<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>World of Reason</th>
<th>World of Emotion</th>
<th>Crucible of Spirituality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Question</td>
<td>What are good results?</td>
<td>What are mutually good results?</td>
<td>How can I be a partner in creating a better world?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Results: Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Complex harmonizing of goods for greater good.</td>
<td>Sacred Imagination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative Authors</td>
<td>John Stuart Mill, Jeremy Bentham</td>
<td>Bernard Lonergan, Frederick Ferre</td>
<td>William Lynch, Rosemary MacNaughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools and Practices</td>
<td>Experience, Action/Reflection</td>
<td>Awareness, Self-Soothing</td>
<td>Imagination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Phrase</td>
<td>I have choices</td>
<td>I am consistent.</td>
<td>I am co-creator of what is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Identify the goals of life.</td>
<td>Creatively imagine solutions which lead to higher goods.</td>
<td>Awareness of participating in sacred plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>Self-directed choices.</td>
<td>Respect for others; Ability to live with ambiguity; Integrity.</td>
<td>Optimism, enthusiasm, flexibility, hope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Inconsistent choices between long and short term goals.</td>
<td>Maintaining consistency between actions and self-views</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Reduce all to cost/benefit</td>
<td>Non-attention to imbalance of power</td>
<td>Attachment (lack of detachment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubris</td>
<td>Expedience</td>
<td>Assuming that one knows the other</td>
<td>My way is best/only way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice</td>
<td>Greed</td>
<td>Freeloding</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>Discouragement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 8

Result Focused Ethics
The Individual-Action Lens

The next ethical lens flows from the second major tradition which focuses on the decision maker’s goals and objectives. Because the emphasis is on each individual person choosing to act in a way which makes him happy, the lens is called the individual-action lens. Drawing upon the traditions of Aristotle, St. Aquinas, and St. Ignatius Loyola, the earliest theorists in the modern era who focused on the right of people to pursue the goals that make them happy are John Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham. Dubbed utilitarianism, the notion is that the ethical action is that which provides the greatest good for the greatest number. In this quest, all people
are to be included so that segments of our community (the world?) do not have to live with dreams deferred.

Although many have taken issue with the theory, the underlying concept that we each get to choose how we will live and pursue the ends that make us happy endures. This particular tradition has had much criticism for not attending to concepts of justice as well as the deontological traditions. However, the reflective process by which one determines what key goals are important and worthy of pursuit for individuals and how to preserve the goals for the community remains fresh and relevant.

Working from the central concept of ethics as finding the goals which will create the most happiness for the most people, the individual-action lens invites each ethical agent to determine for himself what goals are worthy of pursuit. This school of thought matured as Mill and other Enlightenment philosophers were breaking from the Medieval traditions where the church, or other authority, told each person what her role would be based on the family structure, economic status, and gender roles. Mill and Bentham moved forward the notion that each of us has the right to choose what makes us happy, as individuals as well as a community. While the foundations were laid, it has taken more than 200 years for us to come into a more full appreciation of the right of individuals to choose how to participate in the community based on their own preferences rather than an assigned role.

One stark example of the tendency to limit women’s participation based on role was sketched by Linda Kerber as she traced the history of women being able to fully participate as citizens in our community. One of the chapters in her seminal work, *No Constitutional Right to be Ladies*, traced the history of women’s attempts to be systematically included on juries, one of the last barriers to full civic participation. Kerber recounts the following conversation which took place in the House of Representatives in 1966:

> Emmanuel Celler of New York – who had been supporting
women’s voluntary service for many years—rose in the House of Representative to assure Martha Griffiths of Michigan that he was willing to support compulsory service for women if he could be reassured on one issue: “Frankly, I am caught between the urging of the gentlewoman from Michigan and a male constituent, who expects a hot meal on the table when he returns from work. Is it the gentlewoman’s desire to come between man and wife?”

Not until 1975 did the Supreme Court find that to meet the constitutional requirement of “a jury of peers,” women needed to be systemically included in jury panels, even if that meant that they may not be home to prepare dinner.

