

The moral universe

DEMOS

DEMOS

Open access. Some rights reserved.

As the publisher of this work, Demos has an open access policy which enables anyone to access our content electronically without charge.

We want to encourage the circulation of our work as widely as possible without affecting the ownership of the copyright, which remains with the copyright holder.

Users are welcome to download, save, perform or distribute this work electronically or in any other format, including in foreign language translation without written permission subject to the conditions set out in the Demos open access licence which you can read [here](#).

Please read and consider the full licence. The following are some of the conditions imposed by the licence:

- Demos and the author(s) are credited;
- The Demos website address (www.demos.co.uk) is published together with a copy of this policy statement in a prominent position;
- The text is not altered and is used in full (the use of extracts under existing fair usage rights is not affected by this condition);
- The work is not resold;
- A copy of the work or link to its use online is sent to the address below for our archive.

By downloading publications, you are confirming that you have read and accepted the terms of the Demos open access licence.

Copyright Department
Demos
Elizabeth House
39 York Road
London SE1 7NQ
United Kingdom

copyright@demos.co.uk

You are welcome to ask for permission to use this work for purposes other than those covered by the Demos open access licence.



Demos gratefully acknowledges the work of Lawrence Lessig and Creative Commons which inspired our approach to copyright. The Demos circulation licence is adapted from the 'attribution/no derivatives/non-commercial' version of the Creative Commons licence.

To find out more about Creative Commons licences go to www.creativecommons.org

Contents

The moral universe

Introduction Tom Bentley and Ian Hargreaves

Part 1. One world: ethics, diversity and globalisation

East and West: the reach of reason Amartya Sen

New wars and morality in the global era Mary Kaldor

Whatever happened to compassion? Zygmunt Bauman

Foreign policy, values and globalisation Robert Cooper

Liberalism and living together John Gray

Part 2. Ethics and the self; beyond individualism

Ethical jazz Richard Holloway

Ethical know-how Francisco Varela

Individualism and the concept of Gaia Mary Midgley

Private life, public property? Joan Smith

Part 3. Ethical institutions;

Ethical consumption in the twenty first century Melanie Howard and Michael Willmott

Ethics and the multinational corporation Andrew Mackenzie and David Rice

Accounting for ethical business Sheena Carmichael

Media policy and the crisis in political reporting John Kampfner

Can humanity learn to create a better world? Nicholas Maxwell

Can humanity learn to create a better world?

The crisis of science without wisdom

Nicholas Maxwell

Can we learn to create a better world? Yes, if we first create traditions and institutions of learning rationally devoted to that end. At present universities all over the world are dominated by the idea that the basic aim of academic inquiry is to acquire *knowledge*. Such a conception of inquiry, judged from the standpoint of helping us learn wisdom and civilisation, is damagingly *irrational*. We need to bring about a revolution in the academic enterprise if we are to create a kind of inquiry rationally devoted to helping us become more civilised. With this in our possession, we might gradually learn how to make progress towards a better world.

The twentieth century witnessed unprecedented achievements; but it also saw unparalleled horrors: 10 million people dead as a result of the First World War, 55 million as a result of the Second, Stalin's purges and programmes of collectivisation, Hitler's death camps, the disasters of Mao's Cultural Revolution. There was the insanity of the Cold War and the nuclear arms race, which put the entire human race at risk. There were the many hot wars after the end of the Second World War. Well over 100 million people were killed in war during the twentieth century, which compares unfavourably

with the 12 million killed in the nineteenth century. There was China's rape of Tibet, the Khmer Rouge's devastation of Cambodia, the massacres of Rwanda and Burundi. Billions of people had to live subjected to totalitarian regimes, facing arbitrary arrest, imprisonment, torture and death if heard to murmur the mildest protest.

There was the steady, daily, routine suffering and unnecessary death of thousands due to poverty and easily curable disease. It is estimated that a fifth of all people alive today still live in conditions of abject poverty, without safe water, proper shelter, adequate food, education or health care.

A sustainable future?

And then there is our treatment of the rest of life on the planet. Tropical rainforests, precious reservoirs of diverse species, are being destroyed at the rate of over 200,000 square kilometres a year. It is estimated that the globe's tropical rainforests hold roughly four fifths of all species on earth: if the rainforests disappear, the diversity of life on the planet will suffer a devastating blow. We pollute the earth, the oceans and the air, thus causing a dangerous thinning of the ozone layer, and global warming (which in turn will cause the polar ice caps to melt, and the sea level to rise, flooding some of the most densely populated regions on earth). We recklessly exploit finite resources of oil, for energy and transport, without any idea as to what our sources of energy will be when the oil runs out.

Given this dreadful record, one can scarcely avoid asking: will we have to endure similar horrors in the century, or the millennium, to come? The prospects do not seem good when one takes into account the continuing rapid rise in world population, the depletion of finite natural resources, global warming, and the existence of stockpiles of conventional, chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, with the ever-present danger of further proliferation.

