The terms ethics, morality and spirituality are considered synonymous in our habitual or tradition way of thinking. For a better understanding and a proper perspective on life and its problems, we have to take care to form the right concepts and use the right words with clearly defined meanings. Failure to do that will lead to confusion and contradictions, and we will not arrive at the desired clarity of thought. Well-formed concepts, an appropriate choice of words and a subsequent clarity of thought is a powerful instrument for getting things done. If our instruments are defective things are sure to go wrong.

This weakness in our thinking is not only something that happens by mistake, it shows up an inherent weakness in us to face the alienation and shock which comes with a change of concepts. We need to brace ourselves to face up to reality and consequences. We need to form new ideas and act on them, get the feedback, make corrections and move on to the next step in our theorizing.

Actually ethics and morality have to be treated as mechanical, scientific, objectively verifiable terms, which cannot address and decide upon the purely subjective but most fundamental facts of human nature, human life and emotional goodness, which are love and
compassion, and which should form the basis of all human conduct. That is why most of the time we fail to correctly predict human behaviour and are unable to get the right results. This is applicable to, and very relevant to the conduct of business. The purpose of a business should not be seen simply as that of making a profit, but primarily as that of creating goodwill in the market and in society by the way it structures its relationships with its workers, its customers and even the surrounding community, all on the basis of essential emotional goodness which is love and compassion.

Furthermore, it is primarily on the basis of love and compassion that the business can create that all important condition for goodwill in the market and in society, namely, trust.

Love and compassion, being purely subjective are, of course, indefinable terms. Nevertheless we all know what they mean.

Some modern business companies are now engaging in providing welfare and development for people living in their areas of operation through NGOs. That is an area of business activity that provides an excellent opportunity for the experience and development of basic emotional goodness in the form of reciprocal love and compassion, which, after all can only be done within the limited domain of intimate contact and interaction between people.

**Purpose** – to analyze and evaluate human behaviour so as to predict it and see if we can encourage forms of behaviour compatible to the real need of society, the economy, business, and, of course, democracy.

**Design/methodology/approach** – analytical, critical, philosophical, prescriptive.

**Findings** – emotional goodness, consisting of love and compassion as the primary principles to be incorporated into the way we deal with and structure human relations in politics, society, economics, business, industry and family life.

**Research limitations/implications** – this research is based largely on subjective intuitions that are not within the reach of objective scientific verification. Nevertheless these are matters of
inescapable and imperative subjective experience, which in modern civilization we desperately need to introduce into our thinking and the way we do things.

**Practical implications** – it is extremely difficult, but not impossible, within our modern, almost exclusively science-oriented approach to everything we do, to assimilate the recommendations that are being presented here, especially in view of the fundamental changes of attitude and lifestyle that it may call for.

**Originality/value** – This is a purely original thesis, which, however, is indebted to the thought of many greater minds than my own.

If these recommendations are implemented, they might well prove to effectively address some of the most fundamental problems currently plaguing human society in many fields worldwide.

**Keywords**- consciousness, freewill, spirituality, justice, ethics, morality and emotional goodness (consisting of love, compassion). Most of these terms have here been redefined. Consciousness and freewill are left undefined.

**Paper type** – descriptive and recommendatory.
The word spirit, from which the word spirituality is derived, is, in the minds of many people, especially in religion, thought to refer to a non-material entity that inhabits one’s physical body while one is alive and departs from one’s body when one dies.

In a more empirical and up-to-date way of speaking, the word, spirit, may be taken to refer to the self, which we know only as consciousness and, the very existence of which, we know only subjectively.

With some introspection it becomes clear that consciousness, which is the self, is possessed of freewill, and that, in the process of living, the self, which is consciousness, is exercising and expressing its freewill more or less perfectly or imperfectly at every moment and in everything that one is doing.

Thus, in addressing even those who are not followers of traditional religion, an updated concept of spirituality, which even an atheist or an agnostic should have no problem with, might be as follows:

What we refer to as the spirit is simply the self, which is of the nature of consciousness, and which is endowed with freewill. Spirituality is an orientation to life, or a way of life, primarily aimed at or engaged in the expression and fulfillment of one’s own consciousness and freewill, in the way in which one lives one’s life.

Put concisely, spirituality is consciousness most perfectly exercising and expressing its freewill.

The question is; what is it, ultimately, that consciousness aims at in exercising its freewill?

In other words; what is life all about?

Comprehensively speaking, in one’s whole way of living and responding to whatever situations or circumstances arise in one’s life, one aims at creating through the exercise of one’s freewill, one’s own unique composition of beauty, order, harmony and, above all, love and compassion in one’s relationship with all life around one.

One’s own consciousness aspires to live in communion with all surrounding life, tending towards communion with all life in the universe. We may safely presume that, in all living beings, that is what the will to live is all about.
We may make that assumption because, though consciousness, freewill, love and compassion,
being purely subjective, are not scientifically verifiable facts, they are inescapable facts of
subjective experience.

