

Ethics, Politics, and Plenitude

Yasuhiko Genku Kimura

©2000

All that is proper to the divine nature is also proper to the just and godly man; therefore such a man performs everything that God performs, and together with God he has created heaven and earth, and he is the begetter of the eternal Word, and without such a man God could do nothing.

—Meister Eckhart

EVOLUTIONARY ETHICS

In *THE KOSMIC FOUNDATION OF ETHICS*¹, I defined the key concepts of Evolutionary Ethics as follows: That ETHICS is the discipline of identifying, defining, and practicing a code of universal principles that makes *individual* human happiness possible, while POLITICS is the discipline of identifying, defining, and practicing a code of universal principles that makes *collective* human happiness possible: That *happiness* is the fulfillment of what it means to be human, of the nature and virtue of human consciousness, consisting of *knowing, thinking, and love*: That the *necessary condition* of individual happiness is the attainment of knowing, thinking, and love—through the *commitment to truth*, the *responsibility of thinking*, and the *act of giving*², while the *sufficient condition* of individual happiness is the attainment, in accordance with a code of universal principles, of one's values through one's virtuous actions—of which the attainment of one's singular *passion* is the most essential. (I define passion as the deepest desire of the soul or as the arousal of the heart in the awakening of the soul, the locus of ever evolving consciousness): That the *purpose* of human life is self-realization, that the achievement of happiness is tantamount to self-realization, and that ethics as the science of the achievement of happiness, should therefore be a science of self-realization or self-transformation. Thus, the attainment of knowing, thinking, and love does not mean the end of the search for happiness, but the beginning of a life endowed with happiness which will increase as the knowing, thinking, and love deepen and find new avenues of expression in the creative thrust for self-optimization.

We human beings are kosmically endowed with the existential possibility for happiness and the evolutionary thrust for self-optimization—for self-realization and self-transformation. However, we tend to go astray in regard to this possibility for happiness and thrust for optimization. This “going astray” we experience as the absence of happiness and estrangement from the *anthropocosmic wholeness of life* expressing itself as our total *enworldedness* as human beings. In going astray, life, a dynamic, creative, and evolutionary *spiral process*, eventually devolves into a static, non-creative, non-evolutionary *circular structure*. Life, the ascending river flowing upwards from the ocean of possibilities towards the higher mountains of realizations, becomes a stagnant pond. The absence of happiness is an indication that we are not in tune with this evolutionary thrust of life; it is a symptom of a devolutionary stagnation, lacking in the effulgence of passion and joy—the resplendent evidence of a life fully lived in sympathetic resonance with the creative thrust for self-optimization. To be ethical means to live in tune with this creative thrust, and thereby to live a creative life, which creativity extends to the building of a community that is ethical and just.

Evolutionary Ethics is designed to provide a philosophic context for living in accordance with the creative thrust for evolutionary self-optimization. Happiness, both *felicity* (‘earthly’ happiness) and *beatitude* (‘heavenly’ happiness), is the evidence of a life that is lived in integrity with this thrust.

Happiness is the designation given to the universal purpose of human life. A purpose is a directional thrust. The creative thrust for optimization that underlies human life gives it a directionality that is evolutionary and self-transformative. That is to say, the directional thrust or the purpose of human life is self-optimization, self-transformation, self-realization through self-transcendence. Therefore, in Evolutionary Ethics, the standard of good and evil, or of virtue and vice, is whether the thinking and action of the individual is in *accordance* or in *discordance* with the creative thrust for self-optimization. For this reason, the triune principles of knowing, thinking, and love, and of the commitment to truth, the responsibility of thinking, and the act of giving, are chosen to be the contextual principles of Evolutionary Ethics. For human consciousness to be in tune with the thrust for self-optimization, these universal principles must be actively present in the spiritual and intellectual organization of a human being.

The question of whether you may or may not choose to adopt the code of Evolutionary Ethics thus defined, in whole or in part, is something that is left to your own deliberation. No concept or principle of Evolutionary Ethics should be accepted without deliberate thinking and knowing. The adoption of Evolutionary Ethics necessarily entails that you integrate it to make it your own or develop your own code of ethics through your own thinking and knowing by assuming the responsibility of thinking and making the commitment to truth. In this sense, Evolutionary Ethics is a system of METAETHICS, functioning as the *meta-set* for various sets of ethical principles that constitute various systems of ethics that are based on rational and deliberate thinking and knowing. According to Evolutionary Ethics, to accept or to adopt a code of ethics—any code of ethics including that of Evolutionary Ethics—without deliberate thinking and knowing, is *ipso facto* unethical. To be ethical, first and foremost, means to think and to know or to *choose* to think and to know inside your commitment to truth and responsibility of thinking.

Every healthy and functioning human being is evolutionarily endowed with the potential for thinking, knowing, and love. Except in some cases of congenital or acquired brain defects, mental retardation, or so-called mental illnesses, every healthy and functioning human being is capable of thinking, knowing, and loving—of taking a responsibility for thinking, making a commitment to truth, and performing an act of giving in accordance with the law of balance. Every healthy and functioning human being is capable of tuning-in to the evolutionary thrust for optimization, of creating visions of higher possibilities for himself and for his community, and of fulfilling his visions through living a creative, self-transformative life. This means that every healthy and functioning human being is inherently capable of living an ethical life, and therefore experiencing abiding happiness.

THE PRINCIPLE OF JUSTICE

Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

—*Matthew VII*

The ethical principle that bridges ethics with politics, that is, the domain of individual human happiness with that of collective human happiness, is the principle of JUSTICE. Nowhere in the whole philosophic literature of human history is the principle of justice more clearly, succinctly, and simply stated than in *THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT, MATTHEW VII*. Although these immortal verses are in the Christian Bible, having

been uttered by Jesus Christ, the universal knowledge expressed in them is not limited to Christianity³. Unfortunately, as it happens with *esoteric* knowledge, the real meaning and significance behind these verses have been lost in the popular *exoteric* interpretations propagated throughout the ages. Specifically, contrary to the common belief, these verses do *not* teach the precept of non-judgment (“*Don’t you judge,*”) which would mean a forfeiture of the responsibility of thinking and the commitment to truth. The renowned scholar-teacher of Christianity Emmet Fox in his *THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT*⁴ plainly elucidates:

The plain fact is that [what is stated in these verses] is the Law of Life that, as we think, and speak, and act towards others, so will others think, speak, and act towards us. Whatever sort of conduct we give out, that we are inevitably bound to get back. Anything and everything that we do to others will sooner or later be done to us by someone, somewhere. The good that we do to others we shall receive back in like measure; and the evil that we do to others in like manner we shall receive back too. This does not in the least mean that the same people whom we treat well or ill will be the actual ones to return the action. That almost never happens; but what does happen is that at some other time or place, often far away and long afterwards, someone else who knows nothing whatever of the previous action will, nevertheless, repay it, grain for grain, to us.

That which Emmet Fox calls the Law of Life, I call the Principle of Justice: *As we think, and speak, and act towards others, so will others think, speak, and act towards us.* The principle of justice is that which Walter Russell calls the Law of Balance expressed in the sphere of human thinking, speaking, and action. The law of balance states: *Every action is simultaneously balanced by an equal and opposite reaction, and sequentially repeated in reverse polarity.* (Walter Russell, *A NEW CONCEPT OF THE UNIVERSE*⁵) The principle of justice means that there is a *just consequence* to all of our thinking, speaking, and action in accordance with the immutable law of balance—that justice is always done in the whole context of human life *without exception*, as every action is always inexorably balanced by its reaction simultaneously and sequentially.

From the law of balance it follows that you will be the recipient of not only the equal *sequential* reaction of another human being to your thinking, speaking, and action but also of the equal *simultaneous self-reaction* to your thinking, speaking, and action. Therefore, when you love other human beings, simultaneously you self-bestow love unto you, while sequentially others will surely return their love to you; whereas when you hate other human beings, simultaneously you self-bestow hate unto you, while sequentially others will surely return their hate to you. When you love another human being, you love humanity, including yourself; whereas when you hate another human being, you hate humanity, including yourself. Thus, if and when you *understand* this principle of justice, you will *naturally* start *practicing* the precept of justice, which states: *Think about others as you would wish them to think about you. Speak to others as you would wish them to speak to you. Act towards others as you would wish them to act towards you.*

Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother’s eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye.

Through this immortal statement, Jesus elucidates the principle of justice to those who are ignorant of it, and wherefore whose judgment (of others) is *not* in accordance with it. Jesus does not categorically deny judging (others), but denies only the kind of judgment made in the *ignorance* of the principle of justice and in the *absence* of self-responsibility of thinking, self-commitment to truth, and self-awareness coexistent with such self-responsibility and self-commitment. Within a general ideospheric environment

of such ignorance and absence, if you judge another person, not only will he judge you in return but also his judgment will be based on the same metric that you used to judge him *in discordance with* the principle of justice. As he does not measure up to your standard, so do you not measure up to his. You behold a mote in his eye, forgetting that you have a beam in yours, while thinking that you have none. He likewise beholds a mote in your eye, forgetting that he likewise has a beam in his, while thinking that he has none.

The principle of justice implies that we cannot *fake* the character of a human being and his action as we cannot fake the nature of the universe and its phenomenon, and that we must *judge* the character of a human being and his action in accordance with the principle of justice as we judge the nature of the universe and its phenomenon in accordance with the law of balance and other laws of physics—with the responsibility of thinking and commitment to truth that are essential to and integrant of our search for knowledge. Human consciousness is volitional. Human action is volitional. At every moment of our waking hours, we are faced with the responsibility of making a choice. And as a volitional being, we *must* judge people and situations in order to make choices in life. The question is not “to judge or not to judge?” which is not even a valid question, but “on what is our judgment based?” The principle of justice states that our judgment of people and situations must be based on the knowledge of the immutable law of balance, and its subset, the principle of justice itself—and wherefore on the ethical principles of thinking and knowing, of the responsibility of thinking and commitment to truth—and of love that is the law of balance being manifest in the act of giving and regiving.

No human being is infallible. All of us from time to time err in our judgment. However, that should not be the reason for forfeiting our responsibility, as conscious beings, to think and know or to judge and evaluate. By the very fact of being conscious, not only are we *qualified* but also we are *required* to judge and evaluate the characters of other people and their actions as well as, more importantly, the characters of ourselves and our actions. Therefore, the precept of non-judgment is fundamentally against the human nature, and wherefore unethical. A precept that we need instead is the precept of justice aforementioned, which is based on a sound judgment of ourselves and others in accordance with the principle of justice: *Think about others as you would wish them to think about you. Speak to others as you would wish them to speak to you. Act towards others as you would wish them to act towards you.*

The question may arise: What about malicious people? How are we to think about, speak to, and act towards them? The answer: Exactly how they should be thought about, spoken to, and acted towards in accordance with the principle of justice but *with compassion*. Malicious thought should be *judged* as malicious; malicious speech should be *judged* as malicious; malicious action should be *judged* as malicious—but *with compassion*. People who perpetrate malicious thought, speech, or action are *ipso facto* held *responsible* and treated accordingly by the law of balance—by the principle of justice. Our conscious judgment of and volitional action towards them must adhere to the principle of justice but *with compassion*. An intrinsic suffering exists in a malicious thought, speech, or action that is suffered by the perpetrator. Compassion means to suffer together (*com*, together + *passion*, to suffer) *with love*. By judging the perpetrator in accordance with the principle of justice, whereby holding him *accountable* and treating him accordingly but with compassion, we *give* the perpetrator and humanity through the perpetrator a chance to end a *karmic repetition* of the vicious, nay malicious, circle that characterizes a world that has gone astray. This giving of a chance to end a karmic repetition is a part of what it means to *forgive*.

Fundamentally speaking, we treat other people exactly as we treat ourselves with *just consequences* in conformity with the principle of justice. An authentic understanding of this principle will bring about a profound transformation in our lives, and in the lives of others with whom we have relationships. If the

people in a community truly understand this principle even as they understand the basic operations of arithmetic (and the principle of justice or the law of balance is a kind of equation), they will be able to build a just and ethical community wherein happiness is the norm and wherein there is no fundamental conflict between individual and collective happiness.

The building of an ethical community begins with each individual that constitutes the community. The locus of self-generative thinking and knowing, and thus the locus of creativity and understanding, lies not with the collective but with the individual. Therefore, not only are we the creators of our own lives but also the creators of the communities in which we partake, including professional and “virtual” communities. The building of an ethical community in turn contributes to the creation of an ethical ideospheric environment that is conducive to the individual’s ethical development, especially that of children. Hence Edwin Markham’s immortal maxim: “In vain we build the city if we do not first build the man.”

ETHICS AND POLITICS

Politics is the discipline of identifying and defining and practicing a code of universal principles that makes *collective* human happiness possible. Now, what is collective human happiness? Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as collective happiness. Happiness is an individual experience, and happiness is an individual responsibility. Though we can contribute to the happiness of others through the manifold expressions of our love, we can never *make* them happy human *beings* without them *being* responsible for their own happiness. We can bring moments of happiness to others, but it is only they who can make themselves happy human *beings*. Therefore, *collective* human happiness is collective *individual* human happiness, the responsibility for which happiness lies with each and every individual human being that constitutes the collective or the community at large.

What we can do to contribute to the collective human happiness in our communities is the practice of our own codes of ethics in and for the realization of our own happiness, and of the precept of justice in which *we think about others as we would wish them to think about us, we speak to others as we would wish them to speak to us, and act towards others as we would wish them to act towards us*. *What we must not do* is to interfere with the individual’s pursuit of happiness so long as it does not interfere with other people’s pursuit of happiness. *What we can do* belongs to the realm of ethics, while *what we must not do* belongs to the realm of jurisprudence. The more advanced we become in the realm of ethics, the less we need to dwell in the realm of jurisprudence. Conversely, the less advanced we become in the realm of ethics, the more we need to dwell in the realm of jurisprudence. That is to say, the more we do what we can do, the less we do what we must not do without the jurisprudential means. Thus, the preponderance of ethics is inversely proportionate to the preponderance of jurisprudence.

Politics is therefore the discipline designed for the creation of social order conducive to collective human happiness that combines the disciplines of ethics and jurisprudence. We can show the distinction between ethics and jurisprudence by identifying the difference between the concepts of vice and crime. Vices are acts whereby one harms oneself or one’s own property, while crimes are acts whereby one harms the person or the property of another. Vices are simply the errors which one makes in one’s search for happiness, implying neither any malice towards others nor any interference with their persons or properties. Therefore, in vices, the very essence of crime—the intent and design to injure the person or property of another—is missing. The basic maxim of the jurisprudential law states that there can be no crime without a criminal intent, that is, without the intent to injure or invade the person or property of another. No one ever practices a vice with any such intent. The individual practices his vices solely for

the sake of achieving happiness, albeit misguided, but never from any malicious intent towards other people. Thus, vice is an ethical concept; it is a matter that concerns the individual, while crime is a jurisprudential concept; it is a matter that concerns the collective. Wherefore, it is only crimes, and not vices, that are punishable by the jurisprudential law, the code of universalistic principles designed to collectively protect the achievement of human happiness. On the other hand, vices are their own “punishment” as it were, punished by the inexorable law of balance, and the resultant experience of unhappiness.

What are the requisite conditions that need be present in order for the individual constituting a community to pursue his or her happiness? The first condition is the *collective acknowledgment* that each individual has the INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS to pursue his or her happiness in any way he or she chooses. The second condition is the *collective acknowledgment* that each individual has the CIVIL RESPONSIBILITY to protect the individual rights of others. The third condition is the *collective protection* of the CIVIL LIBERTY required for each individual to pursue his or her happiness based on his or her own code of ethics, the formulation and the practice of which requires the INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM to think and to know. The fourth condition is the *collective establishment* of a SYSTEM OF JUSTICE that is designed to protect the citizens from the criminal offense and to punish the act thereof, equipped with a SYSTEM OF POLICE and a CODE OF JURISPRUDENCE. The fifth is the *collective establishment* of a SYSTEM OF DEFENSE that is designed to protect the state from the criminal offense initiated by other states.

In an “ideal” world wherein the citizens all acknowledge their individual rights and practice their civil responsibility, and whereby the civil liberty is protected and the individual freedom is maintained, the society will have very little need for the code of jurisprudence or the systems of justice, police, or defense, except for some universalistic contractual agreements voluntarily established for civil and business transactions. The proper functioning of the latter (jurisprudence) requires the proper presence of the former (ethics), and therefore no amount of work done on the latter without a proper attention paid to the former will ever engender a functional society. Ethics is more fundamental than jurisprudence for the proper functioning of politics. As already stated, the preponderance of ethics is inversely proportionate to the preponderance of jurisprudence. Therefore, the preponderance of ethics over jurisprudence is a clear indicator of a properly functioning community. In a community wherein there is no strong ethical basis, working on its jurisprudence leads only to a “vicious circle” without any real solutions. The fundamental solution to political or social problems lies with ethics, including the problems of economics. For, an “ideal” world is not realizable without the creation of a sound economic foundation. That is to say, ethics is at the basis of both sound politics and economics. Ethics is essential for the health (politics) and wealth (economic) of a community.

ETHICS AND PLENITUDE

WEALTH is the total range of the Kosmos—the entirety of the spiritual, mental, and physical dimensions of the universe accessible to humanity—which one has through one’s effort *earned* the right to claim to be one’s own, wherefore, which one can authentically *give* to others who have authentically earned the right to have it. The wealth in the spiritual dimensions—the spiritosphere—is the individual’s spiritual awareness, knowledge, and love; the wealth in the mental dimensions—the noosphere—is the individual’s intellectual knowledge plus intelligence or ability to think; the wealth in the physical dimensions—the physiosphere—is the individual’s material property.

The acquisition of material wealth is a function and a result of a creative channeling of intellectual wealth in accordance with a set of principles belonging to a dimension of spiritual wealth, termed ethical

principles or values, such as the principles of INTEGRITY and PRODUCTIVITY. Wealth in all three spheres—the spiritosphere, the noosphere, and the physiosphere—is *potentially infinite and actually limitless for everyone*. That is to say, not only spiritual and intellectual wealth (the *metaphysical* wealth) but also material wealth (the *physical* wealth) is potentially infinite and actually limitless for everyone. As, in quantum physics, the *quantum vacuum* is in reality the *quantum plenum-plenitude* in terms of energy that is available from the smallest physical unit of the universe, *plenitude* is in the very design of the physical *phenomenal* universe as well as the metaphysical *noumenal* universe. As there is no scarcity in the generation of ideas, there is no scarcity in the generation of energy—life supporting and sustaining energy. Material wealth, in this sense, is the plenitude of *physical energy* made manifest by means of the plenitude of *metaphysical knowledge or ideas* that protects, nurtures, supports, sustains, and accommodates all growing needs of life.

For instance, the visionary mathematician-inventor Buckminster Fuller has cogently argued throughout his life with his numerous books such as *SYNERGETICS*⁶ that plenitude is an inherent property of the design of (the) Universe, and that the *paradigm of scarcity* that has hitherto dominated the thinking and the practice of humanity is totally unworkable and moribund. Today, the notion such as the “scarce resources” can only mean the scarcity of creativity and the poverty of imagination. It is not only Buckminster Fuller but also many other visionary knowers-thinkers such as John Keely⁷, Nikola Tesla⁸, or Walter Russell in the past and Eric Drexler⁹ in the present who have shown the path towards the materialization of plenitude on the planet. Therefore, we must *recontextualize* or *transcontextualize* our thinking from the paradigm of scarcity to the *paradigm of plenitude*. The commitment to truth and the responsibility of thinking, two of the *cardinal moral virtues* of Evolutionary Ethics, make it clear that such recontextualization or transcontextualization is in order in light of the scientific evidence that we have today. At the very least, plenitude is an exciting possibility *from* which we can develop our individual lives, while the paradigm of plenitude is a potent assumption *upon* which we can build our world.

