

# **Moral Values in Governance: The Key to Solving Social Problems**

ALFREDO L. BENIPAYO\*

## **1. Epiphany**

Words are peculiar things. By themselves and devoid of context, they often have very little significance. String them together, however, and string them together in the proper order and sequence, and words become the carriers of ideas and concepts that have the power to define reality in an infinite number of ways. Sometimes, the reality defined by words can be banal. Sometimes, however, words contain a distillate of wisdom so undeniably true that it literally shocks the listener or the reader into embracing a completely new perspective.

Case in point: the following passage:

“Daily, in the halls of congress, through the printed word and over the airwaves, our politicians and our civic leaders expose, denounce, or deplore this or that government’s anomaly. During election time the principal issue is always graft and corruption. No wonder public concern is almost exclusively centered on malfeasance in government. But with every change of administration, the problem only becomes aggravated. The panaceas and the grandiose promises fizzle out. The accusers become the accused; the halo of righteousness changes heads. The list of dishonor is different but corruption remains the same. Graft and corruption persist, like a cancer gnawing

---

\*Chairman, Commission on Elections; Associate Professor, *Facultad de Derecho Civil*, University of Santo Tomas; Professorial Lecturer, Philippine Judicial Academy.

at our entrails, showing no signs of abatement and consigning us to a state of helplessness and hopelessness.”<sup>1</sup>

Those words were written in 1966 by one of that generation’s profoundest nationalist writers: Renato Constantino. They remain as true today as they were then, and they remain the most lucid expression of the pervasiveness of corruption in government.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that Constantino’s words shook me. And yet, they reminded me that all our anti-corruption laws have not broken the cycle of corruption and brought the corruptors to an accounting. As Constantino’s words teach us, the haloes of righteousness simply change heads: those who once railed against corruption eventually benefit from it; and those who used to thrive on corruption eventually denounce it. In the end, no one has hands clean enough to cast the first stone. And because no one enjoys the moral authority to call out the shortcomings of anyone else, the anti-graft laws remain un-invoked, gathering dust on the high shelves of our legal system while corruption runs rampant.

More tragically still, the continuing validity of Constantino’s words is a biting and supremely imperative indictment of our system of governance: we have failed.

We are failing even though we are trying; we are failing despite some successes; we are failing despite our best intentions. Men no longer see our government as the bastion of integrity to which the fate of the nation is entrusted. For many, we in the government are now only rent-seekers, leasing out our discretion, our judgment, and our conscience to the highest bidder.

And that is the crux of the matter.

Regardless of how many anti-graft laws there are, or how many anti-corruption task forces are set up, the country’s only true line of defense against corruptors are the moral values of its civil servants.

---

<sup>1</sup> Constantino, 1966: 81-82.

## 2. Governance: What governs the governors?

In his recent Encyclical *Veritatis Splendor*, Pope John Paul II spoke about the role of morality in the life of man thus:

“(I)n every sphere of personal, family, social and political life, morality – founded upon truth and open in truth to authentic freedom – renders a primordial, indispensable and immensely valuable service not only for the individual person and his growth in the good, but also for society and its genuine development.”

From this we see that morality transcends its function as a deterrent to corruption, and actually plays the role of a building block to good governance, and a better society. Many who believe that governance is simply a matter of legal black-and-white deceive themselves when they reject the participation of morality in the process of legislation, and in the running of a society.

Allow me to elucidate.

In its broadest and most general signification, the term “governance” refers to the structures established by societies for the purpose of regulating their affairs and promoting their welfare.<sup>2</sup> By this definition, we understand governance to refer to systems of government, whether monarchic or democratic, anarchic or despotic. Recently, however, the term has gone beyond the traditional concepts of state and government, and has been used to describe how society’s movers – now referring to both governmental structures and the non-governmental entities comprising civil society – interact on matters concerning public life, and with a view to achieving social upliftment. The new acceptance of the term “governance,” therefore, recognizes that the welfare of society is not the exclusive domain of the formal government, but the shared responsibility of both the governors and the governed.

This new and ideal conception of governance calls for a drastic shift in our understanding of how society is run. For government, it means opening up to public scrutiny and, as far as practicable,

---

<sup>2</sup> Hassall, G., *Contemporary Governance and Conflict Resolution: A Bahá’í Reading*, January 2000.

ensuring participation in the processes of policy-making, economic management, and bureaucratic administration. For the private sector, it means adopting a more pro-active role that is equally transparent and accountable, but also vigilant and cooperative.