Furthermore, notwithstanding appearances to the contrary, there is no evidence to the contrary.

Since spirituality is purely subjective, it cannot be grasped through the scientific method.
However, anything that is said about it philosophically or metaphysically, does, of course, have
to be logically self-consistent.

Since science, strictly speaking, does not know that consciousness exists, it obviously cannot tell
us whether consciousness exists after death. That is why spirituality has, up till now, been largely
the preserve of religions that claim to know, through divine revelation, all about what happens to
consciousness – the soul – after death.

Divine revelation is not something that can be proved scientifically. Religion requires one to
simply believe in it. Not everyone, especially those with a well developed intellect, can do that.

Spirituality, however, need not have anything to do with religion or life after death. Spirituality
can be defined philosophically and metaphysically in a way that is as valid for atheists, agnostics
and those who do not believe in a life hereafter, as for those who believe in religion and a life
after death.

Spirituality refers to the expression and fulfillment of consciousness and the freewill of
consciousness, whether in a possible life hereafter, or in life here and now in this physical world.

Ethics, morals and human goodness.

Usually, the terms ethics and morals are used interchangeably, and do not deal comprehensively
enough with the analysis and evaluation of human behaviour. This leaves our evaluation of
human behaviour open to confusion.

To allow for greater clarity in our evaluation of various forms of human behaviour, we need to
define ethics and morality as two distinct concepts. The German philosopher, Emanuel Kant,
tried to do that, but somehow his way of doing it is a bit complicated and does not seem to have
captured on.

A distinction between ethics and morality can, however, be made in a way that is quite simple
and straightforward.

Ethics may be defined as principles of behavior that enable one to experience a sense of
satisfaction or fulfillment in living.

Morality can be defined as conformity to the customs or consensus of approval within society.
We need to introduce a third concept, quite apart from ethics and morality; a concept that we may refer to simply as human goodness, definable as behavior expressing love and compassion towards other living beings, including plants, animals and insects!

The terms, love and compassion, which are commonly understood, have here – in accordance with the axiomatic method – to be left undefined since they refer to purely subjective facts of experience.

We can describe the behavioral expression of love as that of paying receptive and sympathetic attention to others, aided by sensitive reciprocal communication with them, enabling one to discover and enjoy in them, qualities of beauty truth and goodness, of which, it may be assumed, there is always an infinite amount, lying hidden in every living being, and just waiting to be discovered.

The behavior of compassion can be described as that of acknowledging, appreciating, encouraging, supporting, identifying oneself with, and participating in the creative goodness of self expression one discovers in others through one’s love for them.

Regarding ethics, as distinct from morality, it would seem that, since human beings are social animals, one’s ethics would have to be moral; that is to say, acceptable to society.

Ethics, as we have defined it, is not necessarily moral as we have here defined morality. There have been individuals who were fundamentally alienated from society, due to their having been brought up without love and affection from anyone, and who, on the contrary, have received nothing but hatred and abuse from others and who have subsequently grown to hate everybody.

Such people might become serial killers who get a sense of perfect fulfillment in life from killing as many people as they can. It is not that they have no ethics. They have their own system of ethics, but, from the point of view of society, their ethics are immoral and evil.

Morality, defined as conformity to the customs of society, is not necessarily good. It can be evil. There are, for example, societies in which things like female circumcision, honor killings or racist attitudes and behavior are morally sanctioned. Outside those particular societies, such morality would be considered evil, and people who, within such societies, would be considered perfectly moral, would from within other societies be considered evil.

Up till now no one has been able to discover any basis for morality, independent of the customs of some or other particular society.

Customs in society can evolve out such things as superstition or the exclusive self interest of that particular society regardless of the interests of other societies, and viewed as evil in other societies.

Confusion in evaluating human behavior arises from the fact that we speak of morality as though it is synonymous with human goodness, which it is not.
Human goodness is missing from our list of criteria for evaluating human behavior. In order to get rid of that confusion we need add human goodness to the list.

Given that human goodness is definable as behavior expressing love and compassion, human goodness would need to be ethical, but it would not necessarily be moral.

Whereas ethics and morals are required to form the basis for society as a whole, feelings of love and compassion are confined to those alone, including plants and animals, with which we have a certain amount of intimacy through interaction.

That kind of intimacy does not, however, extend far enough, and cannot be stretched to form the basis for social order in the large societies to which most of us in the modern world belong.

On the internet I found this statement:

“Surely the absence of a sociology of morality has to be one of the major weaknesses of academic sociology, and a mysterious one at that.”

This is in spite of the fact that;

“For Durkheim, one of sociology's founding fathers, morality was to have a central place as an object of inquiry; moreover, he was passionately interested in it on the existential level, as was Weber.”

The reason why there is this difficulty in creating a scientific sociology of morality is because science necessarily fails to take cognition of human goodness as something apart from morality, simply because love and compassion are purely subjective and thus out of reach of the scientific method of inquiry.

Society would like to arrive at a set of morals that would amount to universal human goodness. But that is not possible because, as explained above, human goodness defined as love and compassion cannot be stretched without limit so as to form a comprehensive basis for social order in large societies.

Though science is unable to take cognition of things that are purely subjective, the subjectively experienced facts of consciousness, freewill, love and compassion, do get mentioned by some scientists as though they are scientific facts that can be included in our theories about human behaviour. This transgression of the scientific method simply renders any such theorizing defective and ambiguous.

In the way in which terms like, justice, ethics, morality, love and compassion are used, there has always been, a persistent, politically motivated attempt to make out that justice, ethics and morality are perfectly good, whereas the fact is that justice, ethics and morality do not necessarily have anything to do with human goodness, and can be downright evil, as in the case of societies in which, things like female circumcision, honour killings and racist laws prevail.
This lack of clarity will continue haunt our thinking so long as we fail to define properly the principles of justice, ethics and morality, and to recognise and clearly define human goodness as distinct from justice, ethics and morality.

The problem for the science of sociology, psychology, biology, politics, law or whatever, is that human goodness, defined as the exercise and expression of love and compassion cannot be recognized as a scientific fact, because love and compassion are facts of purely subjective experience.

There can, of course, be a scientific study of the mechanisms associated with what is claimed to be love and compassion, but there is no possibility of scientifically verifying whether what is claimed to be an expression of love and compassion is really an expression of love and compassion and not disguised expression of hatred and ill will.

If the aforementioned distinction is made between morality and human goodness, then there can be scientific study of the mechanisms of morality, but human goodness, defined as love and compassion can only be a subject of philosophy and metaphysics.

It is doubtful whether civilization, as we know it, under the rule of law, however democratic, can remedy the dehumanizing and degrading materialistic mechanization of human life, resulting from our failure to integrate subjective reality through philosophy and metaphysics into our thinking. It is therefore doubtful that we can avoid becoming increasingly alienated from each other as living beings.

Though a science of love and compassion is not possible, there can nevertheless be, and if human beings are not to be sucked into a totally mechanized existence within an overly materialized civilization in which people are made to function efficiently as machines while becoming increasingly alienated from each other as living beings, there needs to be, as a guide to human behaviour, a philosophical and metaphysical theory of love and compassion; but we need to do this without descending into dogmatic irrationalities of religion and charismatic cults.

The subject of human goodness, as distinct from justice, ethics and morality, and as the foundation of ideal human relations, a healthy order of human society, and a healthy relationship with our global environment and other forms of life on earth, takes us back to the need for a new metaphysics of spirituality.

We are now living in a world culture that is increasingly dominated by, based upon, qualified by and confined to the materialistic model engendered by the scientific method of knowing, understanding and deciding everything.

This materialistic culture, in its conceptualization of what human life is all about, tends to either rule out or bypass the subjectively experienced facts of consciousness, freewill, love and compassion that are most central to human life.
We cannot help philosophically thinking of, speaking of and acting upon these inescapably real and vital, subjectively experienced facts of consciousness, freewill, love and compassion.

In a world dominated by science and technology, however, these facts are ambiguous, and thus cannot be rigorously integrated into our social, economic, legal and political systems of thought and action, as can the objective and thus scientifically and officially cognizable concepts of justice, ethics and morality.

The result of this is that we talk of justice, ethics and morality as though they constitute human goodness, which in fact they don’t.

However, since we are spiritual beings to whom consciousness, freewill, love and compassion are so empirically real that they engage us very intensely, in spite of our inability to account for them scientifically.

This means that, in fact, we live our lives, not only in accordance with concepts and principles that are purely scientific. We live our lives, knowingly or unknowingly, and very largely in accordance with principles and intuitive concepts that are philosophical and metaphysical, which means purely imaginary.

From a free-thinking, ultra-modern, healthy and wholesome point of view, spirituality, which is primarily an expression of love and compassion or human goodness, is increasingly being incorporated into a larger perspective on that all important aspect of business management, namely that of generating goodwill throughout the business organization and the surrounding society which the business serves.

A modern business enterprise sets out to find all possible ways of generating reciprocal goodwill between the entrepreneur, the shareholders, the employees, the customers and in the surrounding community within which the business exists and is transacted.

Goodwill is most directly produced by authentic expressions of love and compassion. However, as we have pointed out earlier, love and compassion can only be experienced within the limited sphere of one’s intimate interactions with one’s fellow beings. Politics, law, justice and morality cannot be confined within such limits, and ethics, as defined above, does not necessarily have to do so. Business organizations, however, are in a position to do that.

Business organizations can, and many are now engaged in creating NGOs to serve the population within a certain limited radius surrounding each branch of the organization. This modern kind of modern business practice provides an excellent opportunity to experience and foster reciprocal love within an otherwise increasingly and dangerously materialistic civilization, and even to turn the tide away from materialism, which is for machines, and towards spirituality, which is for living beings.