Mill, who ardently supported the rights of both women and men to be full participants in the community, articulated a theoretical basis for each of us following our own dreams rather than those dictated by roles. Intriguingly, many times we all choose to embrace traditional roles, however we must always be careful to assure that the choice is our own. Mill reminds us that even though we are part of society, we are not just one of many but an individual with dreams that should not be deferred.

In the process Mill reminds us that we cannot just satisfy the desires of the moment. Mill also invites us to seek the ideal goals, such as liberty, equality, and democracy. We are sometimes asked to put aside our individual preferences for the higher good. As anyone who has stayed inside on a beautiful day to finish a paper or project knows, we sometimes have to endure “short term pain for long term gain.” Sometimes those of us with access to power may be required to not press our advantage in order to allow those with less power to realize their dreams.

The theories of utilitarianism also provide the foundation for our market economy. Just as each of us can choose what we want to do, each of us can choose how we wish to use our resources. Classic liberal economic thought finds that individuals are the basis of our community. As each of us
rationally maximizes our self-interest, does that which makes us happy, the market reaches equilibrium. The notion is that we will not pay more for something than it is worth to us; we will not work for less than we think we are worth or than an individual employer is willing to pay. In this economy we will have full information of our options and opportunities. Thus Adam Smith, and the economists who have followed in this tradition, use the philosophical foundations of utilitarianism to justify the political and economic theories and policies.5

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESULTS BASED THEORIES
(Individual/Action Lens)

- An ethical act is that which creates the greatest happiness for the greatest number.
- A moral act is one which moves toward the greater good, complex harmonizing satisfactions for many.
- Spiritual balance is maintained as we use our imagination to work for mutually supportive goals.

Definition: An action is ethical if good ends and/or results come from the action. In particular, the action will assure that the greatest amount of ideal goals and/or results (happiness) is reached for the greatest number of people.

In this tradition, a moral person is the one who works to harmonize her goals with those of others. Knowing that relationships with others are “alive with feelings” as we make choices which bring us happiness or as our goals and dreams are thwarted, we work together to move toward the common good.6

The crucible of spirituality allows us to creatively find ways to meet both our own goals as well as those of others. Growing up means that we have to come to terms with the need to choose among competing goods, choices that mean that one good path needs to be chosen over another equally good path. Each choice requires change. We use our spiritual energy to fuel the process of change while maintaining the integrity of the community structures of which we are a part.7
Questions for determining right action:

- How does this result help my long-term self interest while allowing for concern about the well-being of others?

- How does this result produce or tend to produce the greatest amount of satisfaction for the greatest number of stakeholders?

- How does this result promote or tend to promote those goals which are part of human happiness (e.g. health, wealth, friendship, knowledge)?

- How does this result move toward harmonizing goods for other individuals in the community?

- How does this result support responsible choices and move toward creative change?

Values which flow from these theories:

- *Maximizing satisfaction:* The ethical agent should aim at maximizing the satisfaction of the organization’s stakeholders.

- *Efficiency:* The members of the organization should attempt to attain its goals as efficiently as possible by consuming as few resources as possible and minimizing the external costs which the agency imposes on others.

- *Loyalty:* The employee should use every effective means to achieve the goals of the organization and should not act in a way which would jeopardize the goals.

- *Avoid conflict of interest:* The employee should use every effective means to achieve the goals of the organization and should not get into situations where personal interests conflict significantly with the goals of the agency.
As each of us learns that we can live our lives the way we choose, we can become heady with the freedom of autonomy. However, we note that we make those choices in a “matrix of personal relations,” a community which cooperates and is bound together by their own needs and a drive to move toward the common good. These relationships are not isolated and theoretical but rather they are infused with the whole range of emotions that come as one embraces a dream, works to make that dream a reality, and then finally succeeds or fails. Along the way we discover that there are goals which give us as individuals a particular good. Then we learn that we can work with others to harmonize the individual goods for a good for all. This shift may be from making sure that I have a job to making sure that others are employed as well. Another example may be noticing that I had good mentoring to learn how to do my work and thus want to put in place programs to assure that all new faculty members receive an orientation which will enhance their ability to succeed.