What this definition does not make explicit, however, is that when we speak of governance, we do not only refer to the government institutions or the civil society organizations. Perhaps even more importantly, we are speaking of the individuals who make up, and indeed, define, these institutions and organizations. Thus, because government and civil society effectively control – or at least significantly affect – the livelihood of all citizens; because government and civil society, through their policies and activities, exert a considerable influence on the lifestyles of everyone; and because leadership by example is perhaps the most potent form of leadership there is, the sins of the governors are visited directly upon the governed.

The net result is not so much the upliftment of society, but its weakening. There is, thus, a failure of governance.

### 3. The Four Sins of Governance

**Corruption.** In my experience, corruption is the most pervasive “sin” of the governors, and exerts the greatest, quantifiable effect on the fortunes of the governed. Corruption, which exists at all levels of both government and the private sector, breeds and fosters poverty because (a) It drives up the cost of goods and services, by increasing the cost of doing business; (b) It diverts resources which could be utilized for social welfare and poverty alleviation measures; (c) It diverts resources which could be utilized for national infrastructural and agricultural development projects; (d) It depresses entrepreneurship; and (e) It contributes to the perpetuation of illicit and vested interests by, among other things, subverting the press.

The list goes on and on. And yet, for all that, corruption is but one of the four major “sins” of the governors that impact on the fortunes of the governed.

**Profit-taking.** Closely related to corruption is the tendency towards “profit-taking.” I, of course, do not use the term *profit* in its

financial sense. Rather, I would define this as a more sophisticated version of one-upmanship whereby the primary concern in choosing what action to take is not the greatest good for the greatest number, but the greatest benefit for the chooser.

Profit-taking is most evident in businesses where the provider of goods deliberately passes off inferior merchandise as top-line, and demanding the corresponding price. This situation is analogous to the practice, carried out by some unscrupulous non-governmental organizations, of securing grants for social welfare projects that do not exist or cost less money than what was asked for. All told, profit-taking behavior leads to the diminished quality of work and service inasmuch as the resources that should have gone towards ensuring quality are pocketed instead.

But poor quality goods and services are just the beginning of a vicious cycle, with equally vicious consequences. Profit-taking drives prices down – although the prices are still relatively high considering the inferior quality. This sparks cutthroat competition, and products and services get even shoddier. New players are effectively shut out of the market as they cannot compete price-wise. In the meantime, foreign goods become relatively cheaper, and foreign services become more desirable because of their consistency of quality. Local brands and service providers are eventually eased out, contributing to unemployment and worsening the already depressed economy.

**Hedonism.** Another “sin” of governance that I see a lot of is hedonism. When I say hedonism I do not refer only to carnal pleasures – although that is the immediate association that can be made. I speak of pleasures in general and this includes the pleasure one might derive from collecting cars, for instance, or gambling, or – in the case of at least one high government official – the pleasure one might derive from drinking vast quantities of Johnnie Walker Blue.

Hedonism is undesirable for two major reasons: the pursuit of one’s pleasures are typically expensive. If the cost of supplying these pleasures outstrips one’s earning capacity, then the recourse to corruption is all but inevitable. *Second*, hedonism fosters a permissive state of mind. This leads directly to the adoption of immoral

lifestyles involving, not just unbridled sexuality, but also substance abuse.

***Abusiveness and Cruelty.*** Finally, I see the sin of abusiveness and cruelty. Or rather, I do not see abusiveness and cruelty, but I certainly see its effects. Extra-judicial executions, also called salvaging, are daily fare in our newspapers, along with stories of illegal arrests and torture. These, obviously, arise from the desire for cruelty, fueled by a distorted sense of authority.

Also sins of abusiveness and cruelty are inmate rape, perpetrated by law enforcers; sexual harassment and sexual abuse, perpetrated in the workplace. Not all may agree with my characterization of these offenses as sins of cruelty and abusiveness, but one must agree that sadistic impulses and intoxication with one's own power are factors which attend many of these cases.

These impulses contribute directly to the proliferation of human rights abuses and instances of cruelty to women and children, in our society.

The ultimate sin of cruelty, however, is abortion. And to the extent that the government has failed to effectively curb this heinous act, I lay the blame upon society's leaders for every single victim of fly-by-night abortionists, wire hangers, and abortifacients.