Is there a possibility that humanity might, during the next century or so, learn how to avoid perpetrating the worst of these man-made horrors? It may be that the very future of humankind is at stake. If we do not learn how to deal more

adequately with the threat of war, sooner or later the arsenal of chemical, biological and nuclear weaponry will be unleashed upon the world, perhaps annihilating humanity for ever. (This essay was written well before the horrors of the 11 September 2001; those events, and the aftermath in Afghanistan and, no doubt, in other places to come, grimly underline the urgency of these questions.)

Humanity can learn the elements of wisdom and civilisation required to avoid such horrors in future. But a precondition for such learning is that we have in existence traditions and institutions of learning well designed from this standpoint. These, at present, we do not possess. It may seem incredible, but our finest traditions and institutions of learning, when viewed from the perspective of helping humanity learn civilisation and wisdom, are disastrously irrational.

Universities all over the world are dominated by the idea that the proper aim of academic inquiry is to improve knowledge and technological know-how. Academic inquiry contributes to human welfare by, in the first instance at least, acquiring knowledge. This means that everything not relevant to the discovery and assessment of knowledge, such as politics, values, human hopes and fears, problems of living, must be excluded from the intellectual domain of inquiry (although knowledge about such things is not, of course, excluded). Strictly speaking, only that which is relevant to the pursuit of knowledge, such as factual claims to knowledge, observational and experimental results, theories and arguments, can be permitted to enter academic discussion: everything else must be ruthlessly excluded. And this is done in the interests of acquiring authentic, objective knowledge (as opposed to mere propaganda or ideology) which alone can be of benefit to humanity. In the interests of serving humanity, one might say, academic inquiry ignores humanity's problems, aspirations, suffering, and concentrates on acquiring knowledge of objective fact.

Natural science, an immensely influential, prestigious core to modern academic inquiry, operates an even more severe censorship system: in order to enter into the intellectual domain of science, an idea must not just be a factual claim to

knowledge; it must be a claim to knowledge that is empirically *testable*.

The limits of 'knowledge-inquiry'

The conception of inquiry I have just outlined might be called *knowledge-inquiry*. It is the dominant conception, exercising a profound influence over every branch and aspect of current academic inquiry. Knowledge-inquiry is widely taken for granted by those academics who see themselves as upholders of reason. (And those who reject knowledge-inquiry tend to see themselves as rejecting reason.)

But knowledge-inquiry, when judged from the standpoint of helping humanity achieve what is of value in life or, in other words, learn wisdom and civilisation, is so irrational that it violates three of the four most elementary rules of reason conceivable. What is reason? As I use the term, rationality appeals to the idea that there is some set of general rules, methods or strategies which, if put into practice, give us the best chances of solving our problems or realising our aims. Four elementary rules of problem-solving rationality are:

1. Articulate and seek to improve the articulation of the basic problem(s) to be solved.
2. Propose and critically assess alternative possible solutions.
3. When necessary, break up the basic problem to be solved into a number of preliminary, simpler, analogous, subordinate or specialised problems (to be tackled in accordance with rules 1 and 2), in an attempt to work gradually towards a solution to the basic problem to be solved.
4. Interconnect attempts to solve basic and specialised problems, so that basic problem-solving may guide, and be guided by, specialised problem-solving.

These four rules of reason are elementary, banal and uncontroversial. No problem-solving endeavour which violates them can hope to be rational. But academic inquiry as it exists at present, viewed from the perspective of helping humanity learn wisdom and civilisation, violates *three* of these four elementary rules of reason.

If we are to avoid, in the twenty first century, the kinds of horrors that we have inflicted upon ourselves in the twentieth century, we have to learn how to solve our problems of living, our conflicts in life, in more cooperatively rational ways than we have in the past. It is not primarily new knowledge or technology that we need; indeed, rapid acquisition of new scientific knowledge and technology is a part of the problem. Population growth, environmental damage and the statistics of death through war have all been made possible by twentieth century science and technology. What we need, rather, is to discover how to act in new ways. We need new policies, new institutions, new ways of living, new responses to our local and global conflicts, our personal and global problems of living.

The *problems*, then, that inquiry needs to help us solve if it is to help us realise what is of value in life are fundamentally problems of *living*, problems of *action*. And solutions to these problems that promote the realisation of what is of value in life will be increasingly cooperative, appropriate *actions*, individual, social, institutional.

Therefore, if academic inquiry is to pursue the aim of helping us achieve what is of value in life in a way that puts the above four rules of reason into practice, then it must give intellectual priority to the dual tasks of (1) articulating our problems of living, and (2) proposing and critically assessing possible solutions – possible increasingly cooperative actions. In addition, inquiry will need (3) to break up our basic problems of living into a number of subordinate, specialised problems of knowledge and technology. But it must also (4) interconnect attempts to solve basic problems of living and specialised problems of knowledge and technology, so that basic problem-solving may guide and be guided by specialised problem-solving. Knowledge-inquiry, as it exists in universities today, puts rule (3) into practice to splendid effect, in that it creates an immense maze of specialised problems of knowledge and technology secondary to our basic problems of living. *Absolutely disastrously, however, it fails to put into practice rules 1, 2 and 4.*

Having traditions and institutions of learning that are grossly irrational in this way must lead to widespread disas-

trous consequences. Our whole capacity to realise what is of value, to create a more civilised world, is sabotaged. We are deprived of a kind of learning that gives intellectual priority to articulating our problems of living and proposing and assessing possible solutions. We need this if we are to *learn* how to resolve our conflicts and problems in more cooperative ways.