Post-modern theorists point us to the common good by asking us to consider how to move to greater good. Frederick Ferré asserts that self-interest encourages us to survival. Choosing to survive and be satisfied, the theory of Mill, is even better. The best is to find a way to survive with “complex, harmonized satisfactions.” Ferré believes that as we seek to maximize the good for all of the members of the community we can begin to mitigate against the problem of evil.

Working towards these complex, harmonized satisfactions is the goal of good leadership. Goleman identifies one style of leadership as coaching, where the leader helps people identify their strengths and weaknesses then work with them to harmonize their individual goals with the goals of the organization. Effective coaches manage themselves by being emotionally aware, empathetic and authentic. Then they are able to work with others without either micro-managing or putting the goals of the organization ahead of the goals of individuals.
Bernard Lonergan asserts that one of the results of our unrestricted desire to know is a desire to also seek the good. This desire propels humans into a quest for the good which is dynamic...[with] its own normative line of development, inasmuch as the ideas of order are grasped by insight into concrete situations, are formulated in proposals, are accepted by explicit or tacit agreements, and are put into execution only to change the situation and give rise to still further insights.\textsuperscript{11}

For Lonergan the practical, concrete trajectory for ethical growth which acknowledges the provisional state of our knowledge is then translated into an ideal where the person-in-community explores concretely how to live a life that is fully human and offer others in the community the opportunity to do the same.

Considering how to find our own happiness while developing empathy for others so they can also find happiness is the core of the moral lens. As we act, we consider not only ourselves but also others.

\textit{The crucible of spirituality:}

Pheobe Snow, a folk singer, laments in a song called \textit{Harpo's Blues}, “I hate to be a grown up and live my life in pain.” Many people think that as we pursue our goals, the most we can hope for is survival – keeping body and soul together. If Lonergan is right that the goal of being human is to know, to learn, we progress not by seeking the individual goals of survival, but moving toward those “terminal values” which parallel Mill’s ideal goals.\textsuperscript{12} These values allow us to think beyond ourselves and our projects, to become in the words of the theorists “self-transcending,” because we choose goals which move not only ourselves but our compatriots along the way toward maturity. As we learn to see beyond the seeming pain of the day toward the larger good we can realize that what seem like failures may in fact be gifts.
A young man who was nervous about his work recently asked my husband how being fired can be good. He recounted a situation of being “fired” in the Air Force which involved a reassignment. While he was devastated in the moment, he realized some five years later that but for the reassignment he would never have received the next promotion. Thus, what seemed like a bad result from another’s petty vendetta was exactly what was needed in the larger picture of his overall career. He thus learned that one can never be sure what is success and what is failure. Being committed to the terminal value of integrity resulted in what looked like a set-back but was ultimately rewarded.

This tale is told on a larger stage as we consider the flash point of the Civil Rights Movement in America when a young worker, Rosa Parks, refused to move to the back of the bus. The segregation laws in Alabama required that African-Americans sit in the back. Parks was active in the NAACP and worked with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The chapter was considering how to highlight the effects of discrimination to the community at large. While the event itself was not planned, the emotion galvanized the community. Hundreds of Blacks joined in the boycott, putting aside their own goals of getting to work efficiently to work toward the greater goal, the ultimate value of liberty and dignity. In the process the community was compelled to face its own goals and the way that it treated its neighbors.

Progress of the sort described above is not inevitable. If we do not learn to keep our egos in check by thinking that our goals are the only ones worth considering, we can delude ourselves into believing that our self-centered actions and goals are the only ones that count. We can use the tools of reason to justify inaction while we blind ourselves to the long term consequences of our policies and choices. As we come to terms with the very human frailties of greed and pride, we can move beyond expedience caused by reducing everything to a cost-benefit analysis and turn toward excellence.
Using the Results Template

As we use the results focused template, we are asked to consider what makes us happy. Those who write in the utilitarian tradition focus on both what makes any one individual happy while also considering what is the greatest aggregate happiness for all. If the focus is on each individual maximizing his own happiness, we see ethics mimicking Adam Smith’s invisible hand, which is the bulwark of a market economy. The underlying assumption Each of us makes choices based on what will lead to our happiness. An example can be seen by looking around at colleagues in a university class. While many think that learning for the sake of learning is pretty exciting, most people who give up their time and money to get an education, for example, find greater happiness than their bank account or social whirl – new information, a better job, another credential. For example, if people value an MBA, then classes can be offered. However, if people no longer value a Master’s in Information Systems, then the classes disappear because of lack of interest.

One temptation is to reduce this lens to a cost/benefit analysis. While the financial issues are important, other goals of life which are harder to define are, according to Mill, more important to consider. Thus, the joy of a cultivated mind or freedom to make choices cannot be reduced to cost. Elections are expensive, but the right to participate in a democracy is seen as bringing greater happiness than reduced taxes. Another temptation is to focus only on short term happiness, pleasure and pain, which is called “hedonistic” utilitarianism. Mill and Bentham ask us to focus on ideal goals or ends such as truth, beauty or freedom. The school of thought which seeks the ultimate goals of life is known as “ideal” utilitarianism. We then find ourselves avoiding expedience to reach short term financial gains as we seek that which is truly important. To help understand how this lens is used, we return to our ethics committee at the PPO trying to decide what to do with the question of informed consent and HIV.

Step 1: Be Attentive
A. Identify the ethical actor.

The ethics committee of a PPO is charged with setting protocols for all of the physicians who are part of the group.

Again, the ethical actor is the one with the authority to act. As with all ethical decisions, we need to focus on the one who gets makes the final decision. If the agent is a group, such as an ethics committee, if that committee is charged with making the final decision, it is properly considered the ethical agent for the situation at hand.

B. Determine the stakeholders.

For this analysis, we focus on two elements of the stakeholders – the number of them in any given category and the impact that our decision will have on them. The reason for identifying the number of persons in each stakeholder group is that a large number of people can shape the way that the result turns out. Again, to the degree that people agree about what makes for happiness, people will make the same choice. If the criterion is maximizing overall good, those with the most in the group will determine what is ethical.

To get a handle on this notion, we can calculate what has been dubbed the “influence factor.” To determine the influence factor of any particular group, establish the approximate number of people in the group. This number is more about the difference in size of groups. Thus, if one group has 10 people and another group has 100, that which makes the 100 happy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Impact (1.0)</th>
<th>IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4,300,000</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
may eclipse the happiness of the 10. In the example, the time frame was a year. Thus, an individual physician would (in this particular practice) see 1,000 patients per year.

The second element is to determine the impact of any particular decision on the groups (see the second column of the chart on the previous page). For ease of calculation, when you add up the impact factor for all of the constituents, the total impact is always 1.00. This number is determined by considering how directly any particular group will be impacted by a decision. The difficulty in a utilitarian analysis is that a decision which has tiny impact for a large group may outweigh the interests of a few. For example, one student considered whether technical climbers should be able to put permanent bolts in the rocks in national parks. Currently, the United States has 281 million citizens, each of whom has a tiny interest in preserving national parks. Even considering that maybe 50,000 people are technical climbers, the minute indirect interest of the citizens in keeping those rocks intact will far outweigh the more direct interest of the technical climbers in putting permanent bolts in the rocks.

The only redeeming consideration is that large groups are not monolithic. Some portion of the citizens will value pristine parks. Others may find the sport interesting and thus be perfectly willing for fixed bolts to be in the rocks. The whole point of market surveys and polls is to try to get some sense of the different interest groups in a population. If the information of a company or political group is wrong, they will not get support for their product or policy. One only has to think of the legendary Ford Edsel which was built without noticing a change in the buying habits of car owners and thus was a marketing failure.

As the United States began reconsidering security policies after the tragedy of 9/11 when airplanes were flown into the World Trade Center in New York, the question about the needs of the many outweighing the rights of the few came into sharp relief. The issue was whether American citizens who happen to be of Middle Eastern descent or have Arabic surnames should be
automatically subjected to greater scrutiny as they boarded airplanes than others with a different ethnic heritage. One school of thought said that because those who masterminded the hijacking of the planes were from the Middle East, then subjecting all who were part of that ethnic group, in effect engaging in racial profiling, made perfect sense. Others said that all citizens should be subject to the same level of scrutiny because terrorists come from all different races, such as the acts of a Caucasian American in the bombing of the Social Security building in Oklahoma City. In any event, the security concerns of all citizens to be able to fly safely clearly outweighed the interest of any one citizen not to be subjected to the annoyance of a thorough search of shoe soles and luggage. The rules, however, are subject to constant tweaking based on the tolerance and concerns of the flying public.

C. *Attend to the context*

One of the characteristics of the teleological tradition is that the theorists emphasize that we are born into a community and shaped by that community. Because we are social beings, Mill asserts that we each want to have “harmony” between our feelings and goals and those of our fellow humans.\(^\text{16}\) Thus, we find ourselves attending to the community in which we participate to see what are considered noble goals and consequences worthy of pursuit.

Mill, like all seminal theorists, expects members of the community to continue to think and grow as they mature as human beings. While the temptation may be to look only at what gives immediate short-term pleasure, Mill encourages each of us to work for unity, which is the motivation and strength of the utilitarian ethic, as we build communities and advance civilization.

II. *Step 2: Be Intelligent*

A. *Pinpoint the Issue*
What is the central problem which must be resolved? As we phrase this issue into a question, we need to focus on what will create the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people. The theorists for this lens assert that because each of us desires to be happy, we make choices which lead always to greater happiness, we will be being ethical.

B. Explore the values in conflict

In a utilitarian setting, the conflicts will arise with competing goals each of which is going to lead to someone’s happiness. One set of conflicts arises when people focus on short term happiness rather than long term happiness. Mill never allows us to wallow in our own selfish notions of happiness. Mill advocates attending to the long view. Mill also asserts that the community is always happier when people have cultivated a noble character. In addition, we are to look at the whole fabric of our lives, not just individual moments. Mill believes that the qualities of self-consciousness and self-observation will assist us in determining the rules of behavior which will allow for the all persons, if not all creation, to find happiness.17

While engaging in this exercise which speculates about what makes people
happy might seem pointless, any time an ethical agent makes a decision, the constituents either ratify the decision or not. Generally, people don’t give us notice about their choices and preferences, rather they “vote with their feet.” They leave the firm, choose other products, find other suppliers. The more accurate we are in evaluating the criteria for happiness of the constituents, the more likely it is that we will also get the results that we want.

C. Identify options for action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell the patient about the reporting requirement before doing the blood work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do not tell the patient about the reporting requirements before doing the blood work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having surveyed the problem, the ethical agent has to come up with a beginning array of possible options. While the evaluation of the problem will probably lead to refinement of the options as well as nuances of action that move toward harmonized goods, the process of decision making requires that we test the possibilities against the abstract principles and values of the lens.

III. Step 3: Be Reasonable

A. Hone ethical thinking skills:

One critique of utilitarianism is that it supports a mindless calculation of pain and pleasure. Jeremy Bentham, who was of a methodical bent, proposed a system of calculation where one adds up what makes one happy and subtracts the points of pain to determine what we should do. While it is tempting to dismiss the process as arcane, most of us do a “cost-benefit” analysis as we work through tough decisions. The analysis doesn’t always only include financial considerations but also quality of life, balance of our happiness with others in our family, and concern for the community. Whether we choose to not take a promotion because we would have to be away from our families too much or choose to work in a non-profit setting to assist those who are less fortunate, we are weighing the relative value of
our choices. The appeal of this theory is that others may not understand why we would choose to not seek the greatest financial wealth but rather find happiness in other quarters and are free to find happiness where they will.

