

# The Heart of All Moral Economics

## Quality of Life Utility Value

No nation is advanced that extracts from planet and people, from the natural resources and the workers and consumers constituting the nation, without regard to the impact upon the lives of those same constituents that all government, economics and business are mandated to serve. How is it that we permit our social systems to ignore that their moral imperative is to *serve life*? I say that the purpose of *every* social system, not just economics, but business, government, and even our spiritual ideologies, is to *empower the people as a whole*; to serve the quality of the life of not just the biggest parasites at the top of the financial food chain, but *all* those whom work for, pay into and serve those systems, such that any moral social system is *mutualistic*. If, on the other hand, your system of economics looks at 'indicators' of its relative success or failure *without* considering the relationship those indicators have with the service of the total quality of life of those whom live within the affected nation or area from which the indication was derived, this is, itself, an *indication* that its own indicators of success conceal moral failure.

For if God is the totality of the lives that are manifested into being, then the service of God is the service of total life, and there's no way to serve life and God without considering the impact that any system, belief or activity has upon the people and the planet, and, indeed, upon *all* of a nation's lifeforms. And in the study of economics, there are countless examples of how 'free market economics' secretly inhibits the ability of the people to *freely* pursue increases in the *total* quality of life of its constituents; as many examples as there are misleading indicators. For a more extensive study of this fact, see my other work on the subject. For now, as but three examples taken from common conservative claims of 'success,' let's glance at GDP, employment and the stock market. Without 'getting into the weeds,' keeping the examples as simple as I can:

(1) GDP is an indication of the total value of the products and services produced by a nation, but if the majority of that value goes to a slim (i.e. *excluding*) slice of the population, then it's only an example of *productivity*, not an example of an impact upon total quality of life. Yes, a higher GDP indicates the *likelihood* of increases in total quality of life, but this, of course, depends upon how the value of those products and services are actually absorbed, or *used* (usefulness to life is the all-important factor, as you shall soon see), by the subject population, and by ignoring this fact, the conservative economist ignores the people that he or she is meant to serve, and hides the fact that the 'success' of GDP is mostly the success of the economy at producing wealth for the already wealthy. (2) The rate at which the population is employed *does* indicate whether or not the population is being supported by the economy in terms of granting the

opportunity for the income upon which all quality of life is dependent (at least in modern society, not necessarily in those 'anachronistic,' or traditional naturalistic 'pagan' societies, which themselves are dependent only upon the fecundity, or providence, of Mother Nature). However, to create an extreme example in illustration of the point, even if the number hits 100% employment, if 90% of the jobs it provides are provided at minimum wage, a wage in which the recipients are always in a state of subsistence, struggling for survival, stressed-out and food insecure at all times, unable to save any money, much less go on vacation or appreciate their lives, then how is that number an indication of the *success* of the economy? (3) What does the stock market really do? It rewards companies for their ability to prey upon people and planet in order to extract as much financial value as possible to hand to its shareholders, entirely ignoring the impact upon people and planet as a whole. Not only that, but very few people possess any considerable stock portfolios, as stock is a luxury investment more or less reserved for those hitting the 'upper-middle-class' or higher in their 'worth.' So if the vast majority of the people fail to benefit from increasing stock scores, and if the increases are themselves indicative of the financial industry's ability to take as much as possible from the people and planet whilst reinvesting as little as possible (which is what profit *really* is), then are you sure, Mr. Conservative Economist, that increases in the stock market indicate *true* success?

These are but a few examples of the immoral basis of traditional economic evaluation that fall under the misleading banner 'free market economics.' You're *free* to make the rich richer whilst fighting for your own seat at a table that feeds off of what's greedily extracted from everyone and everything excluded from having a seat at that table. This is, in itself, an allusion to the principle hinted at by Senator Warren and others: "If you don't have a seat at the table, then you're probably on the menu." This summarizes the general failure of *every* conservative form of 'success,' including the failures of 'free market economics.' My own MORAL system of economic evaluation turns 'free market' assessments on their head, and is based upon what is, tragically, considered an 'extreme position:' the success of any economic system, and the businesses which it evaluates, is predicated upon its ability to increase and safeguard the quality of life of *the people as a whole*. This is the root conclusion of my own *Quality of Life Economics*, a valuational system whose foremost indicator of success I call '**Quality of Life Utility Value.**'

The **Quality of Life Utility Value** principle states that the core consideration in the evaluation of commercial production is that the true, or 'realized value,' of any and every product and service produced by any economy is the extent to which its inherent value is realized in its application to the increase in the quality of life of all the lives receiving and utilizing that product or service. All goods and services possess an innate value in their usefulness to life as a whole, and having no consideration of this innate utility is the same as wasting that value and dishonoring those and that providing that service, and shaming life, and failing God, in the process. You can have the highest GDP on the planet, but if that value sits, hoarded and unused, in the hands of the

few, doing nothing but serving their egos in their narrow assessment of *worth*, then of what value is it, really? What's the point of honoring a system of economics that not only isn't sustainable and is slowly suffocating the planet and bringing the people to their knees, a *dishonorable* system of economic evaluation whose one-sided form of 'freedom' is the freedom of those that own business interests to extract as much as possible without the regulation and distribution serving life, but which actually rewards the *reduction* in the utility of its products?

