, and are animal-like in doing so – still identical with their body’s desires. Yet rules are better/worse because

more life-enabling/disabling whether they are understood or not. While mutually followed rules are thus the social subject for better or for worse, individual actions and deviations have long been the sole focus of moral thought. The conception of collective rule structures as themselves moral subjects has been missing at the theoretical level. In general, these deep structures of shared value agency are only open to question in a society reaching critical consciousness of itself *as* a moral subject. The objective value issue is always whether the rules accepted and lived by are life-range enabling or disabling by their regulation, but this *system* level of life-value measure has been blocked out across cultures and received perspectives of justice, morality, and freedom. The system-deciding rules made and followed by societies and their members and their life-value measure are a terra incognita of the social subject as moral agent. “Our way of life” is normally just assumed as a tribal deity has been assumed in the past - as worthy of divine favour and might against all opposing it.

### **9.5.1. Clarifying the Lost Human Agency and Measure**

It is in the rules of the rule-governed creature, not the foreground actions expressing them, that we find the ultimately governing agency of the human condition. Yet they tend to be assumed at the system-wide level as an external necessity, with even vilely life-abusing rules beheld presupposed as inviolable (e.g., maiming of citizens for virtue or fault, or mass life ruin by disemployment). The meta-measure of any society’s rules is always the extent to which they enable or disable fields of life by their regulating form of reproduction through generational time – for example, by the percentage and extent of their membership with/without basic means of life when the resources to provide them are not/are wasted on mechanisms of enforcement of the rules.

At the level of ruling value purpose, any rule system of society discloses its life-blindness by ignoring or violating common life requirements even while, for example, proclaiming “higher standards of living” with no life coordinates. Closure within a particular construct of rules and meanings deepens by presupposition. It is not bound by the “rule by the majority” as John Stuart Mill (1806-73) conceives oppression of individual lives and their liberties of expression. Rather, more deeply, it is society’s rule structure itself that overrides liberties of individual speech and self-regarding action, with most people acting in accordance with it. Oppression’s structure is not ultimately seated in majority rule over the minority or even privileged class over the rest, but *a rule of all against each by a life-blind syntax of governance*. We may consider here, for example, the regulating presupposition of an infallible invisible hand meting out rewards and punishments by supra-human laws beyond human control which all must compete within to survive, and none may publicly call into question without risk of social ostracism.

### **9.5.2. Laying Bare the Inner Logic of the Game**

Society’s rule system is the preconscious social subject. It becomes conscious when it understands what it really is, a system of prescriptive regulators and rewards or penalties for success or failure in competing at and within its rules. In our world, the actually regulating onto-axiological system is governed by money value for everything, with who has the money impelled by its rules to have more of its value as the nature of

its game. This is its market morality – “The social responsibility of business is to make profits”. Its epistemology is that the truth is what sells, and its social goal is more total private commodities and money in growth cycles.

This inner logic of reality, truth and value at the system level is the great unspoken of philosophy. Here and elsewhere, the rule-system is the self-determiner of society, but is assumed as necessitated without option. Whatever form it takes and however much it is passively presupposed, effective rule structures are the ultimate decider of whether society lives well or ill. Even societies with much lower average private income can live better by life-value measure than those with higher average private incomes (e.g., Kerala versus other states in India, Cuba versus Columbia). Any society can in fact always become better in life terms, but their rule-structures exert immense inertial resistance by *collective-habit hold* and *vested-interest defence*. These are the two great blocks against human emancipation across cultures. They are not only class-seated but mind-fixed.

## **9.6. What is Good in History: Finding the Onto-Ethical Baseline**

A social order only truly advances when its rule system is made more coherently life-serving - usually by the initiation of relatively few who carry the brunt of group indifference and wrath in the painful progression. The collective intention is a process of construction and sedimentation. Historical advances of social rule systems generally crystallize around a gradually emergent clarity about the real life-and-death stakes involved despite powerful private interests militantly resisting and obfuscating the underlying life issues – as in the stopping of universal public healthcare in the U.S. which other industrial societies achieved over half a century ago. The inner logic of overcoming such system paralysis is in all cases by more coherently inclusive life-value conception and institution of collective obligation.

### **9.6.1. Understanding Backward As Well As Forward Movements**

The backwards movements of *homo regulator* occur because those following the value syntax they host cannot see beyond it. Ignorance within its coils is if not bliss, easier in the moment. This is why the post-1980 turn backwards from developing social infrastructures of collective life development to regimes of ever more private money and commodities was not publicly repudiated for its dramatic social and ecological failures. The inertial lock of the ruling mechanism may thus persist, perhaps fatally, but the backward can still be told from the forward movement of rule-systems, whatever the representations are, by the ultimate and objective principle of life-value. Without this anchoring measure, system injustice may reign in the name of Freedom or Allah immune to detection of it.

Life-blind rules and rule systems have, however, been the tragic flaw of the rule-governed animal since the beginning. The inability to move past atomic positions within the instituted rule system sustains it. The common life interest does not compute within these positions and their system of interaction. So submerged have nation-states, classes and peoples been in the demands of “competing in the global market”, for example, that they cannot conceive of the universal life necessities and interests which unite them.

The rules of the game block system self-recognition even as the oceans rise and major cities are submerged. Which mass or academic media observes that poorer societies with civil commons structures to protect life against such challenges suffer little harm while richer societies suffer catastrophe - as in the case of Cuba versus New Orleans hit by the same Tsunami?

At the level of global society in general, a state of nature remains among governments as well as corporations and citizens. Extreme inequalities of private exclusionary holdings in money demand, strategic positions, invokable armed force and so on continue to rule so that the most powerful win at others' costs with no limit to the deprivations and devastations. Like the psychopath at the individual level, superstates, their advising corporations and allies are indifferent to the life despoliation of others as *irrelevant to their competitive interests*. Within this predatory form of contesting and victory, even the common life support systems of all are blinkered out by the "the great game of blood and treasure". The life coherent rules normal in everyday life are alien to meaning. We might call this the schizophrenia of official civilization.

### **9.6.2. When is One God, Empire or Law Good?**

Singly or together, comprehension of the social subjects of history is always grounded in the rule systems governing them, and life-value is always the measure of their worth. Yet the one ultimate issue which still does not surface in the money-capital system is whether its rule system enables or disables people's fields of life themselves: that is, whether the common life interest, its universal life goods and the civil commons base of both are being advanced, or reversed. This unifying frame and ground of evaluation supersedes the brute criterion of victory and success - more for self/self-group alone - which still holds at the political-economic level of regulation.

### **9.6.3. The March of God through the World**

The canonical modern philosopher, Georg Wilhelm Hegel (1770-1831), nonetheless, idealizes the armed conquering state as leading "the march of God through the world". His *Lectures on the Philosophy of History* affirm this "pitiless" logic of "the universal idea" as absolute, with the power of the imperial state cowing any rebellious particularity with "gleaming sabres" and the necessity of "many an innocent flower being trampled in its path". The "cunning of reason" of the "Absolute Idea" is for Hegel what all human development is necessitated by a dialectic of history which, he claims, ends in "more universal rule of right and law". He provides no moral criterion to enable us to reject the Third Reich after him.

Unnoticed by Hegelian philosophers and scholars, not even ceaseless genocide is ruled out. Peoples' lives and deaths are alike compatible with the march of the Idea. Hegel expresses in another way philosophy's long resolution of the problem of mortality and imperfection by eternal ideas and idea systems indifferent to death. Why is death not preferable? There is no answer given. In philosophy it is seldom asked.

#### **9.6.4. The Anti-Universalist Reaction**

In the second half of the twentieth century, however, there has been a great philosophical reaction against “tyrannies of the universal”. Postmodernism, deconstructionism, relativism and anti-foundationalism affirm plurality and difference as all there really is. What unifies their understandings is the idea that *all* universal principles override and oppress particular values and perspectives, the differences by which individuals actually understand and live.

Who is right? The answer is neither. For, neither recognizes any distinction between principles that realize universal requirements of life and those which do not. This ultimate principle of value distinction remains unknown.

#### **9.6.5. Oppositions Lost without a Value Compass or Ground**

Matthew Arnold speaks of the human condition as one in which “ignorant armies clash by night” – one program of declared right confronting another with violent force deciding, “the shock of body against body”, in the words of Karl Marx. Humanity has in fact had endless claimants to universal right and law and wars between them, but with no objective life-value measure whereby to *rationaly test* the claims of “liberating society” or “making life better for people” by this or that system. In the aftermath of European Fascism and Soviet Communism, contemporary intellectuals have come to widely reject “grand designs of universal necessity” altogether, but do not explain what has gone wrong in principled terms. Philosophical positions across schools of thought have no life-value bearings or compass to guide judgment.

With no criterial grasp, the next life-blind program comes to rule as “market globalization” without recognition of *its* tyrannical prescriptions. What are here called “laws of supply and demand” are, in fact, system rules for the supply of priced commodities to private money demand at the highest possible profits to private corporations, a rules system which recognizes only those with money and is imposed by financial and armed means across domains and borders. Alternatives are judged wrong a-priori and ill consequences blinkered out by this grand design of necessity which remains invisible to those assuming its rules.

#### **9.6.6. Underneath Differences across Cultures: The Missing Reality Principle of Life Value**

Even contemporary theories of justice and morality presuppose this rule system as a silent given, abstract it away, or idealize its logic. “Mutual recognition of *differences*” seems an apparently countervailing movement of thought led by thinkers like Emmanuel Levinas (1906- ). For Levinas repudiates the hoary Hegelian dialectical model of master-slave where recognition is won by fight to the death or surrender of one side in trembling fear of the Other. Yet his concept of ethical ‘face-to-face’ recognition has no principled ground to recognize, for principal example, the surrounding rules system as annihilating face-to-face relations and “I-Thou encounter”.

Flights to “the transcendent” (as in the case of Levinas and Martin Buber) or to ideal

“social contracts” without life needs or children (as with Anglo-American political philosophy) capture attention. Elaborate systems of conception bracket out the ruling social order and humanity’s life base together. The *reality principle of life-value* itself is assumed away on both levels.

### **9.6.7. Collective Guilt Made Invisible**

In these ways, humanity’s social subjecthood, the rules by which its members live, are left locked into silent presupposition. It is only when the disasters of the ruling order become heinous beyond debating that the concept of “collective guilt” arises - but only from a safe distance after the *rule-governed* atrocities have unfolded. The Nazi holocaust became the main issue of the Second World War, it is true, but only after it was over. Few now speak of collective guilt and evil in the global-market regime despite its despoliation of life support systems afflicting hundreds of millions of the poor, not to mention species and habitats in extinction spasms. Until there are principles of universal life value to judge it, the surrounding rule system can reign by normalized eco-genocide without philosophical notice.

Yet the inner logic of devastation is daily systematic. Because the actually regulating value system recognizes only pecuniary demand as a title to means of life for anything, all *without* it become expendable – the innermost evil of this global rule system.

## **9.7. Social Rules and Their Validity: From Language to Universal Morality**

A logical problem of this order’s reproduction is unseen. Because the ruling social order itself cannot be examined with the standard methodological confinement to individual opinions and their sums - as explained from Section 8.12. on - it is blinkered out a-priori.

### **9.7.1. The Abdication of Responsible Government by a Presupposed Rules System**

Yet since humanity is a rule constructing and following animal in all matters, it is a profound fallacy *not* to address and evaluate the governing rule-system by which individuals are bound prior to personal choices within it - the unseen framework of system coercion. To not appraise its order is to leave it above question. Thus its essential rules become absolutized as “the laws of the market” whose “invisible hand” governs as a system God.

The present collapse of planetary life is the long-term result of this instituted abdication of responsible government.

### **9.7.2. The Paradigm Case of Society’s Common Language**

Where a rule-governed system is life coherent, it is structured so as to maintain or enable more inclusive compossibilities of life capacities and their expression. Available illustrations are manifold, but let us consider an unpoliticized sphere to focus exactly on the axial principle at work across domains - the universal requirement of all *grammatical* rules to enable more clarity and coherence among speakers of the language

than would be the case without any one of them.

The life-value axiom is revealingly expressed over generational time through language development itself – the paradigm example, as we have seen, of civil commons advance. Where there is *not* enabling function of thought and communication, the grammatical or semantic rule is socially superannuated by social usage - as, for current example, with the rule against the split infinitive in English and the mandatory formal “vous” as a personal singular in spoken French. In different ways, both enable a *wider life range than before* – another basic plane of operation of the primary axiom of value. The split infinitive enables a wider range of meaning and cadence in composition and communication. The dropped formality of “vous” overcomes a hierarchical division which limits the field of shared experience among speakers.

Here again, we may see the life-value principle of *more coherently inclusive life as better* operating within grammatical-rule shifts themselves. Similarly with new words. They may offend traditionalists as “barbarous neologisms”, as the new words of “scientist” and “mob” struck Jonathan Swift (1667-1745); but if they enable a more inclusive compass of meaning than without them, they are validated by the primary axiom as life-value adding. Observe that the changes are of rules across individual differences by cumulative choice of the common rules they share – the social subject in informal action through time.

### **9.7.3. The Life-Enabling Rule of Moral Validity**

The same general principle of life-value advance by social subjects applies across spheres of civil development, including *moral* thought, feeling and action. Consider, for example, the classical transcultural moral adage in its original negative Confucian form, “do not do unto others what you would not have done to you”. There may be problems with this principle – you are not me, and I am not you, so how we know the analogue will work across out differences? Nonetheless the principle revealingly supposes there is a *tacit common ground of life-value* to work from. What you would find harmful done to you is harmful done to others, and so, it follows, you/I/we ought not to do it. This principle then becomes a social-subject choice if rules ensure it (e.g., life-protective law and universal provision in need), a civil commons construction.

This common life ground by which all are united - more exactly, their universal life needs and goods without which the life capacities of each are reduced – is the touchstone meaning of the Good at a system-wide level. This is the subject of *Deep Principles of Justice: Grounding in Life-value Meaning*.

What has been missing in understanding of morality and justice, however, is this very regulating principle of all true value - the universal ground and compass of life-value. While its ultimate principle is now absent in value discourses, it explains the common interest across situations. That is, one ultimate and underlying principle holds true for assessing the validity of any rule system or sociopolitical structure, whether or not it is about to be instituted, or is sunk in the history of conquest and instituted habit. It is always good or bad, just or unjust, to the extent that it more comprehensively enables/disables the lives of its citizens to flourish consistent with others’ enjoyment of

the same. Observe that it is not “liberty” or “market growth” or “the categorical imperative” or other value proxy that guides, but objective life-value measure. At best, at the most coherently inclusive, life-value ecology comprehends all life as explained in Sections 3.15.2 and 8.7.3.1.

#### **9.7.4. Life-Value Coordinates and the Life-Performance Measure of Society**

Sustained biodiversity is a well-known macro measure of a society’s performance with respect to the natural environment, although more modulated in life-value ecology than the standard measure of species numbers in relationship and their reproductive distribution (as explained in Section 8.2.3).

With respect to human life, high life expectancy, universal nutrition, downward disease rates, housing for all, free education to highest levels of qualification, public spaces, discourse and arts uncontrolled by price or party are benchmark measures of social well-being because they directly measure life-capacity enablement in any society. Wherever ranges of life can be deepened and broadened by rule systems - from wilderness reserves to vital games to theoretical physics - the measure of better and worse remains, as we have seen, constant across practices and domains.

#### **9.7.5. The Originary Civil Commons as Paradigm Case**

Everyday language is both the primary vehicle of any society’s life goods and the originary civil commons of the human condition. It is humanity’s ultimate rule system of meaning, its social ordering of thought and communication across self-other divisions, and the primary civil commons of rule-governed universal access of community members to life goods - *let us communicate understanding* is its commons goal and variously affects all fields of life.

Here too, however, comprehension at the level of the system whole is lacking. In the words of Wang Yang-Ming (1472-1529), we confront “fragmentary ideas, isolated details and broken pieces”.

##### **9.7.5.1. The Language Paradigm of Wealth Creation versus Profit by Exclusionary Right**

Despite the persistent undertow of language privatization and gated expertises by priestly, court, scholastic and now corporate-copyright enclosures, a deeper value meaning holds. Language functions best the more universally it is shared and used. Its wealth is enriched, oppositely to private property, money and competitive exclusion. For every word and idea becomes of more life-value the more it is a cooperatively accessible life good – as opposed to a “dead” word or idea at the other pole. That this defining property of language and human understanding has been ignored by theory and violated at every turn in practise by enclosures from priest monopoly to corporate copyright shows at yet another level the ultimate value conflict this study tracks - between rule systems for private gain and civil commons advance of universal life goods.

“In the beginning was the Word” is a Greco-Christian religious motto. “The word is

ours and our meanings grow” is the civil commons principle on the ground.

### **9.7.6. Language Sciences and the Missing Life-Value Calculus**

Linguistic philosophy does not comprehend this nature and ground of language, but the linguistic theory of Noam Chomsky (1928 - ) does provide the set-points of a universal grammar across cultures.

The innermost logic of the social subject is thereby comprehended at a universal level, but not yet at the onto-axiological level of civil commons. Herein may lie the missing link between Chomsky’s linguistic and political works. It is here that the distinction between good and bad rules begins, and the choice space of life value or disvalue opens within the development of language itself. Chomsky’s political work implicitly agrees without explaining the bridging meaning. Life-enabling rules always make the social moral subject better, and life-destructive rules always make it worse – as Chomsky implicitly demonstrates in U.S. and Israeli foreign policy formations whose underlying value syntax is maximize powers for the self-group in blindness to the lives of victims.

### **9.8. The False Opposition of Individual Freedom and Collective Regulation**

A major obstacle to human understanding is the instituted opposition between “individual freedom” and “collective regulation”. This opposition is fallacious because individual freedom is normally only possible so far as collective regulation enables it.

That is, more exactly, individual choices require common rules to protect and enable the lives of individuals. This is not to deny that collective regulators can also stultify individual life expression. The way to tell the good from bad social rules is constant as in all else. The antiseptic domain of grammatical structures again offers a model. For centuries, free verse and experimental syntax of prose were ruled out of official culture. But great twentieth-century writers like T.S. Elliott and James Joyce used their forms to liberate new ranges of creative experience and expression. Yet, on the other hand, without *any* binding common syntax of communication, individuals cannot be understood beyond parochial domains. Coherent construction and agreement among parts of speech are therefore good rules insofar as they enable ranges of meaning lost with no grammatical standards. Thus if the cockney English of Lisa in Shaw’s *Pygmalion* had enabled more clarity and scope of meaning than “the King’s English”, then it would have been better, not worse.

#### **9.8.1. The Open Range and Limits of Free Speech**

The same principles apply to resolve conflicts over ‘freedom of speech’. One may say what one wants, but not so as to block others’ right to their life ranges – hence the restriction on “shouting ‘Fire!’ in a crowded theatre”. One principle of value decides between good and bad across domains.

Collective rule frameworks and individual diversity of expression are therefore not opposed, but work together to enable life so far as neither harms it. This is why more open latitudes of free expression of every kind are good and the mark of society’s

normative maturity as long as they do no harm - the essential argument spelled out by John Stuart Mill's classic, *On Liberty*.

Yet Mill, as liberal thought after him is caught in an atomic framework of choice, and so overlooks the system problem of "freedom of the press" belonging only to those who own one. This is a problem of bias in society's rule-system itself which mainstream philosophy does not yet penetrate. The "free society" may thus ironically come to mean a society in which there is a monopoly over free speech.

### **9.8.2. False Concepts of Individual Freedom**

"Individual freedom" as the freedom to have more money or commodities independently of the deprivation of others - the freedom defended by market doctrine and "libertarian" philosophers like Robert Nozick (1938-2005) - is unbalanced. It ignores the freedom of many more citizens who are deprived of their freedom *by* this rule system – not only in the area of a free press, but in more basic areas such as whether they and their children have enough food to eat or meaningful work through time.

This is the central system problem of the money-capitalist regime and its justifications. As authors like Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Karl Polanyi (1890-1957) have demonstrated in historical detail, this value-ordering regime has, in reality, been built by sustained and drastic external *coercion* of countless individuals' lives to impose its rules – for example, violent clearance of village commons, deprivation of children, maiming and execution for unemployment of those driven off the land, all by state laws. There were no complaints from free marketers about the state overriding their rights, or forcing the thus impoverished families to labor in factories for 16-hour days to survive.

Freedom here clearly applies only to money-capital and commodity sales, and society's rules determine this life-blind bias. Regulation to protect and enable people's lives remains, however, denounced as "uncompetitive" or "socialist"/"communist" - the latter a term carrying a mortal threat in developing capitalist cultures.

### **9.8.3. Again the Missing Measure of Life Value**

What all known theorists pro and con fail to provide is a principled ground of life-value and measure whereby we can tell directly what is well or ill in *any* social rule system, and to what degree in any sphere. The life-value principle offers the missing moral metric which can evaluate traditional, capitalist or socialist formations by impartial and objective measure. That which enables more life capacity enjoyment and expression than without it, or the opposite, is good or bad by the margins of life-range it increases or reduces – domain by domain, or as a holistic set.

This universally applicable measure may again be explained neutrally by the case of language. The words and rules of language enable individuals' meaning and communication not possible without them. They are thus of life value to the measure of their doing so or, conversely, by the loss of communicative capacity without them. Word frequency and range thus become the accepted determiners of correct usage.

Rules or conventions which *disable* people, in contrast, are always bad. For example, customs or rules allowing maltreatment of people in virtue of their gender, skin color and sexual preference are blameworthy to the extent of their disablement of people's lives or, otherwise put, to the extent they reduce their ranges of life. Here too there may come to be agreement across parties to eliminate these disabling rules or customs, a civil commons victory.

## **9.9. Principles and Rules Decide Evil: From the Military Institution to Will to Power**

Humanity's symbolic plans and their material enactment constitute "the second creation", and every step of them is by the ordering of rules. The trials and errors of other animals, on the other hand, lack these cumulatively organized universals of meaning and transmissible formulae of sequential actions. Insofar as actions are governed by these rule constructions, they move beyond confinement to the natural circle of species-specific instincts and instant environmental triggers.

### **9.9.1. Life-Blind Rules Not Only Class Biased**

Marxian anthropology understands these differences and how technological-tool extensions of the human organism eventually construct another material world. Yet it ultimately locates the problems which arise in class divisions rather than the rules by which these divisions are instituted. Life-value onto-axiology does not reject class analysis, but moves to the deeper level of determination by social rule-system by which antagonistic class divisions are instituted, moderated, deepened, or overcome by civil commons formations.

The species-specific danger of the rule-making animal is that in remaking the world, the rule structures can go badly wrong. There are many disorders of this kind. Class exploitation built into "the rules of the game" is not the sole derangement. Taboos and stigmas may be systemically life-destructive *without* class explanation. False metaphysics like the universal will to power can lead life-devastating aggression. The armed-force logic of social pacification and expansion can be driven by classless solidarity. The central challenge of the rule-making species is to recognize life-incoherent regulators in *all* forms.

### **9.9.2. Mass-Homicidal Method: The Most Self-Evident Value-System Disorder**

The supremely destructive rules system of human history is non-defensive armed-force war. The pattern is redundant across epochs. Armed-force threats and attacks against symbolically identified enemies have been reproduced across centuries at ever higher levels of kill capacity.

Whatever the justifying representations, the ultimately regulating principle of armed-force war across nations and times is to *cause the mass destruction or maiming of other human beings and their life conditions*. It does not matter whether it is ancient siege machinery or modern weapons of mass destruction, pre-Christian-era armies or the U.S. military today. A set of defining subset rules are presupposed across cultures:

- (1) social segregation of an arms-monopolizing group to execute this objective on command with no effective limit;
- (2) rank-ordered command-structure relying upon motivation by fear to coerce its membership into performing and risking this mass-kill prescription;
- (3) immersive programs of obedience conditioning, indoctrination, and life uniformity to liquidate human individuality and choice;
- (4) major social investment in races of scientific technology to provide progressively more and varied life-destructive weapons; and
- (5) public moral sanction of this program of thought, felt being and action as heroic life-sacrifice and the supreme virtue.

Every element of this rules system admits of life-protective alternatives consistent with effective social self-defence: for example, a citizenry trained to mass civil disobedience at every level of social organization. Rule-system choice exists to protect and enable human lives and conditions rather than annihilate them. Yet this choice space of the rules we live by has been effectively blinkered out in the case of the armed-force institution, perhaps the greatest transcultural life-blindness of all history. Conquest of Nature has featured the same inner logic of life-assaultive rule with biocidal siege machineries developed in parallel with weapons over centuries.

### **9.9.3. The Psychologization of War: Avoiding the Onto-Ethics of Society's Rules**

The turning-point choice space of the human species always lies in the rules it is governed by, but this choice space has only been engaged at the margins (e.g., the Geneva Conventions protecting prisoners within military wars, but nowhere outlawing mass-homicidal weapons). Perhaps the most known work on the nature and cause of this pathological institution comes from Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) and his followers who have psychologized humanity's regulatory choice space into a dark psychical opposition between an unconscious natural drive for life (*Eros*) and another unconscious natural drive for death (*Thanatos*).

More primitively at the mass level, the issue is externalized into a sectarian dualism of Us versus Them with no objective life standard to tell Us apart from Them or any impartial principle of why one is good and the other evil.

Freud's later ontological dichotomy of Life versus Death/Eros versus Thanatos posits an independent drive to destruction in all human beings, a lawlike instinctual force to explain war. This relocation of the evil to a force within abstracts out the rule-system problem. Social regulators (1) to (5) instead disappear into psychologistic conjectures. Thus the *rule-governed, constructed social disorder* is not engaged – the recurrent blinker of philosophy and theory. The system problem is abstracted out. The high-profit, non-productive technology, environmental waste and hierarchical command at the expense of the public and public resources do not factor into the causal picture, but are presupposed as the nature of war and of man at once. The acquisitive value program imposed by rules and armed force is reduced to a spontaneous instinctual propulsion.

Yet the claimed natural drive to destroy cannot explain why most people have to be forced and relentlessly conditioned to go to war by pressgangs, mass propaganda, military drafts and jobless millions to recruit from..

We may make three philosophical observations on Freud's famous paradigm to highlight its diversionary nature.

- (1) Life-versus-death issues are reduced to competing organic instincts conceived in terms of ancient myth.
- (2) The alleged natural "death instinct" to explain military war overlooks its institution by inherited rules which coerce the actual combatants into the killing and destruction.
- (3) The real mechanism at work in the rules of society's collective institution of defense is thereby pre-empted.
- (4) Alternative to mass-homicidal mechanism by life-protective law across borders is made to seem an unnatural project.

In short, a pathological social-rule construction is locked into an alleged natural program of the individual psyche. The reductive Freudian understanding exemplifies the morbid hold of the ruling value syntax on modernity across ideological and scientific domains.

#### **9.9.4. The Nietzschean Fallacy: Life-Blind Egoism Affirming Free Life**

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) anticipates Freud in his psychological probes of unconscious behaviors, but he goes in the opposite direction of Freud. Nietzsche repudiates society's value constructions as repressive of the manly and creative energies of the "higher man" (*übermensch*). Freud, on the contrary, seeks the reverse - conscious adaptation of the ego to society's given regulatory regime, which he assumes and never challenges or conceives of an alternative to.

Nietzsche is thought to have influenced Freud with his excavation of unconscious desires, but he boldly denounces the socio-regulators that Freud assumes as necessary. They are not "the reality principle", as Freud fashioned them, but the way of "the herd". In their stead, Nietzsche affirms the "will to power" as the hidden meaning of all values - whose highest form is expressed by the "natural aristocracy" in predatory relationship with the sheep-like masses.

##### **9.9.4.1. Life-Value Contradiction at the Core**

Nietzsche makes much of "life instincts" and the "the will to power" of natural life, but the inner contradiction of his position is not penetrated. For on the one hand, he affirms robust life capacity above all, while on the other he abhors what is always necessary for human life to flourish, even for the young Tamerlane or Napoleon - life-protective rules.

While Nietzsche's moral nihilism is lastingly perceptive in laying bare the "ressentiment of the herd" against naturally superior "free spirits", and the delusions and prohibitions of religion and morality expressing a perverted will to power by imposing life-repressive laws, his position is unreasoned. He *fails to distinguish between life-enabling and life-disabling moral regulators* – as Freud fails from the other side. Without life-value consistency, his philosophy plunges into a learned frenzy repudiating any common life grounds of humanity at all. There are only "natural masters" and "slaves". Observe again the naturalization of man-made structures of oppression.

Life-caring values are thus disdained as unnatural and decadent forms imposed by the weak and fearful on the strong and visionary. Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), who wrote a thesis on Nietzsche and became a Rector of Heidelberg University under the Third Reich, follows a similar pattern when he affirms the "Fuhrer as our will and our law".

#### **9.9.4.2. The Inner Cosmos of Inflationary Egoism**

An atavistic worship and mystification of natural powers seems to lie at the core of these visions of *return to a pre-regulatory deep*. Yet it may be a simpler matter of the self-maximizing drive of the surrounding capitalist imperialism idealized as heroic egoism. Prohibitions against the violent predatory energies of system expansion are reviled, and any common life grounds of mutual support are written out - a themal philosophical current from Schopenhauerean pessimism to contemporary postmodern flights of fancy.

In his most famous work, *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche rejoices in the overcoming of all life-protective rules by the will to power of the "naturally superior" elect whose talons of rule seize the masses as prey in their free self-expression and expansion.

#### **9.9.5. The Coded Ideology of a Civilization**

At bottom, Nietzsche articulates an historic drive to reverse human rule systems for this overman expansion in blindness to the life support regulators upon which human life depends. Nietzsche idealizes the master predator model "beyond good and evil". Romanticizing the unfettered selfism at the felt core of money capitalism, Nietzsche leaps backwards to the pre-Socratic ideal of Homeric warriors seeking fabulous conquest and fortune across others' societies – both an allegory of the plundering rich empires around him and an anticipation of the "financial lords of the universe" despoiling societies today for limitless wealth.

A life-blind inner logic holds across monumental expressions - the ruling value of predatory overcoming as humanity's final selector of human worth.

#### **9.10. Above Public and Market Rules: The Money-Sequence System Disorder**

Predatory gain of the dominant few over the many is now instituted in a transnational 'investor-right' rules system which enriches single individuals to greater wealth than

entire societies. Everyone is thought to be players of the game, but one percent at the top receive over 90% of the money gains. This wider predatory system is no more exposed to *life-value* appraisal than Nietzsche's more naked conceits of the primordial energies of lordly selves. The common life interest is ruled out by claimed natural laws of competition selecting for higher forms – the evolutionary-economic axis of the ruling story. Yet beneath diverse representations and idealizing accounts, the social construction deciding how all are to live is the money-to-more-money value system as world sovereign (as explained in Section 1.7).

### **9.10.1. The Ruling Form of Value through Diverse Modes**

The logic of preference governs as follows. Privately owned money-capital uses life as means (the possessor's, the employees', the society's, the environment) in whatever way can be organized to maximize its increase to more in the control of its owners (individuals, corporations, syndicates or institutions). There are innumerable variations of the master value sequence: owner types, intermediations of purchase and sale, productive or non-productive moments, tangible or intangible commodities, labor or non-labor requirements, temporal and spatial spans, forms of life directly or indirectly used, positive or negative externalities of processes, old or new types of government subsidy and policy collaboration, profitable, less profitable or bankrupt outcomes, and, most deeply over time, diversified pathways of directly mutating money investments into more money returns without any required outcome of life value, but increasingly despoliation of host life conditions in consequence.

Virtually all contemporary wars are propelled by this master predator sequence. The proliferating modes of this money-sequence rule system have, however, become so complex and mathematically self-referential that none of the human functions within the  $\$ \rightarrow \$^1 \rightarrow \$^2 \rightarrow \dots \$^n$  circuits are aware of the meaning of the rules system but apical financial dealers – with government themselves led in service to the magically enlarging money-to-more-money sequences directing society's exchange media at every more levels.

### **9.10.2. The Money-Rule System above the Market, Government and Life Needs At Once**

As long as the money-to-more-money system is cipheric to the public and has recovered from its last crash of less developed societies, it is daily affirmed as producing optimal results. Its ruling imperative remains excluded from critical question even through the crashes of entire societies, while its catastrophic ecological externalities are not connected back to its rule. If the money-sequencing system fails at the center itself as in 2008, its primary private-capital institutions are fed by public funds to keep them going as the obligation of supreme public authority itself.

Thus on the collapse of Wall Street in September 2008, a \$700-billion-plus taxpayer's infusion of money-demand was rushed through the US Congress "to save the system" - an amount quickly rising beneath notice to \$1.2 trillion and estimated in 2009 to be \$7.2 trillion of public spending over the longer term, with \$4.6 trillion tracked by March 2010. No-one could keep track of the public money poured in under the direction of the

architects of the disaster themselves – Bloomberg News suing the Federal Reserve to make the information public. Nor were the banks receiving it required to disburse it in credit to families and enterprises losing their homes and businesses, nor to account for any of their expenditures to the U.S. Congress originally passing the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act in 2008. In the words of Congress Representative, Dennis Kucinich, at that time “saving homes, creating jobs, building a new infrastructure” did not factor in. What silently mattered was that the *debt rules* of the banks remained in force across world borders with public money to leverage their collection.

Here we may observe that the rules of money sequence growth override the first principles of ‘the free market’ itself, accountability for public wealth received, and the actual life needs of citizens at once. Instead, hundreds of billions of public dollars to buy and support financial products already repudiated *by* ‘the free market’ were minted for the benefit of Wall Street and its leader, Goldman-Sachs, whose executives had themselves led the collapse from within the U.S. Treasury itself. Money-sequencing at the top was now disclosed as the higher necessity overriding market rules, responsible government, and the life requirements of the people all together. Accountable to nothing but continued money-sequencing for more, the bailed-out champion of the ruling financial system soon posted record profits and planned with lavish bonuses a new bubble of public carbon-credit brokering while effectively usurping government return to the pre-2000 financial rules as “excessive”.

As this process had already precipitated in a few hundred individuals owning more wealth than half the world’s population at the turn of millennium with no correction for those billions malnourished, jobless or immiserated, impartial observation cannot but recognize the life-blind disorder becoming more publicly subsidized with each of its mounting system failures.

### **9.11. System Regulators Determine What the Interests Are, Not the Other Way Round**

Since self money-capital possession seeks to become more money-capital possession through time and place with no other regulatory constant, the unseen war between the demands of this money-sequence system and the life-system requirements of human beings and environments deepens across domains. Although the consequences are cumulatively dire, they are not connected back to what causes them. Social and natural life support systems are instead more comprehensively subserved to competitive realization of private money sequences through ever greater arcs of global expansion. Officially represented as “the Free World”, “the engine of progress”, and “the key to poverty amelioration”, the rule system determines an opposite reality in fact, but disappears into its effects as inevitable costs of globalization”.

#### **9.11.1. Class Interests Determined by the Rules of the Game**

“Capitalist interests” are blamed by critics as the determining mechanism. Yet this view misses the deeper level of explanation that the rule system itself determines what these interests are. That is, capitalist interests are determined by the money-capital rule system in terms of which the money-capital sequencers live and die as functions, always

seeking to be more as the rules of the inherited game. The meta-program of the game is what is missing from evaluation. Positivist-science assumes it as axiomatic, while moral analysis does not examine social systems. There is, in sum, no theoretical space to critically examine *it*, the onto-axiological determiner itself.

Yet just as the rules of any institution precede and succeed the participants in it, so the rules of the money-sequence system precede and succeed their human managements and functions. The rulers are ruled by it, and their interests are decided by *its* rules - which they may change, if allowed to, to make them more perfect *as* an autonomous money-sequence game. The game is what rules, and its beneficiaries are its favoured creatures for a time. The rules society lives by are as always what decide good or ill, the social subject in process which determines itself – here by the magic formulae of financialization represented as “the free market of globalization”.

### **9.11.2. The Governing Rules System Determines Value Meaning and Gain**

That the defining rules of this system itself are no more questioned than physical laws is an ancient pattern. Prior kings and feudal lords assumed their positions as appointed by the laws of God, and sought only to protect or expand their holdings. These natural bloodlines of assumed divine right were gradually replaced by the rule system of private money-capital growth and commodity exchange dispensing with inherited positions. Yet once either regulating social order is presupposed as inexorably and immutably given with no alternative order conceivable, submergence in its rule becomes the condition of intelligibility and worth of the selves within it who daily reproduce and expand it and, as possible, their own positions before giving way to their replacements. The reigning rule-system continues until, in the money-capitalist case, its cumulative rundown of social and natural life infrastructures poses the objective problem of a system in conflict with terrestrial life itself. Yet since the system is assumed as producing the common good by ruling presupposition, no more ultimate requirements than it can be conceived. Rule adjustments at the margins are made to keep *it* afloat rather than to become consistent with the organic, civil and ecological life reproduction. This is the fatally closed circle of this system.

### **9.11.3. System and Life Requirements Conflict: Society’s Ultimate Problem**

While only higher-order regulation by actual life standards can steer the instituted disorder so that it does not violate but meets the requirements of human and ecological life, even revolutionary theory has no such life standards or measures. What is lacking is a principled ground of life-value to recognize the problem and resolve it at the level of life rather than system necessity. There are many glimpses of this principle in *ad hoc* regulators, but they are not connected in principle and are overridden by the system’s rules of growth (e.g., the waiving of environmental regulations on major capital projects like the Alberta tar-sands, the greatest overall point-source of carbon pollution in the world).

Not even the theory and practice of class revolution reaches the life-ground level of analysis in received principle or policy. Rather the theory stops at the level of productive force development and change of ownership structure with no defined *life*

criteria or standards to govern either – a problem made clear in revolutionary states. In this way, even oppositional theory has failed to recognize the ultimate problem and the nature of its solution. Once reason recognizes that the requirements of life and life support systems precede and are more basic than their commodity productivity or who owns them, the deeper common life-ground becomes evident. Yet no received theory adopts universal life requirements themselves as its defined value base – as analysis does ahead.

## **9.12. The Ultimate System Choice**

Beneath philosophical notice, the answer to “the question of how we ought to live” has, in fact, been globally imposed by the laws of a ruling value mechanism assumed by both ruling and revolutionary parties as beyond human control - with even projected proletarian rule perceived as “inevitable” by the operations of the system itself. Until life-support foundations and standards are coherently included in steering decision structures, whoever manages them, the planetary crisis is neither understood nor met.

In the end, the framing meaning is: either the ruling order is adapted to the life values, measures and universal life necessities it has screened out, or it continues to deplete the conditions of life itself. This is the life-and-death choice space not comprehended at the system level.

### **9.12.1. The Missing Link: Accountability of All Rules to Life Support Systems**

The way to tell a better from a worse rule or rule system remains constant across cases and times. Whenever it is known to disable life or life support systems, it must be re-set to be consistent with them, or to better realize their known requirements – from the stable carrying capacities of the atmosphere to the nutritional requirements of children. The principle is self-evident, but no political-economic ordering in reality or imaginary has spelled it out, the missing link provided by life-value onto-axiology.

If one reflects on revolutionary and counter-revolutionary programs in the last century, one sees that their deepest shared fault-line is not recognized. All go wrong insofar as they are, in one way or another, unaccountable to life standards. Neither capitalist money-value nor Marxian labor-value recognizes this baseline problem nor, as we have seen, have other value theories. As the fish cannot see the sea, so it has been with humanity’s life fields and ground.

### **9.12.2. The Elementary Logic of the Life-Value Calculus**

At the positive end, rules and laws score well across individuals and time by a direct feedback process of adjustment to enable more inclusively coherent compasses of life as an exactly regulating process through time. This is not a utopian conception. Good medical and educational practices are *already* defined by life-enabling feedback loops at bodily-function and cognitive levels, although not yet with unifying and principled comprehension.

At the negative end, any value regime is worse to the margins of its reduction or

destruction of fields of life and their support systems. There have, of course, been many evil rules and rule systems across history into the present. Yet humanity's *capacity* for self-made rules is not in plausible doubt. Only the system-deciding purpose of life-value and accountability of rules to it have been lacking. There is positive recognition of discrete domains like availability of water, longevity of life and public literacy, for example, but not as explicit policy regulators within a comprehensive frame of life-value rule. Contemporary civilization fails where it is *not* regulated by such life-value goals and accountability – as we may see with the money-value regime which has significantly undermined even those social life standards which have historically evolved.

### **9.12.3. A Philosophical Analogy: Release from the Cave of Conditioned Images**

The realization of the human capacity for life-responsible regulation might be understood as the life-grounded meaning of release from the cave of conditioned images described by Plato in his Socratic dialogue, *The Republic* - a meaning that Plato abstracted away by noumenal ideals in an immaterial realm above death and imperfection.

Once governed by understanding of *universal life standards* rather than moved by the transient shadows of particular self interests, the common life interest can be recognized and can govern across conflicting perspectives. Plato's transcendental realm of Pure Forms is *re-grounded* and made immanently regulatory by universal life requirements as ultimate principles of understanding and action.

### **9.12.4. The Ruling Forms as Life Standards of Sustainability**

We might say that the Ruling Forms which Socrates and Plato located in a disembodied ideal immaterial realm are, in worldly fact, the universal life standards required by contemporary humanity to be sustainable. They are the ultimate life-ground of the common interest with which all decisions must be coherent to be rational, and on which all binding obligations finally depend and are shaped by.

Humanity's ultimate forms and foundations of reality are thus the life support infrastructures of the earth's ecosystems by which humanity in all times and places, individually and collectively, is sustained from moment or generation to the next. These are, in turn, *chosen* for or against insofar as their sustainment or degradation is by rule-and-decision structures - for example, protection rather than despoliation of the earth's ozone layer, its air and water, and the life habitats of other species over generational time. The method of life-value onto-axiology entails the rational process of this recognition and rule governance in place of the global market's invisible hand.

Illustration assists meaning. There already exists a deducible and increasingly recognized meta-principle of life value to guide individual and social decision at all levels of interaction with the planetary ecosystem on which all human life depends: *the basic life imperative to close all loops of use of non-renewable resources towards zero by systematically diminishing waste*. This is the *life-capital efficiency* principle.

### 9.13. Inner Logic of System Blindness Across Domains

How can the meta-structure of capital be re-set to life standards? This re-setting is not yet comprehended. Well-being indexes have revealingly multiplied in the last 20 years, but with no unifying life-value principle or ground. At the highest level of normative thinking, universal values across cultures have been widely deemed impossible by contemporary philosophers because of ineliminable differences of view and practise. *Or* proxies like “productive force development”, “primary goods” without organic content and, most dominant, “economic growth” have substituted for life-value criteria.

In ruling policy and practise, claims of “economic necessity” and “global standards” have been pervasive as ruling system prescriptions, but the value equations they presuppose are morally absurd. “Demand” = private money willing to pay. “Supply” = priced commodities for sale. “Optimum” is their equation to each other. “Development” is more of both.

criteria are life-blind, consistent with the majority being malnourished, commodities being increasingly incapacitating and addictive, and development being ecocidal. In the regulation of society by these equations, the ultimate global disorder is found, but their locked-in presupposition conceals their life incoherence. Quite astonishingly, no criterion of human life necessities - that without human life is diminished and dies - has been defined by received science or philosophy.

#### 9.13.1. Life-Ground Disconnection Built In By the Ruling System Goal

Some readers may think that life-value understanding is *already* implicit in health medicine, the life sciences, education, and ecology. All seem to be based in and to speak of universal life necessity in some sense – the necessity of caloric intake, of biodiversity preservation, of literacy development, and so on. Supposition of such universal goods and necessities even implies that all should have access to them – the civil commons principle itself.

It is true that at the implicit heart of these research areas and disciplines there are these grounds of implication from which universal criteria of human life necessity and the common good might be deduced. But this philosophical underlabor has been absent. More deeply, money-value rather than life-value standards have become increasingly dominant in these areas of research and practise by funding and defunding mechanisms. “Life sciences” – itself a corporate coinage - now dominantly treat life and life means (e.g., laboratory animals and foods) as instruments to decrease costs or increase revenues for private corporations. Publicly financed education and research has been increasingly understood and directed to “ensure students can compete in the global marketplace” and universities “can bring new knowledge to market”. Ecology itself lacks any life-value principle to resolve the conflict of money-capital and life-capital requirements, and has become a public-policy issue subserved to market and commodity growth (e.g., carbon trading and competitiveness in international energy markets). In short, the more deeply we examine rule-governed trends in even the most central fields of life and life-value development, a similar ruling pattern of funding selection against universal life standards and for global money-value gains has increasingly

predominated.

At the same time, dismissal of universal values has prevailed across philosophy and liberal discourses with the very idea typically rejected as “authoritarian”. Thus a many-faceted block against recognizing any common life interest has been simultaneous with money-value growth presupposed as the ruling goal. Gold toilets for the rich and lack of potable water for the poor follow predictably as the “laws of supply and demand”. Even on the reflective philosophical level, the universal needs of human life dissolve from view or invite stigma. The progressive Oxford philosopher, Steven Lukes, for example, claims in *Power: A Radical View* (1975) that any universalist theory of human needs may be “a paternalist license for tyranny” (p.8).

### **9.13.2. Objective Life Needs of All Blocked Out**

As Jeff Noonan explains in *Democracy and Human Needs* (2008), the closest that received philosophical literatures have come to a criterion is David Braybrooke’s *Meeting Human Needs* (1987) and Doyal and Gough’s *A Theory of Human Needs* (1991). Yet neither gives an objective criterion. Doyal and Gough accept human needs as a moral category, but offer no objective standard of any need. They distinguish between *needs* and *need satisfiers* (e.g., the need for food versus diverse modes of its satisfaction), a clarification which avoids the conventional error of inferring from diverse modes of need satisfaction that there are no universal life needs. Yet in the end, analysis retreats to linguistic philosophy. “Need statements” are distinguished from “want statements” with no ground of meaning beneath the use of words. If language usage allows “Everyone needs a car”, linguistic norms decide.

### **9.14. Beyond Proxies of Well-Being: The Universal Principle of Life Needs and their Measure**

The missing baseline principle of all need or universal life necessity is as we have seen: *x is a need if and only if, and to the extent that, deprivation of its object reduces organic life capacity.*

This universal criterion may be tested by seeking to find whether there is anything that is a need which it does not cover, or anything that is not a need that it mistakenly subsumes. Thought experiment confirms there is none in either case.

This formal criterion simultaneously provides the anchoring principle of the need-capacity linkage at the innermost core of life-value understanding: *needs are, and only are, that without which human life capacities are reduced; while no life capacities can exist or flourish without these needs met.* These principles apply across cultures and individuals. For whatever one’s language or spatiotemporal location may be, food protein, potable water, clean air, linguistic interaction, and meaningful work are what must be accessed for anyone’s life not to be diminished, diseased, or dead.

This same criterion identifies the *measure of life necessity* by the extent to which life capacities are reduced without it. People may get protein, but not enough, with a corresponding reduction in their life capacity and its functionable ranges: for example,

reduced cognitive ability or cardiovascular performance below what they have *with* enough. This is the dividing line of *sufficiency*, exactly where life is made better rather than worse.

This set of principles defines what has been both supplanted in fact and denied by theory at the same time - the exactly determining life-lines of objective standards of living and their measure.

#### **9.14.1. The Bottom Line of Values: What Is Needed to Live and to Live Well**

While there are centuries of ideology and doctrines on “the good life”, the general conclusion today is that none works across individuals and cultures. The counterarguments are manifold. It depends on circumstances and who one is. Or what is one’s need is another’s desire. Or income alone provides a commensurable measure. Or no authority has the right to decide what we need. Or abstract equality is the issue to debate instead of what all are due as human. There are more blocking arguments than theories.

The problem has been that no philosophy has criterially grounded in universal human life goods, the degree of their necessity, and their measure of fulfilment. Their defining principle is precise and objective, as we have seen. All life capacities and their flourishing are only possible to the measurable extent to which these life necessities are met, and their standard is testable by two questions. Is there anything at all not included by this criterion of universal human life need which should be? Is there anything at all which is included that is not truly needed to enable the life capacities of each to be expressed?

If we can thus ground in this ultimately distinguishing principle between better or worse life - that which has been so long denied and obscured - we may at last proceed to humanity’s universal need-capacity set by which all rules and deciding principles may be evaluated in knowing how to live. To this ultimate issue of “deep justice” we now move.

#### **Glossary**

- Agent-relative:** A standard philosophical term signifying individual choice; as in “agent-relative ethics” which assumes that value agency is restricted to individual persons.
- Analytic philosophy:** An umbrella term covering any school or method of philosophy for which logical rigor of conceptualization and argument define philosophical understanding.
- A-priori:** Derived independently of sense experience e.g.,  $2+2=4$ . Truth by definition and tautological deduction is the mathematical model, but presuppositions are often falsely assumed a-priori.
- Axiology:** From the Greek, *axioma*, “what is thought to be worthy”, the ultimate, but under-theorized category of value reason, ideally building from rationally self-evident bases or *axioms* of value a

complete system of value (aesthetic, epistemological, moral, etc.) with unlimited validity across domains. Onto-axiology is axiology which grounds in the nature of being. Life-value onto-axiology grounds in life-value as defined by the Primary Axiom of Value.

**Anti-foundationalism:**

A generic term for the dominant trend of philosophy over the recent century embracing many contemporary philosophers and schools of thought whose unifying characteristic is denial of any universal ground, truth or value.

**Biophilia:**

A term coined by Erich Fromm which means “love of life” which he distinguishes from its opposite “necrophilia”, the “love of death” or repressive inflexibility. Biophilia is distinguished from life-value onto-axiology in attending only to the affective or felt side of life affirmation without principled distinctions among fields and ranges of life value and disvalue.

**Capitalism:**

A socioeconomic system in which all values are conceived in money terms and maximum sale of commodities for maximum private profit is the ultimate value governor of thought and action. (Strictly speaking, the adjective money before capitalism is required to ensure distinction from other forms of capital). (e.g., life capital). Money capitalism is defined by its value governor, **the money sequence of value**.

**Civil commons:**

A unifying concept to designate social constructs which enable universal access to life goods. Life support systems are civil commons so far as society protects and enables their reproduction and provision for all members.

**Coherence Principle:**

see Life Coherence Principle

**Collective agency:**

A concept which is little understood in philosophy and the social sciences which dominantly focus on, respectively, agent-relative methods of analysis or aggregates of individual choices. It is best understood by the rule systems people (s) make or follow as societies - the ultimate and ongoing choice process of societies which govern the lives of all, but are normally presupposed as given.

**Common life interest:**

A concept which disambiguates the categories of “the common interest”, “the public interest”, and so on to specify what these concepts normally omit, shared life support systems.

**Deep ecology:**

A movement founded by Arne Naess whose leading ideas against environmental resourcism are that “the well-being and flourishing of non-human life have value in themselves independent of their usefulness for human purposes” and “humans have no right to reduce the richness and diversity of life forms except to satisfy vital needs” (a term left undefined).

- Deep naturalistic fallacy:** Does not merely identify the good with a natural property, but identifies the survival-of-the-fittest order of nature with human order, and assumes this order as both necessary and good for human survival and development.
- Consequentialism:** Often equated to utilitarianism, but strictly holding that the good or bad is to be found in its consequences, not its principle of action or intention.
- Deontological ethics:** Essentially, “duty ethics”, standardly opposed to utilitarianism insofar as it holds that good lies in the principle or duty which action embodies, not its consequences.
- Determinism:** A problematic term typically, but falsely, counterposed to freedom of choice. The meaning adopted by life-ground ontology is to delimit (de-terminer) a known range of material possibility within which individual or collective choices can occur: otherwise put, individual and social freedom of choice within material limits.
- Development:** A central term of value in contemporary global discourse which does not distinguish between opposed forms of development or growth – principally, more commodities sold for profit (market development/growth) versus more means of life available for people’s lives (human development/growth).
- Dualism:** A central and controversial doctrine in philosophy in which reality is conceived as divided into two unbridgeable and incommensurable orders of being - most famously, mind and body, *res cogitans* and *res extensa*, the dualism instituted in Western philosophy by Descartes. Dualist divisions have been perpetual in philosophy since the ancients, and in respect of the felt side of being include reason-emotion, subjective-objective, and spirit-matter.
- Either-or reduction:** A regulating structure of normative thinking which assumes the logical form of *p or not-p* (“the excluded middle”), thereby eliminating the range of other value possibilities, including both in more complex mutual inclusion. See also **Dualism**.
- Epistemology:** This is a central field of philosophy concerned with the nature, grounds and limits of knowledge: a generally unrecognized realm of value judgment and theory insofar as judgments rest on elective norms of “true” and “false” and “valid” and “invalid”.
- Ethics:** One of the three recognized basic areas of philosophy: that which is concerned with what is good and bad in human action, including competing positions of utilitarianism, deontological/formalist/duty ethics, emotivism/non-cognitivism, evolutionary ethics, intuitionism, naturalism, perfectionism, phenomenological ethics, postmodern ethics, subjectivism/pluralism/relativism, self-realization/teleological ethics, and virtue ethics. Perhaps the most enduring received

meta-ethical debate is between consequentialism (judging by consequences, e.g., utilitarianism) and non-consequentialism (judging by the intrinsic principle of judgment and action e.g., Platonism and Kantianism). Moral philosophy is often equated to Ethics, but is in principle more restricted in reference to ought-to statements which entail prescriptions or prohibitions whose violation is thought to deserve guilt or punishment.

**Existentialism:** Classically defined by Jean-Paul Sartre as “existence precedes essence”, which means that human choice of what one does (existence) precedes any set fate, determinism, role or external design: with those denying responsibility of choice being in “bad faith” (*mauvais fois*).

**Externalism:** Any standpoint or theory which denies the inner fields of thought and feeling or, conversely, restricts reality to space-occupying states. See also **Mechanical reduction**.

**Fields of life value:** This concept refers to the fields of thought (concept and image), felt side of being (sentient and affective), and action (organic movement through space-time), the triune parametric of all value whatever as explained by the Primary Axiom of Value.

**Globalization:** A concept which admits of many different meanings but whose dominant meaning is globalization of capitalism. See **Capitalism**.

**Hermeneutics:** Theory, methodology or philosophy of interpretation of texts.

**Human value identity:** This is a concept which understands value identity as that which is identified with by a self as its value meaning (e.g., the value identity of a person who identifies only with his possessions including life as private property, *and* , at the other pole, the h.v.i. of a person or society which identifies with all of the life process without exclusion).

**Inclusivity principle:** The more coherently inclusive the taking account of in thought, feeling and action, the higher the value understanding.

**Intrinsic and instrumental value:** What is a good in itself and what is good as a means.

**Internal and external goods:** This is the basic distinction between what is a good in itself and what is a good as an external possession.

**Justice:** See **Social justice**

**Life-blind norms:** A characteristic tendency of the ruling value systems of established societies and of their received ideologies to blinker out their life-disabling effects.

**Life coherence principle:** The onto-axiological principle whereby positions or systems must be consistent with (1) factual premises and (2) valid inferences, so as (3) *to enable rather than disable life and life-systems* to qualify as valid.

- Life-Ground:** Most simply expressed, all of the conditions required to take the next breath, or life support systems in their entirety.
- Life-world:** Concept deployed by some continental philosophers like Husserl and Habermas which does not refer to life but to background beliefs. See **Life-Ground**
- Life sequence of value:** The process whereby any body of life becomes more life by means of life: which admits of regressive, reproductive and progressive modes and degrees, each measurable by the criteria of more/less fields of life enabled or enjoyed through time.
- Life standards:** Those principles and laws which protect and enable human and ecological life systems.
- Life support systems:** Any natural or human made system that enables the life of the biosphere in a sustainable way so as to meet human needs.
- Life-unconscious:** The life-unconscious arises out of life desires being conditioned to repressive forms – for example, the desire for oneness with life conditioned to be a craving for a power-machine vehicle dominating nature. See Bernays, Edward W. in **Bibliography**.
- Life-value metric:** More/less life range in any domain or degrees of life function or expression.
- Life-value onto-axiology:** The value-system which regards life and means of life to more coherently comprehensive ranges of life as the ultimate and universal good. (Also referred to as life-value onto-*ethic* when emphasis is on the normative dimension of the axiology.) See **Axiology**.
- Linguistic idealism:** The dominant tendency of philosophy to decouple language from its referents within autonomous and self-referential discourses.
- Linguistic turn:** Major philosophical movement of the twentieth century associated with the work of Ludwig Wittgenstein, but moving far beyond Wittgenstein and his school in its influence (e.g., anti-foundationalism, postmodernism) in confining philosophical problems and discourse to issues of language or sign systems.
- Measures of life value:** These refer to the ranges of the fields of life value which are maintained, gained or lost at the margins in reference to a prior or compared state (e.g., at the collective level, literacy rate growth, caloric and protein intake compared to health requirements, and housing ratios per capita to ratios of able-bodied citizens to available meaningful work of value to others). Life-value measure is applicable to phenomena in any life-field or domain by identification of more/less range of life capacity through time.

- Mechanism:** Doctrines according to which all phenomena are matter in motion or governed and predictable by physics-like laws. See also **Mechanical reduction**.
- Mechanical reduction:** Whatever reduces life or life-systems to mechanical systems so as to rule out non-mechanical life properties (e.g., the irreversibility of life processes, non-substitutability of constituents, or fields of internal life).
- Megamachine:** In onto-axiological terms, a system that runs by a-priori technical formulae disconnected from life needs to reorganize the world to fit a life-blind global system as transitory constitutive functions.
- Meta-Ethics:** The study of the nature of moral judgment: conventionally preoccupied with the logical status of ought and taxonomies of competing theories in exclusion of substantive moral issues.
- Metaphysics:** The ultimately regulating principles of existence (ontology) and knowledge (epistemology): referred to also as “metaphysic” when a doctrine lacks consciousness of the underlying principles of its assertion. //Metaphysics - The ultimately regulating principles of existence (ontology) and knowledge (epistemology) which typically lack grounding in universal life support systems of causation, choice and identity
- Money sequence of value:** Using anything whatever as means (including money derivatives) to turn private money sums into greater quantities in reiterated choice paths of money-value adding. The money sequence of value ultimately regulates and is expressed in myriad forms of so-called “globalization”.
- Moral Philosophy:** Moral philosophy is often equated to Ethics, but is in principle more restricted in reference to ought-to statements which entail prescriptions or prohibitions whose violation is thought to deserve guilt or punishment (e.g., in life-value onto-axiology, the prescription/prohibition not to harm life). See also **Ethics**.
- Natural kinds:** A concept introduced by Saul Kripke to refer to basic names like those for water or the human species which retain their meaning in every context whatever and which are “rigid designators” of their referents, not merely conventional signs but necessary in all worlds.
- Need:** That without which life capacity is reduced.
- Objective Values:** Values which are independent of individuals’ affirming them (e.g., the values of universal life support systems like the earth’s atmosphere ).
- Open question argument:** Whenever identity of the good with a natural property is claimed, the question of value that always remains is - but is it really *good*? (e.g., “pleasure”).

- Onto-Ethics/Onto-Axiology:** A primary concept of life-ground value theory in which the standard and reductionist split between ontology (the philosophy of being) and ethics/axiology (critical theory of good and bad) is overcome in a non-divided unity of understanding: such that the analysis of the ultimate structure of being as such (ontology) and of the ultimately regulating principles of good and bad (ethics/axiology) are integrated into one field of philosophical understanding.
- Pareto Optimum (or Pareto efficiency):** A standard ideal of philosophical and economic rationality in which no-one can be made better off without making someone else worse: based on pure-type dyadic exchanges of private assets *in vacuo*.
- Onto-axiology:** A concept which supersedes the standard reductionist split between ontology (the philosophy of being) and ethics/axiology (general theory of good and bad). Objective Values - Values which are independent of individuals' affirming them (e.g., the values of universal life support systems).
- Pareto Optimum (or Pareto efficiency):** A standard ideal of philosophical and economic rationality in which no-one can be made better off without making someone else worse: based on pure-type dyadic exchanges of private assets *in vacuo*.
- Phenomenology:** A major school of contemporary philosophy in which human consciousness as such is adopted as the direct object of analysis prior to the subject-object distinction, causal explanation or scientific claims.
- Primary Axiom of Value:** An axiom formally expressing the first and ultimate principle of all value and disvalue, and the measures of each across time, place or culture i.e., x is of value if and only if, and to the extent that, x consists in or enables more coherently inclusive thought/felt being/action. See also **Fields of life value**.
- Proceduralism:** A generic pattern of leading philosophies of value which assume that universal values can only be implicit in or decided by procedures of argument (e.g., "contractarian" models of justice and norms of "the ideal speech situation"), and whose rational "procedures" distinguish the different schools.
- Profit:** The positive difference between input of value and output of value whose dominant type is private money inputs and private money outputs to the maximum gain of money-capital owners. Profit from the positive difference between public investment and the life-value gain of citizens is its civil commons form.
- Relativism:** A generic term for the view that there are no objective or universal values because all values are by their nature relative to the contingent cultures, preferences, individuals, practices and world-views in which they are embedded.

- Ruling Value-System:** A society's value-system presupposed by those governed by it which ultimately regulates the decision norms and goals of the society's dominant social institutions, individual roles within them, and the thought structure of those internalizing it. See also **Value Syntax**.
- Second-order Shift:** A move from first-order value-system (e.g., to maximize pecuniary possessions or equivalents) to a second-order level of value understanding and choice within which the first-order value-system is only one regulating possibility. This is a logic of distinction which is straightforward in non-normative matters (e.g., the first-order of red and blue, and the second order of color), but not at the normative level wherever a ruling value program is assumed as without alternative.
- Social justice:** The baseline and measure of social justice is defined by the principle of its opposite which it overcomes: systematic suffering from need by the life-capacity loss entailed by the deprivation of life means.
- Soul:** The ultimate elective depth of the person or community, the feeling core opening beyond self as the felt bonds of being which admit of infinite possibilities.
- Transcendental deduction:** Logical analysis in which the necessary presuppositions of the intelligibility of a claim or position are deduced as self-evident (eg., the necessary presupposition that all humanity is European in the statement "Columbus discovered America").
- Truth:** See **Validity**.
- Universals:** Applied to general terms like 'red', 'table' or 'human being' in which an ancient debate from Plato through medieval scholasticism to philosophy today has involved the issue whether 'universals' refer to eternal forms independent of their instances ("idealism" or "realism") or are explicable as merely convenient designations for resembling particulars ("nominalism").
- Universal life goods:** All goods *without* which human life capacities are reduced or destroyed.
- Validity:** From the Latin, *validus*, or strong, usually reduced to rigorous logical consistency of inferences from premises (philosophy) or replicatable demonstration of empirical claims (science), with neither required to be consistent with life requirements. See **Life Coherence Principle**.
- Value compossibility:** The compatibility of formerly competing or traded-off goods yielding more coherently inclusive value provision (e.g., housing development including preservation of natural environments for multiplied value).

**Value neutrality:** A standard which is claimed when a value-system is so deeply taken for granted that its outcomes appear as value free although achieved by the regulation of strict criteria of value and value judgment (e.g., the canons of scientific method).

**Value-system:** Any stable set of regulators of judgment and action, whether or not the value deciders are recognized.

**Value syntax:** Organizing principles of pro-and-con meaning, prescription, position and transformation which regulate a value system, but may be invisible to those who presuppose it. In the ruling value syntax of contemporary global society, the *subject* is money capital whose *verb* is seeking to become more without upper limit, and all *modifiers* are money-demand or its equivalents: with competing money capital subjects and the human and natural resources they purchase, exchange and dispose of always used to become *more* money capital. Rationality in this onto-axiological grammar is regulatively presupposed as (i) self-maximizing strategies in (ii) conditions of scarcity or conflict over (iii) desired payoffs at (iv) minimum costs for the self to (v) win/gain more.

## Bibliography

Adorno, Max (1966/1973), *Negative Dialectics* 178pp. New York: Continuum. [This is an onto-epistemological work of the Frankfurt Critical Theory school which in general seeks to spell out the dehumanization of humanity by industrial capitalist ideology, but here in particular argues for dialectical thinking to dissolve conceptual forms before they harden into distorting lenses of experience by the inherent one-sidedness of words which exclude all to which they do not refer.]

Arendt, Hannah (1964), *Origins of Totalitarianism*. 520 pp. New York: Meridian. [Classic study of the nature of totalitarian regimes in Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union under Stalin whose striking insights into such phenomena as “the negative solidarity of alienated masses” are not generalized into explanatory principles applying beyond these alien regimes.]

R. Audi ed. (1995), *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 882 pp. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. [An excellent short encyclopedia of received philosophical authors, concepts and schools cited in this essay.]

Aristotle(1995), *The Complete Works of Aristotle* (ed. J. Barnes), Princeton: Princeton University Press [Includes Aristotle’s most famous work in ethics, the *Nicomachean Ethics*, as well as his other works in normative philosophy and value theory, *Eudemian Ethics*, *Economics*, *Politics*, and *Virtues and Vices*. The theory for which Aristotle is best most known, with a still contemporary school of ethics by this name, is “virtue ethics”. Aristotle’s general conception of the good, implicit in Plato’s earlier philosophical cornerstone, *The Republic*, also defines one of the major strains of philosophical thought thereafter: namely that the good is that which an entity thing aims to achieve in accord with its nature, whatever it is, with the good for the human being the realization of his or her human essence (reason), and the development of its faculties to the utmost: (*eudaimonia*, or self-realization).]

Armstrong, J. Sharing One Skin (1996), *The Case Against the Global Economy* (ed. Goldsmith E. And Mander J.) San Francisco: Sierra Books, 460-471. [Perhaps the most philosophically powerful statement of a first nation’s idea of life-grounded identity in opposition to the ruling value syntax.]

Aurobindo Ghose (1989), *The Life Divine*.1112pp. Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo Ashram.[The author’s greatest work which is distinguished by its dynamic, evolutionary conception of God in which the material world is not considered illusory as in Shankara’s and Buddha’s “illusionism”, but is in perpetual transformation from the Subconscient All through Desire-Force to Mind (instrumental reason),

Supermind (world consciousness), and Gnostic Consciousness (the all experiencing itself as all in all).]

Ayer, A.J. *Language, Truth and Logic* (1936), 160 pp. New York: Dover. [This classical statement of the once dominant school of “logical positivism” holds that since there are not observations that prove value statements as true or false, they are meaningless.]

Bacon, Francis (1620/1963), *Novum Organum*, 135pp. New York: Washington Square Press.[The origin of modern scientific method is standardly attributed to Bacon’s 1620 essay which adopts the machine as its model, the beginning of centuries of scientific and philosophical mechanism dominant to the present day, from scientific economics to models of the mind.]

Becker L.C. ed. (2000), *Encyclopedia of Ethics*, 641pp. London GB: Routledge [This is the definitive comprehensive text in the field by experts in the areas of published philosophy up to the end of the twentieth century, and provides the widest representation of value theory formally available. McMurtry’s essay entries on “Competition” and “Forms of Consciousness” define and explain primary but under-examined ethical categories addressed in the Theme essay.]

Bernays, Edward W. (1933), *Propaganda*, 159 pp. New York: Liveright [This is a revealing book by a nephew of Freud and a primary pioneer of modern mass-market conditioning and appeal to and control unconscious desires not needs to sell commodities and engineer consent.]

Bernecker, S. and Dretske, F. (2000), *Knowledge*, 595 pp. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [This is a state-of-the-art sourcebook of contemporary Anglo-American epistemology featuring definitive chapters by Austin, Ayer, Bonjour, Chisolm, Davidson, Goodman, Kripke, Lewis, Putnam, Quine, Russell, Sellars, Strawson and others featuring the standard criterion of knowledge as true, justified belief, with methodological elision of life-coherencerequirements.]

Bok, Sissela (1995), *Common Values*, 130 pp. Columbia MO: Missouri University Press [One of the few philosophical works which analyzes social moral systems and seeks a common core of values across cultures: but without any criterion of needs or relationship of the “minimalist norms” to the basic “biological survival needs” .]

Braybrooke, D. *et al* (1995), *Logic on the Track of Social Change* 273 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [This work is a first in joining formal logic to social analysis and focuses on selected historical conflicts of rule-prohibitions generating social change.]

Brentano, F. (1969), *The Origin Of Our Knowledge of Right and Wrong*. New York: Humanities Press. [An eminent modern representation of ethical idealism wherein values are not life-grounded, but conceived as akin to a-priori mathematical truths of which there are “correct” and “incorrect” understandings.]

Broome, J. (1999), *Ethics Out of Economics*, 267 pp. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [This analysis criticizes “the shifted sense of utility” in neoclassical economics over the last century, arguing that the directive principle of utilitarianism is an impartial principle of happiness production not economic self-maximization.]

Carman J. and Juergensmeyer M. eds. (1991), *A Bibliographical Guide to the Comparative Study of Ethics*, 811pp. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [The most culturally all-round bibliographical source available of major religious ethical traditions.]

Chang, Wnag-Tsit (1963), *Sourcebook in Chinese Philosophy*, 856 pp. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press. [This is the definitive and comprehensive collection of classical Chinese Philosophy from Lao tzu and Confucius to K’angYu-Wei, providing texts across millennia on “human-heartedness”, “natural harmony” and “the the Great Norm” or Tao’.]

Daniel, S.H., (2005), *Contemporary Continental Thought*, 490pp. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall [A distinctively comprehensive selection and primary explanation of the leaders of critical theory and postmodern philosophy from the first half of the twentieth century to the present].

Darwin, C. (1936), *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. 549 pp. New York: Modern Library [Darwin’s classical statement of what is and is not “fit” to live.]

Davidson, D. (1980), *Essays on Actions and Events* (2001), 324pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press.[A leading work of analytic philosophy in action theory, it is representative in confining action to intended individual

events, and weighting primary distinction of action versus physical events. Unlike W.O. Quine, another leader in the field, D. does not agree with reduction of individual actions to physical behavior, but against A. Goldman thinks bodily movements are necessarily part of an action.]

Dawkins, R. (1976), *The Selfish Gene*, 224 pp. Oxford: Oxford University Press.[Widely influential text of contemporary evolutionary biology featuring explanation by “the selfish replicators of genes and memes” by whose “universal ruthless selfishness” action is explained.]

Derrida, Jacques 1981. *Positions*, 114 pp. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [This is one of many books by the contemporary leader of postmodernism who argues the principle of undecidability with its entailment that any universal claim or truth collapses into unseen differences of perspective, positions and interpretations.]

Descartes, R. (1637- 41/1996), trans. Weissman, D. And Bluhm W.T., *Discourse on method and Meditations on first philosophy*. 383 pp. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press. [Often conceived as the father of modern philosophy, Descartes’ work has been most famous in its dualistic conception of human being - the mind or *res cogitans* as the immaterial and indivisible substance, and the body or *res extensa* as the material substance or body involving nothing but “divisions, shapes and motion” .]

Dewey, John (1925), *Experience and Nature*, 443pp. Chicago: Open Court.[This is Dewey’s most substantial work explaining his philosophy of experience whose experimentalist logic of knowing rejects all dualisms, highlights felt immediacy against merely abstract cognition, and integrates democracy and education into the process of intelligent life growth.]

de Wal, Franz (2009), *The Age of Empathy: Nature’s Lessons for a Kind Society*, 304 pp. London: Crown Publishers.[Like Kropotkin over a century earlier, argues against the dominant view of selfish competitive instincts of human and natural life as one-sided, showing empathy to have evolved since the emergence of mammals.]

Doyle, Ian and Gough, Len (1991), *A Theory of Human Need*, 365 pp. New York: Guilford Press. [This work makes the important distinction between needs and need satisfiers, but without any underlying principle of need across cultural differences.]

Dworkin, R. (1978), *Taking Rights Seriously*, 371pp.. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.[This well-known work “places the individual at the center” arguing that individual rights “always trump” other evaluative considerations, with norms, morality and justice only properly understood within a system of competing individual rights as fundamental.]

Edgeworth, Frances (1881[1932]). *Mathematical Psychics*, London: London School of Economics. [This is a formative work of onto-axiological economic mechanism in which it is assumed that “the conception of man as a pleasure machine may justify the employment of mechanical terms and mathematical reasoning in social science”.]

Edwards, Paul (1967), *Philosopher’s Index*, 8 volumes. London: Macmillan [This is the most comprehensive and detailed encyclopedia of philosophy in existence.]

Epstein, Samuel (2005). *Cancer-Gate*, New York: Baywood Press. [Expert explanation of the environmental causation of the many-levelled cancer epidemic.]

Falk, R. (2001), *Religion and Humane Social Governance*. 208 pp. London: Palgrave MacMillan.[An eminent legal scholar argues that only classical religious values can ground humane governance assuming empirical science as the sole alternative.]

Feuerbach, L. (1986), *Principles of the Philosophy of the Future*. 80pp. Indianapolis U.S.: Hackett Publishing. [This work applies the author’s “transformative method” of translating God’s attributes into human attributes to the human condition and the abstract possibility of the “community and unity of man with man”.]

Freire,Paul.(1967),*Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 243 pp. Boston: Beacon Press. [This classic in the philosophy of education, social justice and liberation emphasizes the importance of literacy in “desubmerging consciousness” to understand and confront structures of oppression.]

Freud, S. (1962-74), eds. Strachey J. et al, *Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Freud*, 24 vols. London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. [This edition contains all the works alluded to in this essay, including *Totem and Taboo*, *Group Psychology*, *The Ego and the Id*, *Beyond the Pleasure*

*Principle, and Civilisation and its Discontents.*]

Gandhi, M. (1935/2000), *The Bhagavad Gita according to Gandhi* 245 p. Berkeley, Ca.: Berkeley Hills Books.[Gandhi conceives the dynastic war of the Gita as an allegory for the inner war of the soul between the divine atman and the selfish forces of avidity.]

Gauthier, D. *Morals By Agreement* (1986), 367 pp. Oxford: Oxford University Press.[Definitive contractarian account of morality in a Hobbesian-market mode as an agreement among abstract and rationally self-maximizing agents deciding step by step is best for their own self-interests with no concern for others or *tuisism* involved.]

Georgescu-Roegen, N (1971), *The Entropy Law and the Economics Process*, 277pp. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press. [Unanswered critique of neo-classical economics, “the new economics”, by trained physicist and economist demonstrating that the reigning model of economic science violates the second law of thermodynamics.]

Gould, S.J. (1989) *Wonderful life: the Burgess Shale and the nature of history*, 347 pp. New York: WW. Norton. [This account by a famous paleontologist of the long extinct vertebrate world of the Burgess shale fossils prior to the four-limb and large-body development of vertebrate evolution expresses wonder at their beauty with no principles of value judgment.]

Great Law of Peace of the Longhouse Peoples. Akwesasne: White Roots of Peace, 1971. [Fire councils open with poetic tribute to life support systems as ultimate ground of the lives of all “expressing gratitude to the earth where men dwell, to the streams of water - - the maize and fruits - - to the animals that serve as food - - to the great winds - - and to the sun”.]

Hanfling, Oswald ed. (1987), *Life and Meaning*, 254pp. Oxford: Blackwell. [An excellent reader in onto-ethics featuring keynote selections from eminent ancient, modern and contemporary authors on the meaning of life from a wide spectrum of positions, including Mill on Nature.]