Mill invites us to thus consider both qualitative happiness as well as quantitative happiness. Mill was absolutely committed to the notion of a strong community where people were free to choose how best they wanted to live. The notions of liberty and personal independence were central to his thoughts about the greatest good for the greatest number. He was a visionary in the areas of women’s rights, for example, advocating that when all people are free to manage their own property and be responsible for their destiny, all of us are happier. Thus, he advocated people sacrificing for others as long as that sacrifice resulted in a greater sum total of happiness for the community. Thus, Mill would advocate each of us limiting our power in order to assure the well being of the collective interests of the community.

In making leadership decisions, CEO’s and others can move from considering only how to maximize shareholder value to being a good citizen and attending to the well being of employees. One Executive Director of a non-profit was advised by the health care consultant to include greater health care benefits for the top three employees of the company than the rest of the employees. The rationale was that all of the other Executive Directors and CEO’s were doing it. This ED refused. He asserted both to the consultant and the Board of Directors that the culture of the organization was built on all people being valued the same and thus being treated equally. By all people having the same health care plan, those at the top remained aware of the changing health care costs and coverage and those in the heart of the organization knew they were valued. The leadership exhibited by this ED means that in other tough times employees will be willing to sacrifice for the good of the company. All have a sense of being valued as they work together to make the organization successful.

B. *Apply ethical principles and values:*
To apply the principle of the greatest happiness for the greatest number, we have to determine what, exactly, makes each of the constituents happy. In this particular sense, the goals to be sought are those end which make people happy in light of their core values. Each of us must balance for ourselves the core values in terms of personal goals, the goals of the community as a whole, and our own tolerance for pain. Some of us are willing to tolerate great pain because of the adrenaline rush (think of your favorite stock broker) while others prefer a more sedate life and are risk adverse.

Having identified the constituents, the next task is to determine what makes them happy. The first criteria to consider are the deal breakers. What are the core ideal goals that are, for this constituent, non-negotiable. If you are lucky, the constituent will be self-aware enough to identify the non-negotiable values. Most of us are not that aware and so we have to listen to each other to determine what is important.

The next set of goals are those which are preferred but not necessarily deal breakers. Most of us have a set of goals which are important that we try to achieve. The more resources and personal power we have, the more we are able to reach those goals. However, when we can’t reach our goals, we compromise. In these situations, the ethical agent must be aware of what has come to be called the tipping point. At some point the unhappiness of a given person or group reaches critical mass. Something becomes the

### Criteria for Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Committee   | 1. Consistent process  
2. Happy physicians (so don’t leave for another plan) |
| Physicians  | 1. No malpractice actions  
2. Easy process to inform |
| Patients    | 1. Full information before treatment  
2. Confidentiality of treatment |
| State       | 1. Stop spread of AIDS  
2. Accurate information |
| PPO         | 1. Consistent process  
2. Protect physicians  
3. Protect patients |
proverbial last straw that broke the camel’s back.

As discussed earlier, for the Civil Rights movement, the tipping point came when Rosa Parks was asked to give up her seat on a Selma bus after she had worked all day. That unjustified request galvanized the Black community to action with a bus strike which ultimately led to the end of segregation. Many of the ethical scandals which broke over the past three years came when the cumulative actions of CEOs and Boards of Directors which resulted in greater and greater opacity of financial dealings rather than transparency reached the breaking point as well. Then, when the floodgates opened, people demanded a much greater accountability to avoid the abuses of the past.

If either the good citizens of the South or those with financial power in American business had attended to what made for the greatest happiness for their various constituents, they would have moderated their own quest for personal happiness. Through self-sacrifice and restraint, both groups could have avoided Congressional intervention. Had those in power worked to assure that African-Americans fully participated in the economic life of America, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would not have been needed. Had the financial moguls of the late 20th century attended to well-identified financial “best-practices,” Sarbanes-Oxley would not have been passed. Ironically, the cost of compliance with the law is much higher than being ethical in the first place.

For ease of calculation, assume that all constituent groups get 10 units of happiness. Economists call a “unit” of happiness a “util.” So each constituent group gets 10 utils of happiness. As you review the options, decide how happy each option will make each group. The scale runs from 1 util – very unhappy – to 10 utils – blissfully happy. Be sure to look at both the identified deal breakers and tipping points. While the process may feel arbitrary, make your decision based on your best understanding of the goals and values of the constituents. The goal is to be objectively subjective. By using the best data you have available and then making a calculated
estimation of what people value, you will get to a good policy. Remember, if you are wrong, you will find out sooner or later.

Repeat the process for each option which you are considering. The ethical option is going to be the option which generates the greatest number of utils of happiness.

Lest you think that no-one goes through this process, think of every market survey in which you have participated or every opinion poll which is conducted. A well-done market survey measures what people value and anticipates then what public policy or business decision will be supported with market choices, votes or other action. If someone launching a product is wrong about what their customers need and/or want, the product will fail. If you misread an employee’s tolerance for invasion of privacy or moving jobs of shore you will have people walking out or protesting in other ways.

The final step is to do the math to decide which option generates the most utils of happiness. This step involves multiplying the influence factor by the number of utils generated by the option. After completing the math for each constituent, the numbers are added to get the grand total of
utils of happiness. The process is repeated for each option. The option which generates the highest number of total utils of happiness is the ethical option.

This process is a hybrid between the calculus of Jeremy Bentham and the idealism of John Stuart Mill. The reason that the process has value is that it forces each of us to consider the various constituents as separate from ourselves. We often believe that everyone has the same interest that we do when in fact their interests are very different. The other point of this exercise is to show the tyranny of the majority. If the majority considers only its narrow self interest as they act, they can tromp over the minority concerns.

C. Overlay moral content

As we reflect on the options we can ask whether we are treating people with inherent dignity. Are we moving toward the greater good, which means moving from our own self interest into the greater good for the community. This process is different than compromising. It requires the hard work of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>IF (x)</th>
<th>Util</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>182,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Util with this Option</strong></td>
<td><strong>184,096.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
listening to each other and finding ways that each person’s desires can be met. Often what people say they want initially is just the cover over a deeper desire. By getting to the root dream, one can come to individualized solutions. Accomplishing these harmonized goals may require that we think “outside of the box” to come up with innovative solutions. However, in the process we will become co-creators of our destiny and discover that being an adult does not necessarily mean that one has a life sentence to live in pain.

Phase 4: Be Responsible

A. Rank the options from least preferred to most preferred.

Having determined the utils generated by our actions, we can see which option truly does generate the greatest good for the greatest number. As the options are ranked, summarize why the ranking of options was made and demonstrate the primacy given to not only individual happiness but the happiness of the community.

B. Correct for Bias

The temptation at this level is to rationalize toward expedience rather than excellence. Thus, we seriously need to ask whether we embracing excellence rather than seeing ourselves content with expedience. In the process we must attend to our own selfishness or greed for more, even if it is at the expense of others. Another bias is considering only cost. While the financial side of the conversation is important, we must attend to overall happiness, not just the bottom line.
Correct for bias:
As we give the informed consent, we need to be sure that we take the time to explain fully what the process is and listen to the fears of the patients. Because of the conditions under which the HIV virus is spread and the bias in the community, we will have to be particularly attuned to those who would hide because of shame or fear.

- **Efficiency** judges people in terms of the acquisition of riches, power, status and prestige while **excellence** judges people in terms of standards established in the community for values such as awareness, maturity, and competence.

- **Efficiency** requires only that a person act to maximize satisfaction of his own wants and needs while **excellence** requires that a person seek goals in light of the virtues embodied in the community.

- **Efficiency** requires that a person identify the strategies to acquire goods and become skilled in using those strategies to “get ahead” while **excellence** requires that a person continue to progress in reaching the ideals of the community and recognize what the highest perfection is.

- **Efficiency** requires only that a person follow the rules of justice until the rules change. Thus, people who are efficient may not have any personal moral standards while **excellence** can be defined independent of the current rules. Thus, people who strive for excellence have personal moral standards which are harmonized with those of the community at large.