And what are we saying to Mother Nature, the host, provenance and providence of value, and to those whom extract from Her and make use of Her providence in rendering products and services, when this principle is ignored? What are we saying when we take *life* out of the equation? Are we not saying that She is of no value, and that the workforce are but cogs in a careless machine? Are we not dishonoring every person and part of the global economic chain by ignoring Quality of Life Utility Value? Are we not implying that we care nothing for enhancing the innate value of everyone and everything through supporting their ability to maximize the quality of life impact of everything that they do, everything they make and offer to their fellow divine beings? Is this not the path of laissez-faire capitalism, a form of capitalism encouraged by 'the 1%' because its 'no holds barred' approach maximizes profit and greed while entirely ignoring and, in fact, encouraging the *inconsideration* of this prime moral economic principle?

If, for example, one particular service may be rendered to two different people, and the first person has so little need of it that they receive little to no quality of life increase from said service, while the other person has so much need of it that they receive a *massive*, even incalculable increase in quality of life from the exact same service, then rendering that service to the first person and not the second person is a clear moral wrong and ethical injustice. There are, of course, *endless* examples of this illustration. Two identical twin boys raised in polar opposite circumstances, one whom may be considered over-advantaged (or 'privileged'), the other disadvantaged (or 'underprivileged'), the first possessing toys beyond counting and three bikes in the garage, the other having few toys and no bike, both receive a brand new bike for Christmas. To the first boy, the bike is mostly unappreciated and may well gather dust in the garage sitting beside the others, whilst, for the second boy, the bike may well come to be the center of his world. We can, of course, use simpler examples, such as comparing an obese man who's just finished a large meal to the starving man on the street that the first man stepped over on his way into the restaurant. How might one consider the Quality of Life Utility Value of handing them each an apple? And what of wealth hoarded entirely unused, our 'advanced society' teaching us from the time we begin to think that those whom we should admire are those whom extract and hoard as much of the innate value of the world and Mother Nature and the work of others as possible, *entirely unused, the Quality of Life Utility Value left to rot away?* Are we not teaching our children to have no morality, no socioeconomic awareness, no honor,

only the greed and ego that are used to build soaring towers in the foolish attempt to trump everyone else, these hollow edifices of secret shame built upon endless waste and disgrace?

Consider how universal the principle of Quality of Life Utility Value is in application to any truly moral economic assessment, and how it illuminates the evil of capitalist society in general; a society in which this value moves towards minimization with continued increases in the disparity of the receipt and utilization of all wealth, products and services. Ours is a society in which 'good business' means 'maximizing the bottom line,' which, in turn, means that those of advantage are compelled to take as much advantage of the disadvantage (especially the lack of protection, or 'positive freedom') of anyone and anything and any part of the planet and its collectively-hosted life as possible in accruing ever more wealth, products and services that possess commensurately *reducing* increases, even decreases (such as from the health-reduction of overconsumption), in the quality of life of said accruing, over-advantaged, unscrupulous individuals and their profit-maximizing organizations. Worse, capitalist society *encourages* this evil by, instead of rebuking and censuring said individuals and their organizations and finding ways to discourage such injustice and encourage greater economic opportunity and equity distribution as a whole, as morality unequivocally dictates via this principle, instead rewards this evil with empty increases in egotistic and class-based 'status,' even calling such moral criminals the 'upper class' and the 'nobility' of the ignoble, compromised country. Tell me, how is the 'nobility' of the 'advanced nation' to be truly served and deserving of the labels 'noble' and 'advanced' when the primary concern of the wealthy (regardless of the misleading conservative rhetoric and propagandist application of 'free market economics') is to perpetually hoard as much Quality of Life Utility Value as possible, *unrealized*, whilst those in need fight for survival?

Someday this prime principle of economics, Quality of Life Utility Value, will be central to the consideration of a *truly* advanced society, one that will look back upon this epoch in embarrassment, condemning all those which we now immorally hail as the 'upper class.' For only in a land bereft of honor, entirely ignorant of such morally-critical concepts as this, may a kleptocratic clown be crowned king, his power built upon the shame of conning the commoner, his wealth made by maximizing the waste of ignoring Quality of Life Utility Value, all sold to the people as 'freedom.' This is true no matter the hollow rhetoric hiding his reign of rot, and no matter how high the hypnotically-waving flag is flown over the overlording lies of the prevailing parasitism. *"If you have more than you need, build a longer table, not a higher wall."* G.J. Boyle.