#### **4. As above, so below: The influence of governance on popular morality**

Leadership by example is the perhaps the most potent form of leadership there is. It is also that form of leadership to which we, as a people, seem to have a particular susceptibility for.

Jose Rizal was one of the first to point out our predilection for imitation. Glibly, he blamed *indio* indolence on the Spanish colonists who would always *siesta* the noontime heat away. We have not proven him wrong. We, who have never had the opportunity to develop a distinctly Filipino culture, soak up the cultural characteristics of others like a sponge. Unfortunately, sponges do not discriminate between what is desirable to absorb and what is not. And neither do we.

Thus, the behavior and the attitudes of society's leaders, either *per se* and through the policies that they make, inevitably filter down to the lower strata where they are emulated. In this way the existing moral values of the governed become diluted by the kind of governance provided by our governors.

For instance, when a politician womanizes, the typical Filipino reaction is not disgust, but acceptance. In some cases, particularly with "macho" men, the reaction could even be outright admiration. This exemplifies the impact of a leader's individual morality on the governed. While the behavior is undesirable, it is nonetheless attached to the stature of the individual exhibiting it, and in that way, gains a measure of acceptability, even desirability.

On the other hand, the influence of an individual leader's morality on the public could be exerted through a government policy authored or otherwise endorsed by that leader. An example would be the use of condoms. *While some would probably say that the use of condoms has its own merits, the underlying message in the government policy to promote their use is that "it's ok to have sex as long as you protect yourself and your partner."* Thus, an act – either pre-marital sex and/or sexual infidelity – which would ordinarily be offensive to the moral values of chastity and fidelity, seem to become more acceptable.

While it can be argued that mass media – particularly television – and the Internet are greater influences on our morality, it must be remembered that even these are ultimately subject to what their owners, operators, and government regulators deem morally acceptable. Thus, if the MTRCB, for instance, allows the showing of sexually charged content on television, it can still be said that the responsibility for that corrupting influence may be laid at the feet of governance.

Our susceptibility however, cannot. While bombardment with corrupting influences may account for some weakening of moral fiber, it cannot fully account for why such influences are able to actually subvert existing moral values.

## 5. The fault, dear Brutus, lies not in our stars, but in ourselves

No anti-corruption measure, no morality or sumptuary law, nor any other sort of statute will ever be totally successful in curbing these four sins of governance, nor prevent them from being emulated by ordinary citizens. Indeed, morality simply cannot be legislated. The bottom line will always be the morality of individuals. Our worst enemy is, ultimately, us. Unfortunately, many of us – those in government, those in the private sector, ordinary men and women – subscribe to a morality of convenience that I, with the *caveat* that I am neither a theologian nor a philosopher by profession, call *moral subjectivism*: the belief that the rightness or wrongness of an act is determined by the specific circumstances surrounding its commission, particularly the “goodness” of the intent.

Moral subjectivism effectively rejects the existence of the norm of morality – the expression of the Natural Law as discerned by the conscience, which is the “judgment of human reason recognizing and applying the Eternal Law in individual human acts.”<sup>3</sup> For subjectivists, the ultimate arbiter of what is right and wrong is their own appreciation of the circumstances of their acts. The subjectivist conscience is simply made to conform to the rationalization of the deed.

This mode of thinking is extremely convenient since it refuses to acknowledge that some acts are either intrinsically or extrinsically evil, thereby making everything permissible, given the right set of extenuating circumstances and the appropriately noble intent. For instance, a person who receives a bribe may think in this wise:

*“I need the extra income to augment my meager salary so I can provide for my family better.”* The nobility of the intent is typical since most people never set out to actually do wrong for its own sake. However, the ends cannot justify the means. If acts are intrinsically evil, a good intention or particular circumstances can diminish their evil, but they cannot remove it. They remain “irremediably” evil acts; consequently, circumstances or intentions can

---

<sup>3</sup> Glenn, *Ethics*, 1930.



never transform an act intrinsically evil by virtue of its object into an act "subjectively" good or defensible as a choice.<sup>4</sup>

As St. Thomas said, "it often happens that man acts with a good intention, but without spiritual gain, because he lacks a good will. Let us say that someone robs in order to feed the poor: in this case, even though the intention is good, the uprightness of the will is lacking. Consequently, no evil done with a good intention can be excused. 'There are those who say: And why not do evil that good may come? Their condemnation is just' (*Rom* 3:8)."<sup>5</sup>

The bribe taker, however, rarely ever stops there. There is usually a strong urge to justify the act further.

"Anyway," the bribe taker says, "I'm taking this money to do something that I can legally do in the first place. It's not like I'm breaking any law doing this thing." Here we witness denial on at least two levels. First, the bribe taker denies that in soliciting and accepting a bribe, he ignores the *extrinsic* evil of the act, brought about by its proscription by human positive law. Secondly, the bribe taker denies the *intrinsic* evil of inviting bribery as an act which attempts to violate the integrity of the bribe giver by coercing his spirit.<sup>6</sup> It can even be said that bribery, which increases the cost of doing business is analogous to forcing up prices by trading on the ignorance or hardship of another (*Am* 8:4-6).<sup>7</sup>

"And besides," the bribe taker may finally add: "Everyone else is doing it, so why can't I?" This is an expression of moral relativism – the belief that moral standards are grounded in social approval. Like subjectivism, this mode of belief negates the concept of the intrinsic and extrinsic morality of human acts.

The bribe-taker can, of course, also take various other routes to arrive at the same conclusion: that inviting the bribe and taking it are permissible acts. He may engage in *consequentialism* –

---

<sup>4</sup> *Veritatis Splendor*.

<sup>5</sup> Taurinen, *In Duo Praecepta Caritatis et in Decem Legis Praecepta. De Dilectione Dei: Opuscula Theologica*, II, No. 1168, Ed., 1954.

<sup>6</sup> Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. *Gaudium et Spes*, 27.

<sup>7</sup> *Catechism of the Catholic Church*.

whereby he justifies his act by determining that the foreseeable consequences of his choice will be desirable; or he may walk the path of *proportionalism* – deciding according to the relative weights of the good and bad effects of his choice, thereby arriving at a “greater good” or a “lesser evil.”

These moral justifications are commonplace nowadays, and applicable to all acts, whether or not such acts were morally ambiguous to begin with. They reflect the weakness of our moral foundations, and, more disturbingly, the very real shift from moral to non-moral values as the standards by which human actions are gauged.

Where once before, we cleaved to values such as honesty, justice, temperance, and beneficence and respect, the pre-eminent values now seem to be utility, compromise, satisfaction, and deniability.

## 6. Non-moral Values

Moral values are the standards against which we measure the rightness or wrongness of human acts. Under ideal circumstances, these standards are based on the Eternal Law which contains a “specific and determined moral content, universally valid and permanent.”<sup>8</sup> What I call non-moral values, on the other hand, are likewise standards of rightness or wrongness, but which are derived solely from human reason, autonomous of Divine Wisdom and Revelation. “Such norms would constitute the boundaries for a merely “human” morality; they would be the expression of a law which man in an autonomous manner lays down for himself and which has its source exclusively in human reason.”<sup>9</sup>

**Utility.** By far the most common justification for corruption, utility rationalizes the act by relying on the extent of its usefulness. In practical terms, the more useful the bribe, the greater it is likely to be. If a corruptor sees that a bribe will facilitate an act that he wants performed, he will give the bribe commensurate to the extent to which the bribe makes life easier for him. Typically, the converse

---

<sup>8</sup> *Veritatis Splendor*.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

is true as well. If there is no use in giving the bribe, then corruption would be unacceptable.

Therefore, if the “goodness” of an act is primarily determined by its usefulness, then it follows that other concerns – such as honesty and fairness – are necessarily subordinated to that principal criterion.

**Compromise.** Another non-moral value that is extremely pervasive nowadays is compromise: the act of giving up a principled stand in favor of certain concessions. This behavior is more popularly known as “selling-out.” Many of us involved in governance, both in and out of government, have engaged in compromises at one time or another. Sadly, it is often out of necessity that principled stands have to be softened in order to ensure a more desirable outcome.

*Per se*, I would not call compromise a “bad” value. I believe it becomes bad, however, when it is used as a justification for intrinsically bad acts, such as when it rationalizes rampant profit-taking, or when it excuses abusive behavior, e.g., never mind that the boss harasses the office secretary, as long as she gets a raise. In such cases, compromise effectively perverts one’s sense of justice, and allows the tolerance of injustice.

**Satisfaction.** Another standard by which the rightness or wrongness of acts is increasingly being measured is the capacity of those acts to bring satisfaction to the actor. On many occasions, I have heard people being told to do whatever makes them happy. While it may not be totally wrong to follow one’s bliss, to do so at the expense of one’s duties, and without regard for one’s responsibilities to others would constitute immoral self-indulgence, closely akin to gluttony, and offensive to the moral value of temperance.

The use of the non-moral value of satisfaction is characteristic of hedonists, who believe that the main purpose of existence is the acquisition of pleasure, and that the most noble occupation is the amassing of the means by which such pursuit of pleasure is made possible.

**Deniability.** Most vicious, to my mind, of the four non-moral values that justify the four sins of governance, is deniability – the antithesis of responsibility – this refers to the ability to do what

one wills without suffering the consequences therefor. More than any other non-moral value, deniability involves intellectual dishonesty. It does not justify the wrong being done, it merely assures the wrong-doer of impunity.

What is particularly alarming about deniability is that even our children learn its dubious worth at a very young age. As they say in schools across the country, "*di bale nang mandaya, huwag lang magpapahuli.*" This amply reflects the mindset that non-accountability equals right, an attitude that inhibits transparency and openness, fosters corruption, and protects official wrong-doing.

On another level, deniability also indirectly gives rise to a diminished respect for human life and rights inasmuch as violations are deprived of their righteous consequences, and violators get off scot-free; free only to repeat their abuses. Thus, abortionists hide behind the mantle of anonymity – keeping their crimes from all but themselves, denying their monstrosity to all and sundry; wife beaters hide behind loving demeanors, and their wives' long-sleeved shirts, and dark glasses; and child molesters dress in sheep's clothing to infiltrate our schools. Of these people, once they are discovered, their neighbors and loved ones usually say: "he would never hurt a fly." Such is the potency of the web of deniability that they weave around themselves.

## 7. Moral Recovery

With governance in the hands of women and men who base their actions on non-moral values, we are subjected to policies that fall far short of our moral ideals. We promote the use of condoms, for instance, thereby yielding to the utility of latex, compromising on the ideal of chastity and fidelity, abetting the undisciplined urge to seek carnal satisfaction, and cultivating a culture of sexual permissiveness devoid of any sense of responsibility and accountability.

We encourage our citizens to find employment abroad because we need dollars. We sell out the development of our children by depriving them of loving parents and sound role-models. Indirectly, we promote consumerism by greatly stressing the value of money. We opt to go for the quick buck, smug in our denial that we are breeding a next generation that has been deprived of the wisdom

and guidance of their parents and older siblings. Even worse, we make domestic incestuous rape more likely, and infidelity, almost certain.

Our government plans to legalize some forms of gambling. At one time, there were initiatives to sanction divorce. And just the other day, a high government official went on record saying that if our people want to be protected from criminals, they should arm themselves.

I am certain that these policy directions can all be justified if they are judged by the non-moral values I have outlined. But it begs the question, *is this the only way to do things?* Do we have to promote condoms to minimize teenage pregnancies and the spread of the HIV virus, thereby cultivating a morally desensitized society that is, ironically more vulnerable to very problems we set out to solve? Do we have to actively encourage this diaspora of Filipino workers, and further weaken the Filipino family? If we persist in this, we only weaken society and aggravate our problems with poverty, unemployment, and criminality, thus driving even more Filipinos abroad.

Do we need to legalize gambling in order to curb it, thereby allowing the rich to get richer at the expense of the poor who only get poorer? Do we really need to officially sanction divorce, despite the lasting damage it inflicts on children? Should we now walk around daily, armed to the teeth, and risk becoming more boisterous, and therefore more likely to need weapons?

While these measures may be founded on sound theory, and motivated by good intentions, they are merely palliative measures, designed to gain quick wins and immediately tangible gains, without paying attention to the need to prepare the foundations for sustainability. Inevitably, the small victories dry up, and in the end, these policies only perpetuate the ills they try to remedy.

I believe that the realities of life in our cities and our homes tell us very clearly that there are better ways of doing things. Principled ways and means that put a premium on adherence to *moral* values; that do not end up simply aggravating the problems they try to solve; principled governance that points the way to lasting and sustainable solutions to social problems.

But for this, the necessary first step, is a moral renewal of the existing order.

As Pope John Paul II said:

“In the face of serious forms of social and economic injustice and political corruption affecting entire peoples and nations, there is a growing reaction of indignation on the part of very many people whose fundamental human rights have been trampled upon and held in contempt, as well as an ever more widespread and acute sense of the need for a radical personal and social renewal capable of ensuring justice, solidarity, honesty and openness.”<sup>10</sup>

Until such a renewal takes place, we will always be governed by individuals who see only utility, find nothing objectionable with compromising our root principles, prioritize instant gratification, and are comfortably removed from the ill-effects of their short-sightedness.

The Pope gives us a glimpse of this situation taken to its logical conclusion:

“In the political sphere, it must be noted that truthfulness in the relations between those governing and those governed, openness in public administration, impartiality in the service of the body politic, respect for the rights of political adversaries, safeguarding the rights of the accused against summary trials and convictions, the just and honest use of public funds, the rejection of equivocal or illicit means in order to gain, preserve or increase power at any cost – all these are principles which are primarily rooted in, and in fact derive their singular urgency from, the transcendent value of the person and the objective moral demands of the functioning of States. When these principles are not observed, the very basis of political coexistence is weakened and the life of society itself is gradually jeopardized, threatened and doomed to decay (cf. Ps 14:3-4; Rev 18:2-3, 9-24). Today, when many countries have seen the fall of ideologies which bound politics to a totalitarian conception of the world – Marxism being the foremost of these – there is no less grave a danger that the fundamental rights of the human person will be denied and

---

<sup>10</sup> *Veritatis Splendor*.

that the religious yearnings which arise in the heart of every human being will be absorbed once again into politics. This is the risk of an alliance between democracy and ethical relativism, which would remove any sure moral reference point from political and social life, and on a deeper level make the acknowledgement of truth impossible. Indeed, 'if there is no ultimate truth to guide and direct political activity, then ideas and convictions can easily be manipulated for reasons of power. As history demonstrates, a democracy without values easily turns into open or thinly disguised totalitarianism'.<sup>11</sup>

Obviously, moral renewal is a tall order. One that cannot be filled all in one swoop, anymore than we can declare all positions in the bureaucracy vacant, or dislodge all civil society leaders, overnight. Besides, in all fairness, many in government and civil society today can be characterized as being enlightened. Removing them along with all the rotten apples would simply be unfair. However, far too many remain in the dark. After all, if even one of our governors persist in applying non-moral values instead of moral values, that is still one too many.

Where, then, must this moral renewal take place?

## 8. The Battlefield

The struggle for moral renewal will not be fought in the streets, nor in the halls of congress, nor in the courtroom arenas. This fight will unfold in the battlefields of the hearts and minds of our nation's youth.

As Jose Rizal rightly said, the youth *are* the hope of the fatherland. Today we typically interpret this to mean that we should make sure that the youth are well prepared to take on the task of governance when their turn comes around.

I, on the other hand, believe that Rizal meant to say more than that.

Beyond exhorting us to see to the preparation of our youth for the many tasks of governance, I believe Rizal foresaw the

---

<sup>11</sup> *Veritatis Splendor*.

succeeding generation as being capable of reminding the older generation of what is truly important; of reorienting our moral compasses through their vigilance, and with the flames of their passionate idealism. In this sense, and considering that we grown-ups have so far failed – with our cynicism and skepticism – to arrest our society's slide into moral decay, the youth are our last hope for social renewal, and survival.

The task of the older generation is clear enough. We must make sure that the values we teach our successors are the correct ones. Not the non-moral values that dwell on utility, compromise, satisfaction, and deniability, but the moral values that urge us to be honest, to be just, to practice temperance, and to practice transparency in all our dealings, and be responsible for all our acts.

With these values, the youth – when they govern – stand a good chance of finding more lasting solutions to the problems that plague society, and rescue us from ourselves.

## 9. Conclusion

I have often heard it said that moral values are anachronistic in today's high-powered world; that they emasculate and prevent upward mobility in the corporate arena; that they have become incompatible with success.

I reject these notions. While it may be true that moral values like honesty, justice, temperance, and responsibility may bring one into conflict with others who believe differently, at the end of the day, it will still be the one whose achievements did not come at the expense of others who will sleep soundly. It will be he who will have confidence that his works will not crumble overnight into dust; it will be he who will have the satisfaction of knowing that his efforts have been crowned with permanence and lasting value; it will be he who will see that the world has been made a little better by his passing through it. And *that* is a truer measure of success than fleeting glory and momentary wealth. □