Throughout human history, it has long been believed that material wealth is antithetical to spiritual wealth, and that spirituality is incompatible with materiality. This deeply-held belief overlooks the fact that the creation of material wealth, as a category of creation, strictly follows the *kosmic laws of creation and balance*, that the creation of wealth is the result of an efficacious use of the human intelligence in accordance with a set of universal ethical (philosophical-spiritual) principles such as integrity and productivity, and that there is a categorical difference between *earned wealth* (wealth acquired through honest value-productive effort) and *unearned wealth* (wealth acquired through dishonest means such as the use of force, coercion, or fraud and without any value production). The material wealth, as well as the intellectual wealth, as defined and discussed in this article is earned wealth—the only real wealth worthy of discussion. Earned material wealth is not only *not* antithetical to or incompatible with spiritual wealth but also dependent thereupon for its successful creation. This long-held belief in the antithesis or incompatibility of spiritual and material wealth is a symptom of the obsolescent and mistaken belief in the dichotomy of mind and body or spirit and matter. When we become aware of the non-duality of matter and spirit, and of the plenitude (potential infinitude and actual limitlessness) of the metaphysical universe, we will come to realize the plenitude of the physical universe as well.

The creation of wealth, be it material, intellectual, or spiritual, requires that you consistently practice a certain set of ethical (philosophical-spiritual) principles in life, in particular the principles of integrity and productivity:

In the present system of economy, wealth is representable by and exchangeable with *money*. Money is a *symbol and universal substitute of value*, a *means of exchange*, and a *means of savings or investment* in economic

transactions or calculable social exchange. Therefore, the creation of wealth can be equated with the generation of money. Money is generated through the engagement in calculable social exchange. Technically, the basic category of human action in calculable social exchange is called *offer*. An offer is a *communicative action*, in which one states: "I will deliver X to you, if you deliver Y to me." Or more precisely, "I *promise* to deliver X to you. Therefore, I *request* that you deliver Y to me." What is offered in this communicative action is a *condition of satisfaction*. It is thus not a product or service but a condition of satisfaction which the product or service makes possible that is what is offered in calculable social exchange. This condition of satisfaction is what is called *value*, of which money is a symbol and universal substitute.

When an offer is accepted, that which get exchanged are mutual *promises*: *Person A promises to offer the condition of satisfaction X to person B; person B promises to offer the condition of satisfaction Y to person A*. Promise is the communicative action that brings forth a future as an express commitment. To elicit a promise from another person requires that you make a request of that person. A request is the communicative action that brings forth an express commitment in another person. Thus, a request is implicit in a promise. Calculable social exchange is an expression of the law of balance, underlying the universe of *non-volitional* motion, in the sphere of *teleological and volitional* human action, normatively expressed as the *principle of equal giving and regiving*. That which is given or regiven in calculable social exchange is a condition of satisfaction given or regiven through an offer in the form of a promise.

Integrity is the *power* to keep your promise and to maintain balance between the giving and regiving of conditions of satisfaction. Integrity builds your reputation as someone whose word and fairness others can trust. This integrity-based reputation is what builds your financial power. Financial power is not the amount of money you have, although it is a result of it, but the capacity to elicit promises from others to provide you with your own conditions of satisfaction in social exchange. Your financial power, your capacity to elicit promises from others, is thus identical with your capacity to make requests of others. Your capacity to make requests of others is directly proportionate to your capacity to fulfill your own promises and to maintain fairness in social exchange, meaning integrity. Therefore, a wealthy person is someone who has established an evidence of integrity, and thus trustworthiness, in calculable social exchange. A wealthy person is someone who has consistently delivered on his own promises, while maintaining fairness, in calculable social exchange. A wealthy person is someone whom, because of his integrity, others assess as competent and qualified in entering into calculable social exchanges of great magnitudes in many different domains.

Moreover, this integrity entails *productivity*. Productivity is *creativity* exercised in the context of social exchange. Productivity is integrity in respect to the creative thrust for optimization, which arises from the recognition that productive work is the process whereby one can give the fullest expression to the desire for creativity and sharing. For the productive individual, his productive work is a form of prayer to manifest that which he envisions in his thought and is a fulfillment of his creative inner thrust for self-optimization—for self-realization. Through productive work, you *create* conditions of satisfaction to offer to others and *exchange* them with the conditions of satisfaction that you desire in life, the whole process of which is the evolutionary spiral of wealth generation.

In the manner of Francis Bacon who said, "Knowledge is power," we can say, "Integrity is power." Integrity is the power to move the world to conform to your word given in the form of a promise, a commitment, or an intention. Integrity is what creativity is, of which productivity is a special case. Integrity is the power to manifest your thought in reality in accordance with the *law of creation*, in which thought engenders motion, and then motion coalesces into entities that appear to compose our physical

reality. Let there be light; and there is light: Let there be happiness; and there is happiness: Let there be plenitude; and there is plenitude. This is integrity. This is creativity. Financial power is but a manifestation of that power which is integrity, which is creativity, underlying the creative process of the Kosmos, expressing itself as human integrity and productivity. Through productive work, we can gain or regain our total *enworldedness* as human beings, which expresses the whole anthropocosmic context of human existence from which many of us have estranged themselves, resulting in the condition of unhappiness.

To increase our financial power means to increase our capacity to create conditions of satisfaction for others and to elicit promises from others to provide us with our conditions of satisfaction in calculable social exchange. To increase our capacity to create conditions of satisfaction for others means to increasingly tune-in to the creative thrust for evolutionary optimization *within and without*. To increase our capacity to elicit promises from others means to increase our capacity to make requests of others, which means to increase our capacity to fulfill our own promises, wherefore to increase the degree of your integrity in calculable social exchange. When we can collectively attain a high degree of financial power through the practice of integrity in economic production and social exchange, we will be able to create a world of abundance in the universe of plenitude. In such a world, there will no longer be such an oxymoron as unearned wealth, which is in actual fact a “wealth drainage” that has plagued and subverted the world throughout history.

In an “ideal” world wherein the principles of integrity and productivity, along with other ethical principles, are practiced, there will be an abundance of creativity and sharing—of production and exchange of conditions of satisfaction amongst people on the planet that exists inside a universe of plenitude and is inhabited by a race whose intelligence knows no limitations in its capacity for knowledge and creativity. Thus, ethics, the science of human happiness, is an essential key to the creation of an “ideal” world wherein there is no scarcity either in the mind of people or in the reality of the planet. Economy is only a subset of ecology. Ethics is a necessary path for the creation of the ecology of plenitude in both the ideosphere and the physiosphere. Plenitude is not sufficiency, the condition of just enough, but the condition of more than enough. The potential plenitude of the universe *without* has been proven by science. When we human beings realize the potential plenitude of the universe *within*, we will have a universe of plenitude *within and without*. An “ideal” world of happiness and plenitude is well within our reach, if we start practicing the set of evolutionary ethical principles that forms the foundation for the achievement of individual and collective happiness on earth.

We all know that we do not live in an ideal world, far from it. However, the *art of living* consists in living *in* a less-than-ideal world without being *of* it by living *from* an ideal world. Living *in* a less-than-ideal world without being *of* it means that you do not abide by the prevailing but moribund paradigm of living but by the new model of living that you create for yourself that may in the future become a new paradigm of living for humanity. Living *from* an ideal world means that you start living your life in accordance with a possible paradigm of the ideal world that you envisage. The source of power is in thinking. It is your thinking that moves and transforms your life. It is our thinking that moves and transforms our world. The art of living is indeed the art of thinking. What you think will determine your future. What we think will determine our collective future. Therefore, a new world will only come if we think a new thought.

NOTES:

1. *The Comic Light*, Vol. 1 No.1, 1999. Also included in *The Twilight Manifesto* and *Think Kosmically Act Globally*, The University of Science & Philosophy Press, 2000.
2. Human consciousness being volitional, thinking, knowing, and love do not occur on their own accord but only through volition, intention, and choice. Genuine thinking, knowing, and love are in fact rare at this stage of general human development. Those who have not been aware of how little they think, know, or love are unlikely to have known genuine thinking, knowing, or love worthy of their designation.
3. In the Hindu or Buddhist context, the Principle of Justice is akin to the Law of Karma.
4. Dr. Emmet Fox, *The Sermon of the Mount*, p. 117, Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1938. Republished by Harper San Francisco.
5. Walter Russell, *A New Concept of the Universe*, p. 39, The University of Science & Philosophy, 1989
6. R. Buckminster Fuller, *Synergetics* (1975) & *Synergetics 2* (1979), Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc.
7. Theo Pajmans, *Free Energy Pioneer: John Worrell Keely*, IllumiNet Press, 1998
8. John J. O'Neill, *Prodigal genius, The Life of Nikola Tesla*, Angriff Press
9. K. Eric Drexler, *Engines of Creation*, Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1986