Hartmann, Nicolai (1950), *Ethics*, 821 pp. London: Allen and Unwin. [Originally published in Germany as *Ethik* in 1926, follows an ancient philosophical tendency since Plato to conceive moral values as akin to pure mathematical forms whose objective certitude is eternal and independent of perception of them. “Values do not change - - [it is] only our insight into them that changes”.]

Heidegger, M. (1977), *The Question of Technology and Other Essays* (trans. Lovitt W), 182 pp. New York: Garland. [This is an influential work in which Heidegger explores the lamentation that “everywhere we remain unfree and chained to technology” (p. 5), an obfuscatory treatment in which technology’s economic value selector and regulator is blocked out.]

Heidegger, M. (1996), *Being and Time*, 487 pp. Albany N.Y: State. [ This is Heidegger’s magnum opus crystallizing his study of philosophy from the pre-Socratics and pioneering contemporary existential phenomenology, featuring the elusive idea of Being (*Sein*) as the forgotten ground of philosophy, the struggle of individual being against the “they-self” (*das Man*), and the “being towards death” that sets the defining issue for the individual (*Dasein*).

Hobbes, Thomas (1651/1958), *The Leviathan. Parts One and Two*, 299 pp. New York: Liberal Arts Press. [The first classic of the liberal canon, arguing on a mechanistic basis that men are matter in motion moved by appetites and aversion, above all towards “power after power that ceaseth only in death” whose generation of interminable conflicts and war breeds an existence which is “nasty, brutish and short” until all yield up their powers unconditionally to an absolute sovereign, “the Leviathan” state, which “bears their persons” and imposes the peace by which all can live in fear only of it.]

Hodgson, Bernard (2001), *Economics as Moral Science*, Heidelberg: Springer Press. [An inside and scholarly critique of formal consumer choice theory in neo-classical economics which lays bare its dehumanizing reductionism.]

Holmstrom-Hintikka, G. and Tuomela, Raimo eds (1997), *Contemporary Action Theory*, 2 vols. 266/267pp pp. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic. [The volumes provide an overview of action theory, volume 1 on individual action (what philosophy focuses on, usually in relationship to mind) and volume 2 on social action.]

Honderich, T. (1995), *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, 1009 pp. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [A comprehensive dictionary of philosophy by experts in the field with useful entry on action theory.]

Hume, David, (electronic), *The Complete Works and Correspondence of David Hume* [The complete written corpus of the widely conceived leading philosopher of the English-speaking world includes his *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, where he presents the famous argument that no “ought” can be deduced from an “is”, as well as his view that advocacy of “the equality of property” is a “crime deserving of the severest punishment”.]

Jonas, Hans (1966), *The Phenomenon of Life: Towards a Philosophical Biology*. 303pp. New York: Harper and Row. [A rich phenomenological study which is insightful on the modern alienation between the natural organic world as lifeless mechanism (*res extensa*) and human mind and inwardness as a realm apart (*res cogitans*).]

Jablonka, E. and Lamb, M. (2005), *Evolution in Four Dimensions*, 472 pp. Cambridge Mass.: Bradford Books/MIT Press.[This book importantly argues against a received one-way dogma that evolution is a developmental system in which not only genes but heritable variations play a role in evolution through epigenetic, behavioural, and symbolic processes which modify DNA sequences by selecting which genes switch on and off.]

Kant, I. (1992) *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*, 15 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Kant’s signature concepts of the “categorical imperative” (“act only in such a way as make the maxim of your action a universal law”) and “the kingdom of ends” (never treat another as simply a means, but always *also* at the same time as an end”).]

Kropotkin, P. (1955), *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* , 362 pp. Boston: Extending Horizons Books. [This is a classical argument for cooperation as a factor of evolution as distinguished from Darwinian competitive struggle alone, providing a wealth of data including of pre-capitalist cooperative social formations but not defining principles.]

Kuhn, T.S. (1962), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 209 pp. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Definitive analysis of scientific paradigm shifts following persistent anomalies building towards crises in the “normal science” of the day.]

Laing, R.D. (1972), *The Politics of the Family*, 92 pp. Toronto: Anansi under auspices of Massey Lectures. [Explains how validating and invalidating attributions within a “family drama” can control and distort the development of human personality by the “mapping” of family roles across generations.]

Lane, R.E. (2000), *The loss of happiness in market democracies*, 465 pp. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.[This is a major empirical study showing that rising income and growth negatively correlate with reported happiness after \$7500+Cola per year, thereby demonstrating that the primary assumption by market economics of a positive correlation or equation is false.]

Lieber, J. (1975) *Noam Chomsky: A Philosophic Overview*, 192 pp. New York: St. Martin’s Press. [This work explains Chomsky’s linguistic theory connects it to his analysis of public affairs via the unifying idea of an autonomously rational human nature.]

Locke, John (1690/1950), *The Second Treatise on Government*, 139 pp. New York: Liberal Arts Press. [This is the founding classic of liberal value theory arguing for private property by labor right, but negating labor and non-scarcity provisos by the introduction of money by “tacit consent”.]

MacIntyre, A.(1981), *After Virtue*. 271 pp. London: Duckworth. [This is the definitive contemporary work of “virtue ethics”, including the distinction between “internal and external goods”, and the criterion of “practices” and “excellences”.]

Mackie, J.L. (1977), *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong*, 249 pp. New York: Penguin.[This text is representative of the dominant subjectivist view of Ethics as merely “preferences”:, arguing that all ethical judgments of right and wrong, good or bad are “false”.]

Manno, J.P. (2000), *Privileged Goods: Commoditization and Its Impact on Environment and Society*, 252 pp. London: Lewis Publishers. [This is a definitive documentation by expert witness of the devastating effects of the commodity measure of efficiency on ecological systems.]

Marcuse, H. (1956), *Eros and Civilization*, 209 pp. Boston: Beacon Press [This is an original philosophical synthesis of Marxian and Freudian thought moving beyond Freud’s reality principle of necessary repression to affirmation of “the life instinct” “and unrestricted “libidinous” possibility enabled in a society which has overcome material scarcity, capitalist repression of labor, and remaining “surplus

repression”.]

Marcuse, H (1964), *One-Dimensional Man*, 260pp. Boston: Beacon Press [Marcuse’s most famous work which was a central text of the 1968 student uprisings in Europe and America as a critique of capitalist technology and its reduction of life to a totalizing consumer-management culture.],

Marcuse, H. (1978), *The Aesthetic Dimension: Towards a Theory of Marxist Aesthetics*, 71 pp. Boston: Beacon Press. [This is distinctive account of art as creative negation of the status quo.]

Marcuse, H., Habermas, J. *et al* (1978-79), *Theory and Politics*, *Telos* **38**,125-153. [This rich debate-discussion reveals the differences and limits of the two leading progressive philosophers of the twentieth century and what they have left behind: featuring a germinal statement of the dismissal of Heidegger’s “bad metaphysics”, the organizing ideas of Habermas’s “communication theory”, and Marcuse’s Hegelian-Freudian-Marxian ontology ally revealing the absence of a principled life-ground of value in philosophy’s theorists of “the life-world” (Habermas) and “the life instinct” (Marcuse)].

Marx, Karl and Engels, F. (1975- ), *Collected Works of Marx and Engels*, 44 vols. (ed. R. Dixon et al). New York: International Publishers [Complete works of Marx in English, relevant where Marx either presupposes or denies value orientation in an underlying conflictedness between moral and onto-ethical concerns he incandescently expresses, on the one hand, and a rigorously conscious scientific method denying issues of value as objectively significant or merely ideological, on the other hand. His Prefaces to *Contribution to a Critique of Political Economy* (1859) and *Capital* (1867) provide the most precise statement of the latter position, and his early *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* the richest reaches of the former.]

McMurtry, J. (1978), *The Structure of Marx’s World-View*. 278 pp. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [this work defines an ultimately regulating inner logic of Marx’s philosophy and science across domains and periods, in particular drawing out his undergirding concept of human nature and its realization upon which the whole implicitly rests.]

McMurtry, J., (1979) “How to tell the Left from the Right”, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* **IX** (3), 387-411. [This study moves underneath the phenomena of ‘left’ and ‘right’ as primary naming categories of ethico-political opposition to the unexamined principles governing their value-stand meanings since the ancients, and how they provide an explanatory moral compass today.]

McMurtry, J. (1981) “Is There a Marxian Personal Morality?”, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, Supplement VII, 171-9. [This analysis is useful as the only work seeking to deduce a substantive individual ethic from the work of Karl Marx in the light of the methodological barriers against such a project.]

McMurtry, J. (1984), “Fascism and Neo-Conservatism: Is There a Difference?”, *Praxis International* **4** (1), 86-102. [A systematic comparison of regulating principles of doctrine.]

McMurtry J. (1986) “The Argumentum Ad Adversarium”, *Informal Logic*, VIII.1, 27-36. [Explains the underlying logical disorder of fallacies by diversion (*ignoratio elenchi*) as forms of switching the issue to an accepted enemy or adversary of the community addressed (e.g., “communist”, “liberal”, “unbeliever”), a track-switch of thought argued to be a universal but defeasible form of fallacious thought and social life.]

McMurtry, J. (1988) “The Unspeakable: Understanding the System of Fallacy of the Media”, *Informal Logic*, 41:3,133-50. [This analysis sets out the general regulating framework of the “ruling value syntax” as a system of rules selecting against whatever invalidates the presupposed ruling order of control over society’s means of existence, and for whatever validates it - in correspondence to the > < degrees of each.]

McMurtry, J. (1989), *Understanding War*, 90 pp. Toronto: Science for Peace [This monograph demonstrates the locked choice-spaces of the military paradigm of war across cultures and times, and explains the onto-ethical alternative of warring for life value and life support systems.]

McMurtry, J.(1998), *Unequal Freedoms: The Global Market As An Ethical System*, 372 pp. Toronto and Westport CT: Garamond and Kumarian [A systematic critique exposing the unexamined ethical assumptions and assertions of classical, neoclassical and contemporary ethical and political theory as well as policy of the “liberal market order” as a ruling value system.]

McMurtry, J. (1999/2002), *The Cancer Stage of Capitalism*, 312 pp. London and Tokyo: Pluto and Springer Press. [This work explains how ruling value systems since the ancients may be life-blind and yet presupposed by the leading critical philosophers of the period, spelling out this pattern in the money-value sequences of late capitalism which are argued to be systematically carcinogenic at the social level of life organization.]

McMurtry, J. (2002), *Value Wars: The Global Market versus the Life Economy*, 262pp. London: Pluto Press [This volume explains and tracks the underlying epochal principles of opposing value-systems in the 'new world order' across phenomena of wars, social system conflicts, ecological crises and public-sector meltdowns, with defining constitutional regulators for a life-grounded global order.]

McMurtry, John (2007), "The Postmodern Voice of Empire: The Metalogic of Unaccountability", *The Postcolonial and the Global*, (eds. Krishnaswamy K. and Hawley J.), 328 pp. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.[This is a systematic life-value critique of postmodern thought system within a representative text of postmodern/postcolonial positions.]

Merchant, Carolyn (1980), *The Death of Nature*, 292pp. New York: Harper and Row.[This work provides a prototype eco-feminist analysis of the images of modern scientific mechanism since Bacon and their violent usurpation of the prior central metaphor of 'earth as nurturing mother'.]

Mill, John Stuart (1963-91), *Collected Works*, 33 vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. [These volumes contain the works cited in this essay, *On Liberty* and *On Utilitarianism* and the essay, "On Nature" from his *Three Essays on Religion*.]

Miller, Peter and Westra, Laura, eds (2002), 326 pp. *Just Ecological Integrity: The Ethics of Planetary Life*, Boston: Rowman and Littlefield. [Representative text of original work in environmental ethics by philosophers, social scientists and ecologists on occasion of the Earth Charter 2000.]

Mill, J.S. (1860/1996) *Utilitarianism*, 260pp. New York: Oxford University Press [This volume contains the primary modern statement of value as defined by "the Greatest Happiness Principle" wherein "all actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce pain".]

Miller, P. And Westra, L (2002), *Just Ecological Integrity: The Ethics of Planetary Life*, 326pp. Boston: Rowman and Littlefield. [This cross-current collection of articles, written for the occasion of the Earth Charter 2000 in Costa Rica, provides state-of-the-art analyses at the interface between human understanding and values, on the one hand, and ecological challenges of sustainability, on the other.]

Mirowski, P. (2000), *Machine Dreams*, 540 pp. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [This study tracks the machine model in models of applied cognitive science into the "automaton theater" of economic, military and decision-theory research.]

Monbiot, G. (2000), *Captive State: The Corporate Takeover of Britain*, 430 pp. London: Macmillan.[This analysis excels as a documented paradigm case of how rule-system formation and application by contemporary states have been captured by private corporate power.]

Moore, GE (1909), *Principia Ethica*, 272 pp. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [This is the classic work of ethical theory of the twentieth century, and exhibits in paradigm form the close analysis of argument and agent-relative premises which have typified the dominant analytic school of Anglo-American moral theory since David Hume.]

Nietzsche, Friedrich (1964), *The Complete Works of Nietzsche* (ed. O. Levy). New York: Russell and Russell. [Includes the works in value theory referred to and critiqued throughout the Theme Essay, such as *The Genealogy of Morals* and *Beyond Good and Evil* which explain Nietzsche's master idea that "values are constructs of domination", and that moral will is ultimately a "will to power": with "slave morality" too as a will to power moved by *ressentiment* against the rule of "nature's aristocracy", to whose "free expression" inferior human beings "must be reduced to slaves, to tools". Martin Heidegger and Michel Foucault diversely express the Nietzschean value ontology - the former in a dichotomy of *Sein* (Being) and *das Mann* (loosely, superior and mass man), and the latter in the organizing idea of a ruling knowledge/power alliance with no limit.]

Noddings, Nel (1984/2003), *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*, 275pp. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. [This work leads in developing a concrete relational morality of *caring* with no onto-ethical ground.]

Noonan, J. (2003), *Critical Humanism and the Politics of Difference*, 189 pp. Kingston-Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press. [This study exposes a deep-structural contradiction between postmodern denial of any universal human essence *and* the presupposition of just such a value essence for human life to self-determine differences.] // [This pathbreaking study examines postmodernism in the works of its leading authors (e.g., principally Derrida, Foucault, Lyotard and Iris Young), and exposes a deep-structural contradiction - between postmodern denial of any universal human essence *and* the presupposition of just such a value essence - for human life to self-determine - which Noonan shows is implicit in "the principle of difference" itself, and in submerged humanity's continuous uprisings against ruling systems of oppression.]

Nozick, R. (1974), *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, 367pp. New York: Basic Books. [A very influential work rejecting liberal arguments for equality of rights in favour of rights of private property to trump any kind of redistributive ethic, argument or policy.]

M.C. Nussbaum and Amartya Sen eds. (1993) *The Quality of Life*. Clarendon: Oxford University Press. A major collection of articles and replies to them by leaders in the field including the editors, G.A. Cohen, Onera O'Neill, Hilary Putnam, Charles Taylor, and Michael Walzer, on equality, capability and well-being, gender justice, and standards of living: none of which grounds in need requirements or life support systems.]

Nussbaum, M. (1999 ) *Sex and Social Justice*, 476pp. New York: Oxford University Press.[Major work of an outstanding Aristotelian liberal and feminist, revealing in its attention to "separateness", "the separate individual" as the ground of value understanding, the "fundamental fact of ethics", thus entailing abstraction out of life support systems as a methodological given.]

Olson, M.(1965) *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*, 176pp. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press. [Along with Arrow's Paradox, the classical and more comprehensive statement of the problem of collective action based on individual choice functions alone.]

Ostrom, Elinor (1990) *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, 280 pp. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press. [Recipient of the 2009 Nobel Prize in Economics, Ostrom confines her study to small-scale commons organized and governed by individuals without government funding, legal enforcement, or life-value criterion.]

G. Outka and J.P. Reeder eds. (1993), *Prospectus for a Common Morality*, 302pp. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [This collection of original articles includes internationally recognized leaders in the field with, as elsewhere, no common life interests defined.]

Pareto, Vilfredo, (1971 [1906]), *Manual of Political Economy*, New York: A.M. Kelley [Classic of rational choice theory and economic reason whose famous principle of "Pareto optimality/efficiency" is based on dyadic asset exchange with no relation to life value.]

Parfit, D. (1984), *Reasons and Persons*, 543pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [The definitive work of this author and of contemporary discourse on "personal identity", exemplifying fine-grained argumentation on the idea that "personal identity" means sameness through time.]

Patel, Raj (2009), *The Value of Nothing: Where Everything Costs Much More than We Think*, 250pp. Toronto: Harper-Collins [Useful work on global market failures and commons options.]

Perry, R.B. (1969), *Realms of Value: A Critique of Human Civilization*, 487 pp. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. [Perry provides the most comprehensive argument for the general value theory of the good = what is desired.]

Plato (1961), *The Collected Dialogues of Plato* (ed. E. Hamilton and H. Cairns), Pantheon Books: New York. [The complete dialogues in which Socrates' and Plato's idealist "Theory of Forms" posits pure, transcendental and eternal ideas of which all material entities are but inferior, mutable copies.]

Polanyi, Karl (1944/2000), *The Great Transformation*, 315 pp. Boston: Beacon Press. [This canonical study lays bare the life fabric of violent transition from pre-market village society through the utopian free market cataclysm to the 1944 understanding of community instituted by public institution and the welfare state.]

Radhakrishnan, S. and Moore, C. (1957), *Sourcebook in Indian Philosophy*, 683pp. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [This is a definitive and comprehensive collection of Indian philosophy and non-

Western value understanding, including the full texts of the eleven principal Upanishads, the Bhagavad-gita, and canonical selections of early and late Buddhism.]

Rawls, J. (1967), *A Theory of Justice*. 542pp. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press. [This is the leading work in the field whose paradigmatic method assumes self-maximizing rational choice “including wanting a larger share for oneself” and abstract agents and institutions decoupled from life needs and collective support systems.]

Reid, G.B.R. (2007), *Biological Emergences: Evolution by Natural Experiment*, 517pp. Cambridge Mass: MIT Press.[This work by a biologist explains how the “autocatalyzing” organism is a coordinating system which reduces infinite interactive possibilities to predictable pathways of homeostasis but is sufficiently flexible to allow for emergence of new types of life.]

Rescher, N. (1969), *Introduction to Value Theory*, 205 pp. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.[This monograph by the most published analytic philosopher of the last century exemplifies the era’s formalist method and symbolic notations purged of substantive issues of value.]

Robert, J.S. (2008), *Embryology, Epigenesis, Evolution*, 290pp. New York: Cambridge University Press [Critiques the one-way “genomania” which has swept over contemporary evolutionary biology and popular thought, as in sociobiology, with value choice erased.]

Rorty, R. (1989), *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*, 289 pp. New York: Cambridge University Press. [With his earlier *The Mirror of Nature* (1979), this work is the most prominent text of the anti-foundationalist movement in philosophy, denying any common standard of truth or value].

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques (1984), *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* (trans. M. Cranston), 182 pp. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books [Rousseau conceives human beings in their natural state of human language, reason and species sympathy before private property, division of labor and vain desires corrupt and alienate them.]

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques (1968), *The Social Contract* (trans. G.D.H. Cole), 100 pp. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books [Rousseau’s best known but widely misunderstood work featuring the grounding idea of ‘giving the law to oneself’ to resolve the conflict between individual freedom and state law, with citizens choosing “the common interest” to constitute the “general will” of democratic government.]

Russell, Bertrand (1983- ), *Bertrand Russell: Collected Papers*, 29 vols. London: Allen and Unwin. [Includes Russell’s prolific corpus of philosophical and public works, including his regret of twentieth-century philosophy’s wide abandonment of “understanding the world itself , that grave and important task which philosophy throughout has hitherto pursued”].

Samuelson, Paul and Nordhaus W.D. (2005), *ECONOMICS*, 784 pp. New York: McGraw-Hill. [The standard global reference text and classic of contemporary economics in which the preface invokes the value imperative to “Spread the gospel of economics anyway we can”.]

Sartre, Jean-Paul (1972), *Critique of Dialectical Reason*. 2 Vols. London: Verso Books. [Sartre’s major work after his earlier 1953 classic of existential phenomenology, *Being and Nothingness*, seeking to synthesize individual existential choice with Marxian dialectical reason.]

Schopenhauer, Arthur (1818/1957), *The World as Will and Representation*, 3 vols. London: Routledge . [This is Schopenhauer’s definitive work, the classic “pessimistic philosophy” in virtue of its depiction of cosmic life as a round of blind desire, competitive struggle and suffering which leads reason to “denial of the will to live”.]

Schweitzer, Albert (1936), “The Ethics of Reverence for Life”, *Christendom*, 1, 225-39. [This is perhaps the most crystalline argument for Schweitzer’s flagship “new ethics” rebutting prior ethics for “an absolute ethics of will-to-live [which] must reverence every form of life, seeking so far as possible to refrain from destroying any life, regardless of its particular type”.]

Searle, J.R. (1995), *The Construction of Social Reality*, 238 pp. New York: Free Press. [Searle argues clearly for the irreducibly symbolic and rule-governed character of objective human reality not possibly explicable by physical particles and fields of force.]

Sen, Amartya (1977).”Rational Fools: A Critique of the Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory”, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 6, 317-44. [This classic article argues against the purely selfish

understanding of self-maximizing rationality.]

Sen, A (1998), *The Possibility of Social Choice*”, 37pp. Trinity College, Cambridge: Nobel Lecture [This lecture provides an incomparably rich documentation of the literature on social choice, demonstrating there is no conception of social choice in received social science or philosophy other than as an aggregation of individual choosers.]

Singer, Irving (1966 -1987), *The Nature of Love*, 3 volumes. Chicago: Chicago University Press. [The most comprehensive study of theories of love from Plato to Sartre, it argues for love as “bestowal of value” on the love object without life-value considerations.]

Smith, Adam (1776/1966), *An Inquiry into Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. 2 vols. New York: A.M. Kelley. [Possibly the most influential work in history, the founding work of “the moral science” of modern economics.]

Spinoza, Baruch (1985), *The Collected Works of Spinoza* (ed. E. Curley), 7 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [Spinoza’s most studied work, the *Ethics* is a deductive system modelled on Euclid’s definitions, axioms and theorems in which God or infinite substance is conceived as the rational system of the universe in its thinking and extended modes and infinite attributes which can be better (more adequately) or worse (less adequately) comprehended.]

Tompkins, P. And Bird, C., *The Secret Life of Plants* (1973). 402 pp. New York: Harper & Row [This book provides extensive evidence for the sentience of plants.]

Taylor, Charles (1989), *Sources of the self: the making of the modern identity*, 601pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. [This is a standard work in what is called “communitarian ethics” for its grounding in historically developed social relations as distinct from abstract liberal selves maximizing in a “value-neutral void”, but without any common life interest or base.]

Thoreau, Henry (1965), *Walden, and other writings*. 732 pp. New York: Modern Library. [Thoreau’s classic writings affirming a life of harmonious simplicity and awakens in Nature and his explanation of opposition to war by non-violent civil disobedience.]

Trungpa, C. (1988). *Shambala: The Sacred Path of the Warrior*. 202 pp. Boston: Shambala Press [A leading example of contemporary conception of religious illumination and practice as that of a “warrior path” of happiness, here the Tibetan Buddhist “vehicle of the thunderbolt”.]

Vico, G. (1724/1984), *The New Science*, 445 pp. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press. [In which Vico argues that humanity can only know for certain that which it has created because it is directly our construction.]

Weisbrot, M., Baker, D., and Rosnick, D. (2006). “The Scorecard on Development: 25 Years of Diminishing Progress”, *International Journal of Health Services* 36,2: 211-234.[Scientific identification of the pattern of degrading human life systems during market-system globalization.]

Whitehead, A.N. (1938), *Modes of Thought*, 172 pp. New York: Macmillan [Whitehead’s most well known lectures on his “process philosophy” which conceives Nature as “alive”, “feeling”, “purposing” and ever “creative” in the energy flows described by physics (the totality of which processes he conceives as God), as opposed to “dead” and “inert” in the Newtonian tradition.]

Wilson E.O. (1984) *Biophilia* (157 pp.) Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press. [An eminent entomologist proposes the “biophilia hypothesis” of an innate “affinity with nature ingrained in our genotype” to explain “why humans care for other species unrelated to them”.]

Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1968), *Philosophical Investigations*. 260 pp. New York: Macmillan. [Perhaps the most celebrated work of twentieth-century philosophy, it leads what philosophers have come to call “the linguistic turn” of philosophy with no reference to the world beyond “language games”.]

World Commission of the Environment and Development (1986). *Our Common Future*, New York: Oxford University Press.[ This famous work endorses “five to ten times” more commodity system “growth” with no life standards of “sustainable development”.]

### **Biographical Sketch**

**John McMurtry** holds his B.A. and M.A. from the University of Toronto, Canada and his Ph.D from the University of London, England, and has been Professor of Philosophy at the University of Guelph for over 25 years and University Professor Emeritus since 2005. He is an elected Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, and his many articles, chapters, books and interviews have been internationally published and translated.