C. **Attend to common good**

The chapter began with a poem by Langston Hughes concerning the disappointment of “dreams deferred.” Mill asserts that everyone has the right to seek what makes him happy – not just those of power or privilege. We often forget that we have people who help us and thus we need to help others. We forget that we build on the hopes and dreams of our parents and
Attend to the common good:
At first blush the common good would seem to require that we act without telling people the consequences. However, as we work toward complex, harmonized goals, we must realize that all people desire health. The question is what to do to give us the best chance of healing. Thus, telling people what the consequences of their blood tests might be and working to find solutions which will make both the patient and the community happy attends to the common good.

Statement of action:
After consideration, the ethics committee will recommend that the protocol of informed consent be maintained, even when the patient is just getting blood work. Because the greatest good for the greatest number requires that all people know the ramifications of a medical procedure, we will assure that a careful process be implemented. We will also work with all of our patients to assure that in the case of illnesses which may impact the larger community, educational policies are in place to minimize the spread of disease.

D. Act with courage:
Draft the short statement that will be placed on the company bulletin board. Articulate the statement so that you answer the core questions of this particular lens.

- What makes the constituents happy because their individual goals are met.
- Having attended to the whole person of those who are affected, how have I attended to feelings and basic dignity.
- How do I move toward the greater good for all the community, not just myself.

Step 5: Returning to Awareness:
After writing down your choice, consider whether or not the ethical analysis makes sense. Did you like the result? What were the problems with the process? What are the sticking points with the process? How did you see the process enhanced or modified by adding the world of feelings and attending to the common good.

grandparents and thus need to attend to the hopes and dreams of our children, all of our children. We need to attend to systemic barriers which keep people from being able to find happiness and thus require that they defer their dreams.
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A. Continuous Improvement

The process of continuous improvement involves evaluating the result of the action. As you take action in your life based on the lens, watch for intended and unintended results. Also watch for new questions or answers that were not complete. The trajectory for maturity is not necessarily smooth, but as we attend to the goals, harmonized values and final end values, our ideals, we can get there. As we take responsibility for our own self-directed choices as well as respect others, we will learn to live with ambiguity and integrity. In the process we will learn how to maintain consistency between our actions and our self-concept.

B. Crucible of Spirit:

As we are called to balance, we need to address whether we are being overly attached to our goals or whether we are detached from our every-day lives enough to see the bigger picture and attend to the higher good. As we become aware of being part of a larger community, we can become optimistic and enthusiastic about participating the community as a whole.

We will also be aware of our tendencies toward pride and control, believing our way is the only way and being attached to our own desired ends. We will make sure that in the community we carry our own weight and not freeload on the good will of others. If we do not attend to our spirit as we do our work we risk become angry and discouraged. We will also notice where we have power to help others reach their dreams. In the process we will discover the joy of helping others rather than attending only to ourselves.

CONCLUSION

The individual/action lens invites us to consider how to live a productive life. Beginning with the ethical key phrase, what are good results, we learn to make responsible choices which will help us survive and thrive. To avoid becoming greedy as we seek ever more toys, we learn to seek mutually
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As we use our imagination, we can then see ourselves as partners in creating a better world. With detachment, caring more about the people and the process than the result, we help all have a shot at realizing their dreams.

Continuing the Conversation

1. Using either the second problem in the simulation or another fact pattern, analyze the situation using the Individual/Action lens. Was the problem easy to do, indicating that this may be your preferred method of working ethical problems? Was the process difficult indicating that this may not be your ethical home?

2. Read an op ed piece in your local paper or a national paper and find examples of utilitarian thinking. In what ways did the author appeal to the “greatest good for the greatest number” as a justification for the policy direction. How did the advocated policy balance the goals of those in power against those who do not have as much opportunity to reach their goals.

3. Reflect on ways that you attend to meeting your own goals while attending to the greater good. How do you use your creative abilities to find ways to both meet your goals and those of others? What strategies do you have in place to correct for pride and greed?

Notes:

1. Hughes, “A Dream Deferred.”
2. For a careful exploration of the critiques of utilitarianism relative to distributive justice, see Karen Legbacq, Six Theories of Justice, p. 22-32.
15. Lebacqz, *Six Theories of Justice*, 16.