Rapidly solving problems of scientific knowledge and technology in a world that has not learned how to act cooperatively is as likely to do harm as good. Rapid population growth, modern armaments, the increasing destructiveness of war, environmental problems, immense differences in wealth between first and third world countries: these are all the outcome of our increased power to act, made possible by science, without a corresponding increase in our power to act humanely, cooperatively, and in our long-term interests. *The crisis of our times is the crisis of science without wisdom. And this, in turn, is due to our possession of a kind of inquiry rational, perhaps, from the standpoint of improving knowledge, but grossly irrational from the standpoint of improving wisdom.*

Wisdom and values

What, then, would academic inquiry be like were it to be devoted to helping us create a better world in a genuinely rational way? The basic aim of inquiry would be to promote the growth of wisdom – wisdom being the desire, the endeavour, and the capacity to discover and achieve what is of value in life, for oneself and others. Wisdom includes knowledge, understanding and technological know-how, but goes beyond these to include the desire and striving for what is of value; the ability to experience, to perceive what is of value; the capacity to help solve those problems of living that arise in connection with attempts to realise what is of value. Wisdom, like knowledge, can be thought of as something possessed not only by individuals, but also by institutions or societies.

The basic method of *wisdom-inquiry* (as we may call it) would be to put the above four rules of reason into practice, and to promote putting these rules into practice in personal

and social life, in the pursuit of what is of value. The fundamental intellectual tasks of inquiry would be (1) to articulate our personal and global problems of living, and (2) to propose and critically assess possible solutions, possibly increasing cooperative personal and global actions. These tasks, at the heart of academic inquiry, would be carried out by social inquiry and the humanities. Social inquiry (economics, sociology, political science, etc) would not primarily be science, or engaged in the pursuit of knowledge: its task would be to explore imaginatively possible actions, possible policies, political programmes, institutions, ways of life, to be assessed from their capacity to promote civilisation. We urgently require a wealth of vividly imagined and fiercely scrutinised possibilities for diverse aspects of our personal and social lives if we are to discover how to rid ourselves permanently of war, environmental degradation, dictatorships, injustice, poverty and hunger.

Academic inquiry would also need (3) to break our fundamental problems of living into subordinate, more specialised problems. In this way, the natural and technological sciences emerge out of social inquiry, intellectually subordinate to social inquiry. At the same time, inquiry would need (4) to interconnect fundamental and specialised problem-solving, so that each is influenced by the other.

It is essential that wisdom-inquiry is without political power, and is non-authoritarian in character. There can be no question of academics deciding for the rest of us what our problems are, how they should be solved, how we should live or what is of value. Far from depriving us of the power to decide for ourselves, the task of wisdom-inquiry is to help us enhance our power to decide well for ourselves by providing us with good ideas, proposals and arguments for our consideration. Academics need to engage in debate with non-academics, but must have no power or authority to determine the thoughts and decisions of others. Wisdom-inquiry is a sort of people's civil service, doing openly for the public, with exemplary intellectual honesty and integrity, what actual civil services are supposed to do, in secret, for governments.

Academic inquiry must of course retain its independence, and must not degenerate into merely serving the special interests of government, industry, the nation, or public opinion. The academic world needs just sufficient power and authority to retain its independence, but no more. If we are to believe the pronouncements of experts, this should be because there are good reasons to do so, and not because experts possess some unassailable authority of expertise.

Conclusion: the need for 'wisdom-inquiry'

It is I hope clear from this thumbnail sketch that wisdom-inquiry differs dramatically from what we have at present, knowledge-inquiry. A more detailed exposition of wisdom-inquiry would further highlight this dramatic difference. We urgently need to bring about a revolution in the aims and methods, the overall character and structure of academic inquiry, so that it takes up its proper task of helping humanity learn wisdom and civilisation. Such a revolution would affect every branch and aspect of academic inquiry: the natural sciences, social inquiry, and the relationship between the two; mathematics, the technological sciences, and the humanities; education; and the way academic inquiry relates to the rest of society.¹

Could such a revolution occur, and can we learn in future how to avoid the horrors of the past? At present, academics show few signs of recognising the need for the required revolution. Will no one take responsibility for creating traditions and institutions of learning intelligently designed to help us become civilised?

Nicholas Maxwell is Emeritus Scholar in the Philosophy of Science at the London School of Economics.

¹ For further details see Maxwell N, 1984, *From knowledge to wisdom*, Blackwell, Oxford; *The comprehensibility of the universe*, 1998, Oxford University Press, Oxford; *The human world in the physical universe*, 2001, Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham.