

Part 2—DIALOGUE ON THE ETHICS OF MUTUAL LEARNING IN GOVERNMENT AND CORPORATIONS

This conversation began in a dialogue between David Boulton and Phil Ryan, a constitutional lawyer representing a software company interested in providing post 9-11 airport security systems in California. The conversation evolved from security to privacy (messages 1 thru 7) and thereafter to the ethics of business and society. ** Indicates the messages that best convey our orientation and thought about 'ethics'.

"We of the great modern democracies must strive unceasingly to make our several countries lands in which a poor man who works hard can live comfortably and honestly, and in which a rich man cannot live dishonestly nor in slothful avoidance of duty."

- Theodore Roosevelt

Page 3 — #1 - Phil Ryan's 'What if' paper to California Senator John Vasconcellos re Airport Security: the rationale for a new and more sophisticated airport security system - one that would have stopped 9-11 from happening.

Page 7 — #2 David Boulton to John Vasconcellos re Phil Ryan's 'What If' on Airport Security the issue isn't technology (we've had the technological ability) its privacy - the technology could migrate from airport security to other non intended areas.

Page 8 — #3 Phil Ryan to John Vasconcellos re David Boulton's comments on 'What If' asserts that the technology hasn't previously existed, acknowledges privacy issue and defends the proposed system.

Page 10 — #4 David Boulton to John Vasconcellos and Phil Ryan re Privacy The reason we don't have such a system isn't that we haven't had the technological means. We haven't had it before 9-11 because our perceived need for such a system didn't rise above the social and economic objections to implementing one.

Page 11 — #5 Phil Ryan to David Boulton and John Vasconcellos re Privacy David is correct that for 30 years we have lacked the political will to recognize that information is the sine qua non of public safety. It is tragically clear that un-communicated information is conveyed ignorance.

Page 12 — #6 David Boulton to Phil Ryan and John Vasconcellos et al re Privacy & Ethics will our society's learning keep pace with and help drive the ethical debate regarding the limits we impose on such systems? I think we must proceed here and I think before doing so the advocates should be engaged in a rigorous, non commercially prejudiced, dialogue into these issues with people who advocate the freedoms of privacy.

Page 13 — #7 Phil Ryan to David Boulton and John Vasconcellos et al re Privacy & Ethics I absolutely agree your notions of the privacy issues. It would be a national tragedy if we broke down J. Edgar Hoover's culture of secrecy from local law enforcement and created 500 hundred local Hoovers.

Business Ethics, Learning Conversation begins...

Page 14 — #8 David Boulton to Phil Ryan and John Vasconcellos et al re Ethics ** Its not the Hoovers that scare me its how much more dangerous corporations can become. **One of our most fundamental international business ethics assumes that businesses have the right to pursue their economic interests even to the extent of directing the thoughts and emotions of people with the clear intent of covertly manipulating their economic behavior.** What happens when corporations have these tools?

Page 15 — #9 John Vasconcellos to David Boulton and Phil Ryan et al re Ethics I FEAR WE'RE BEING SO DELUGED BY FRIGHT MESSAGES, PARANOIA, WE'RE ON THE VERGE OF BLITHELY SURRENDERING ALL OUR HUMAN CIVIL RIGHTS!

Page 10 — #10 John Vasconcellos to David Boulton and Phil Ryan et al re Ethics AMEN, DAVID, AMEN!!

Page 17 — #11 John Vasconcellos to Heather Barbour re David Boulton's Ethics SO WHO & HOW & WHEN & WHERE MIGHT WE INITIATE SUCH AN EXPLORATION?

Page 18 — #12 John Vasconcellos to all re DAN YANKELOVICH 'TRUST'/INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP FORUM;4/28/02 THEREFORE WE HAVE TODAY AN ENORMOUS AND GROWING PRESSING NEED FOR A NEW INSTITUTIONAL MORALITY

Page 21 — # 13 David Boulton to John Vasconcellos re Leadership Forum - Institutional Morality = Ethics * My view is that the deep fulcrum for liberating healthy change here is to address the 'ethic' underlying and organizing the 'morality'. **I think that the corporate behaviors we are concerned/outraged by are merely the logical consequences of an underlying ethic we take for granted.**

Page 22 — # 14 John Vasconcellos to David Boulton re Institutional Morality = Ethics OUCH - THAT'S FRIGHTENING! IT IS NOW TIME THAT EACH AND ALL OF US COME TOGETHER INTO A MOVEMENT THAT CHALLENGES THIS ETHIC, RECLAIMS OUR LIVES!

Page 23 — #15 Heather Barbour & David Boulton Thread re: Ethics and The Intrusion Explosion - Ethics 15 in global historic turns -- we're leading the way into the post-human rights period. homo economus.

Page 24 — #16 Josh Holcomb to John Vasconcellos and David Boulton - The Ethics of Trust? The emails have given rise to a very basic question: Is trust an ethic?

Page 25 — #17 David Boulton to Josh Holcomb and John Vasconcellos et al - The Ethics of Trust ** **Trust is 'inside' - ethics are 'outside'. In the middle of 19th century we, as a nation, had a conversation about our 'ethics' – we decided that people couldn't 'own' people. We decided that human beings are entitled to a freedom befitting their human beingness – that human beings can't be property – can't be slaves.150 years later we must again take up this conversation. Today we face the question are human beings 'assets'?**

Phil Ryan to California Senator John Vasconcellos re Airport Security WHAT IF By Phil Ryan - Ethics 1

On the morning of September 11, 2001, two terrorists boarded American commercial airliners destined for the west coast. A month earlier, the CIA had notified the INS to place these two individuals on their terrorist watch list. When they purchased their tickets for cash, neither airport law enforcement nor airlines security had any information of the danger they posed. It was therefore a failure of *intelligence* not a paucity of *security* that led to cruel mass murder at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

At the same time, some nineteen-suicide terrorists boarded four commercial jets, three employees of Callixa Corp., a San Francisco based information technology company with offices in New York City, were attending a major trade show featuring their company's software on the 105th Floor of the World Trade Center. Their names were: Naomi Solomon, the number two executive at Callixa and a resident of New York city, Wayne Evans, a veteran of the 82nd Airborne and combat in Desert Shield and Desert Storm, a resident of Virginia, and Chris Wemmers, originally from Hamburg, Germany, a resident of San Francisco. Along with thousands of others, they perished instantaneously when the first plane exploded into the World Trade Center.

It is an unfathomable irony that had Callixa's software, which these three people were about to display at the World Trade Center, been employed at Logan Airport, it would have prevented the two watch-list killers from boarding their fateful and fatal flight. Eulogies are always inadequate to the losses suffered, but Callixa's employees have offered a technology memorial to their fallen colleagues. Before America was attacked, Callixa's software provided enterprise information integration on a real time basis to the financial services industry. Callixa's product accesses any number of databases stored on different platforms in multiple languages and integrates this information instantaneously. How then can a technology designed to serve vast, international and multinational financial institutions provide airline passengers with a meaningful sense of security that air travel is safe from the madness of September 11th?

First, federal and local law enforcement and commercial airlines must recognize the horrific lesson of September 11th; namely, that bombers not baggage murdered thousands in New York and Washington, D.C. The history of American airport security is one of divided authority over the paramount public responsibility for human safety. From the airport parking garage to the ticket counter, local law enforcement has public safety jurisdiction. From ticket purchase through baggage checks to boarding, private airlines and their minimum wage contractors are the guardians of public safety. Once on the plane, federal jurisdiction assumes responsibility for passenger safety. Thus institutionally, a tripartite command structure has existed over air travel for more than thirty years at the very point of terrorist attacks.

President Bush has properly stated that we are at war. Yet our airport defenses, the mission of terrorists' attacks, are commanded by a disparate committee, part civilian and part paramilitary with conflicting responsibilities and interests and sparse intelligence communication. Thus even though the CIA and the INS possessed intelligence that at least two of the World Trade Center bombers were wanted terrorists, they did not and could not share this information with airlines' security, since law enforcement investigative material is prohibited from disclosure to non-law enforcement, non-governmental entities.

The post-September 11th congressional debate offers little in the way of restoring public confidence in the safety of air travel. Without questioning the sincerity of either the Democrat or Republican proposals, both miss the point that it is bad people who threaten Americans not the quality or content of their luggage. Both political parties propose, "federalizing" airport security and neither suggests federalizing much less sharing criminal intelligence. Predictably, Democrats insist that replacing minimum wage and minimally trained private security personnel with well-paid, civil service federal employees screening bags will restore public confidence in air safety. Republicans counter with the notion of a public/private partnership similar to the present system with direct oversight of private security employees by the federal government as the better plan. If September 11th teaches anything, it is that the means of mass murder are not stored in baggage but in the souls of evil passengers. In short, neither proposal invests public safety professionals with the power and authority to do their jobs – the jobs of crime prevention and public safety.

Congress has passed and the President signed into law the federalizing airport baggage checkers. Increasing luggage scrutiny has never prevented hijackers and killers from wreaking their havoc. What is missing from the public debate is the central and fundamental truth that security starts and ends with intelligence. No one would suggest that a military commander undertake an offensive or defensive operation without solid intelligence on the enemy. As the Al Qaeda terrorists plotted their mass murder and mayhem, numerous government agencies possessed information about their goals, identities and activities. Presumably the CIA was trying to recruit Al Qaeda comrades as informants and, a month before the bombings, notified the INS to place two of the terrorists on their watch list. The State Department has attempted to persuade Arab governments to arrest terrorists; the Treasury is freezing their assets. When they entered the United States, they had to go through U.S. Customs and the INS must have checked their names against the terrorists watch list.

In fact, there are forty-three different agencies that have at least some jurisdiction in the war on terror. But at the crucial moment when they boarded their chosen planes to transform them into flying bombs, none of these government agencies shared the information contained in their various databases with the frontline of airport security – **local police!** *Uncommunicated intelligence is conveyed ignorance.* And this, more than anything, is the cause of the enor-

Ambassador Mary Ryan (no relation to the author), head of the State Department Consular Affairs, has testified that American Embassies and Consulates could have stopped some of the terrorists from entering the country if agencies such as the CIA and FBI had shared information with the State Department. California Senator Dianne Feinstein has urged: “The agencies need to get together and create a single database with information about terrorists...I am concerned about continuing to appropriate money to systems that don’t talk to each other.”

Mayor Rudy Giuliani has been quoted in the New York Daily News, saying, “We need the information and we need it right now. We need **real-time information** about what is happening.” Former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, James Woolsey has said: “The Nation is in trouble if the agencies continue to create databases that cannot communicate with one another.” Sandy Berger, former Clinton National Security Advisor stated: “The first dollar I would spend would be on data integration.”

Thus America’s war on terror is faced with both policy and technical issues. New York Senators Schumer and Clinton have introduced legislation to break down the inarticulate barriers of multiple databases not on speaking terms with federal and local law enforcement. The State of Florida is discussing data warehousing, a technology primarily used for analysis of marketing of historical data, as a solution. But even assuming that federal agencies share their terrorists’ data with the state of Florida, such a project would take years and billions of dollars to complete. And, most significantly, the information would never be current! Former National Security Advisor Berger cut to the heart of the issue when he said: “*Real-time*, intelligent data-sharing among agencies such as the INS, Customs, Federal, state and local law enforcement is a must.” But Mr. Berger cautioned that real-time data integration faced formidable bureaucratic hurdles. “Sharing data presents policy and turf issues...give up part of your database and you lose part of your budget,” he said.

Callixa's **Airport Threat Detector** may be thought of as a *virtual data warehouse*. The moment a passenger's name is punched into an airline ticket computer Callixa's powerful **Threat Detector** accesses multiple databases and instantaneously determines if the passenger is on any watch lists. Callixa has built a prototype for a demonstration to San Francisco International Airport and the San Francisco Police Department. Callixa has propounded a series of questions to airport and local police officials. They are being asked:

What if there was a way for the background of every single American and foreign airline passenger at the airport to be checked against the FBI's databases?

And what if there was a way to simultaneously check this information against databases maintained by more than 40 federal agencies as well as state and local law enforcement agencies or even international agencies?

What if this could be done even though those databases are written in a variety of computer software platforms across an assortment of operating systems and even foreign languages?

What if there was a way to do all this by existing airlines personnel using existing passenger reservations systems at passenger check-in?

*And what if this could take place in real time, automatically notifying local law enforcement of any passengers matching potential threat profiles **before** they board the flight?*

What if you could do all of this while protecting the civil liberties and privacy of every passenger screened by the system?

And what if you could do this all now?

Perhaps the most sadly ironic admission by anti-terror officials was Transportation Secretary Minetta's recent statements that he doesn't have enough sniffing dogs and electronic baggage scanners to meet Congress' airport security requirements. What should be obvious in the 21st Century is that government measures that fail to improve and enhance law enforcement's abilities to prevent evil people from boarding American flights, is, in an old Texas expression, simply a dog that won't hunt.

David Boulton to John Vasconcellos re Phil Ryan's 'What If' on Airport Security - Ethics 2

From: David Boulton
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2001 11:26 AM
Subject: RE: airport security

P
A
R
T

John,

2

I think their argument that the breakdown was a breakdown in intelligence (or the lack of availability of the intelligence that existed) is right. But the technical aspects of solving the problem have existed for quite a while. The issue hasn't been the inability to technologically provide the information (though on the surface they look to have a great system) it's been the 'privacy' issue. Proposals like theirs run right into the 'big brother' scare. Its very touchy stuff. It may be, like in so many other cases, the Bush administration will use the 9-11 crimes as the basis for pushing against citizen rights and be able to overcome the resistance from privacy advocates. Frankly and in theory, I would be all in favor of it in this limited case (boarding airlines) but its a hard thing to contain. What other circumstances will it bleed into? If you have someone in your circle you trust on the privacy frontier I suggest you get their thinking before you get involved with this.

Phil Ryan to John Vasconcellos re David Boulton's comments on 'What If' - Ethics 3

John & David,
Here's a quick reply to David's email comments.
Phil Ryan

As a constitutional lawyer of more than three decades and whose original net worth arose from my defense of the now badly tattered 4th Amendment, I'd like to volunteer for your trusting circle on the "privacy frontier." But before commenting on the privacy issue, I must correct the notion that the technical aspects of intelligence data sharing has existed in a meaningful and timely way. There are forty-three federal agencies presently dealing with terrorism. Not only do these intelligence databases not talk to each other, as Senators Schumer, Clinton and Feinstein have pointed out, proposals for data warehousing will cost billions of dollars, five to ten years to produce and the intelligence will never be current. Callixa's software, on the other hand, creates a virtual data warehouse and provides intelligence information instantaneously in real time.

I share David's concern that the Bush administration and particularly the Attorney General have used the 9-11 horror to constrict our civil liberties and civil rights. It is also my view that this contraction of American liberties has added absolutely nothing to the war against terror. Ironically and sadly, any restrictions on our civil liberties must be considered a victory for the September 11th terrorists.

David appears to make two privacy points which I'd like the address. The first is the privacy issue at the airport. Callixa built a prototype for SFO using the existing airlines technology. Airline ticketing is done on a thirty year old computer system. Some years ago, the FAA and Northwest Airlines came up with the CAPS system, which frankly, is an ethnic and racial profiling system that is now being used by many airlines. The ACLU and other privacy advocates opposed this system and, frankly, I agree with them. To give you an example of the crudeness of airport intelligence, a few days after September 11th, a passenger purchased a ticket for Israel at SFO. The airlines' computer found that he had flown more than 200,000 miles in a year, primarily to the Middle East. A 917 call (airport version of 911 calls) was made to SFPD. The police responded, only to discover that the passenger was the CEO of Intel, which has plants in Israel! Callixa's technology does not rely on suspect passenger profiles or computer data from private carriers.

Here's how the Callixa *Threat Detector* works as demonstrated to SFPD. The local police department is the sponsor and licensee. When a passenger's name is entered into the carrier's ticketing computer, the police *Threat Detector* instantaneously checks the name against any law enforcement databases of terrorist suspect to which the police have been granted access. If there is no match, ticketing proceeds as usual. If, on the other hand, Boston police had had the *Threat Detector* on September 11th, Mohammed Atta, on CIA and INS watch lists, would have been prevented from boarding the deadly flight.[\[1\]](#) And the CEO of Intel would not have been pulled out of the ticket line. Moreover, because Callixa's software is a virtual database/warehouse, the millions of passengers checked at ticket counters are not even a blip on the screen.

David's point that this should be limited to boarding airlines, at first glance, seems a valid one. It should be noted, however, that a present the FBI still functions under the J. Edgar Hoover culture of denying local police vital intelligence information. The real problem will be changing the federal mentality to recognize that homeland security while keeping local police ignorant of terror intelligence is doomed to failure and further tragedy. With respect to containing the *Threat Detector* to airports, this is simply a matter of code restrictions and recognition that airport security is both a local and federal responsibility. As for local police extending the technology to routine police stops, it should be noted that police for twenty years have had the technical capacity to run warrant checks, CLETTS checks and now computerized fingerprint checks. Again, note that Callixa's data integration is virtual and therefore not a gatherer and storer of information.

Indeed, Callixa's *Threat Detector* is the only proposal I know of that protects the civil liberties and privacy of everyone screened by the technology. Only the bad guys get caught.

If you'd like, I can arrange a demonstration like the one we've provided SFPD for you, your staff and, most certainly for any civil libertarians like David.

My best,

Phil Ryan

[1] It is vital to note that California law enforcement routinely runs computer checks on CLETTs and through the FBI fingerprint database. Under federal and state laws, only law enforcement officers are entitled to investigative materials. The *Threat Detector* simply communicates existing law enforcement information to law enforcement officers at the airport before dangerous terrorists board. Any citizen or non-citizen not already a suspect will not even register on police screens.

John & Phil,

Phil Ryan's letter begins with wanting to correct the notion "that the technical aspects of intelligence data sharing has existed in a meaningful and timely way". I didn't mean to imply that the systems in place today have the technical capabilities to do what we need. Rather that the problem isn't a lack of technological capability in general. If our government wanted to have and pay for such a system it could have had one some time ago. The reason we don't have such a system isn't that we haven't had the technological means. Rather, we haven't had the social-economic-political will. We haven't had it before 9-11 because our perceived need for such a system didn't rise above the social and economic objections to implementing one. Since 9-11 the perceived need has grown to overpower the economic considerations and so the conversation turns to privacy and the related social issues involved.

David

P
A
R
T
2

Phil Ryan to David Boulton and John Vasconcellos re Privacy - Ethics 5

P
A
R
T
2

From a constitutional lawyer's perspective, the most attractive feature of Callixa's *Threat Detector* is that it does not access or convey information about anyone other than suspected terrorists about whom law enforcement has credible information and it **does not** single out people because of their race, religion or accent of speech! The only information the *Threat Detector* gathers from airlines is the personal information currently required to board a flight. The only information the *Threat Detector* gathers from the more than 40 federal agencies with terrorist jurisdiction is a suspected terrorist. And only law enforcement officials see this information. Thus, Mohammed Atta's "invaded privacy" keeps him off the plane!

I think David is correct that for 30 years we have lacked the political will to recognize that information is the sine qua non of public safety. It is equally true that data warehousing is a budget buster, takes years to install and is never current. Three years ago, Dr. Bitton introduced real-time data integration to the IT world. Sandy Berger, former National Security Advisor to President Clinton cut to the heart of the political problem when he said: "Real-time, intelligent data-sharing among agencies such as INS, Customs, Federal, state and local law enforcement is a must, but recognize the hurdles...sharing data presents policy and turf issues...give up part of your database and you lose part of your budget."

Mayor Guiliani said, "We need the information and we need it right away. We need real-time information about what is happening."

September 11th has seared a fundamental truth in the American consciousness. It is tragically clear that uncommunicated information is conveyed ignorance.

Phil Ryan

**David Boulton to Phil Ryan and John Vasconcellos et al re Privacy & Ethics
-Ethics 6**

Phil,

I like and agree with what you said. I agree 'un-communicated information is conveyed (systemic) ignorance'. I like Callixa's approach and I have actually recommended them to a significant client of mine. I think we should implement such a system for airline security. My only concern is that this kind of intelligence-information power can be abused. Once the disparate systems are subsumed and integrated to provide such on-demand power, the cost of mining that data for other non initially intended uses is comparatively low. The issue that emerges for me is similar to human cloning. Will our society's learning keep pace with and help drive the ethical debate regarding the limits we impose on such systems? I don't know.

I think we must proceed here and I think before doing so the advocates should be engaged in a rigorous, non commercially prejudiced, dialogue into these issues with people who advocate the freedoms of privacy.

- Best, David

**Phil Ryan to David Boulton and John Vasconcellos et al re Privacy & Ethics
- Ethics 7**

P
A
R
T

Sent: Friday, February 15, 2002 9:29 AM

Subject: Re: DAVID BOULTON'S RESPONSE TO airport security PROPOSAL

2

David,

I absolutely agree your notions of the privacy issues. Given the present Supreme Court and the current Attorney General, these concerns are not insignificant. It would be a national tragedy if we broke down J. Edgar Hoover's culture of secrecy from local law enforcement and created 500 hundred local Hoovers. I appreciate your thoughts. Keep them coming.

Phil Ryan

**David Boulton to Phil Ryan and John Vasconcellos et al re Privacy & Ethics
- Ethics 8**

P
A
R
T

From: David Boulton
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2002 12:43 PM
Subject: RE: DAVID BOULTON'S RESPONSE TO airport security PROPOSAL

2

Phil,

You asked me to keep them coming...

Its not the Hoovers that scare me its how much more dangerous corporations can become. One of our most fundamental international business ethics assumes that businesses have the right to pursue their economic interests even to the extent of directing the thoughts and emotions of people with the clear intent of tactically manipulating their economic behavior. We take this for granted. It's the "American Way" and yet it, more than terrorism, strangles our nation - it is an invisible crime that goes far beyond the scope of the FBI. Its a cancer on our national intelligence - our national learning - our ultimate national advantage.

We need more ways of being more extensively intelligent together. We need a situationally relevant, intelligence support system. We need to be able to detect threats as they move through our 'gates' and do so without unduly stuttering the flow of legal citizen behavior. One of my work threads involves distributed relationship architecture, I understand some of the implications of the underlying processing capabilities of such systems, and, I do think that they should be developed (and evolve) to respond to the needs of national intelligence. And saying all that, its *the national intelligence of our people* that concerns me most.

We have seen what Madison Ave. can do with tobacco company ethics, lucasfilm's technology concepts, Spielberg's attention direction and with the right 'star attractions'. We have a semi-hypnotized society - hypnotized into accepting manipulation as normal, hypnotized into a lack of respect for their own learning. What happens when these incredibly powerful interests, who place the right to make money above the injustice of manipulating people's lives, have access to the kind of intelligence powers these systems could provide?

The seedling concepts are being prototyped on the web today.

From what I have skim-gleaned of Callixa's underlying technology philosophy, I respect and appreciate them as a company and would like to get to know them better. We need a system such as theirs, and in the due course of more analysis, very possibly theirs in particular.

At the same time, there is substantial risk to America, in my view, of having the economics in this situation grandfather a lobby that leads to allowing such systems to be used for ever more purely economic reasons.

One question for me is will the companies that get involved in this 'market' behave respectfully or manipulatively? This is too dangerous a place for manipulations emanating from narrow economic interests. We need a much more extended dialogue here. However it is perfectly legitimate for companies who have relevant products to help inspire and resource such a social dialogue to help educate our people into the many contingencies involved. I trust, as in John's 'politics of trust', that that is your intent.

I appreciate the opportunity for dialogue that your participation and thought quality has made possible and I welcome more.

Sincerely - David

John Vasconcellos to David Boulton and Phil Ryan et al re Ethics - Ethics 9
John is in ALL CAPS - David in normal then blue

P
A
R
T

2

Sent: Saturday, April 06, 2002 12:23 PM

Subject: Re: DAVID BOULTON'S RESPONSE TO airport security PROPOSAL

ALOHA DAVID - CATCHING UP SOME MORE - -

In a message YOU WROTE - :

Phil Ryan's letter begins with wanting to correct the notion "that the technical aspects of intelligence data sharing has existed in a meaningful and timely way". I didn't mean to imply that the systems in place today have the technical capabilities to do what we need. Rather that the problem isn't a lack of technological capability in general. If our government wanted to have and pay for such a system it could have had one some time ago.

FAIR ENOUGH!

The reason we don't have such a system isn't that we haven't had the technological means. Rather, we haven't had the social-economic-political will. We haven't had it before 9-11 because our perceived need for such a system didn't rise above the social and economic objections to implementing one. Since 9-11 the perceived need has grown to overpower the economic considerations and so the conversation turns to privacy and the related social issues involved.

I FEAR WE'RE BEING SO DELUGED BY FRIGHT MESSAGES, PARANOIA, WE'RE ON THE VERGE OF BLITHELY SURRENDERING ALL OUR HUMAN CIVIL RIGHTS!

WHAT A TRAGEDY!

WHAT A TRULY FRIGHTENING TIME IN OUR LIVES, IN OUR WORLD - THE MOST SUCH IN MY ENTIRE LIFE TO DATE

JOHN

YES, I FEEL THAT FEAR. AND, I ALSO FEEL THAT WE ARE ON THE VERGE OF REDEFINING WHAT WE MEAN BY OUR 'HUMAN CIVIL RIGHTS'. THIS ERA WILL PASS AND WE WILL BE THE CLEARER, CLEANER AND STRONGER FOR IT. THE TRAGEDY IS THE MANGLING OF INNOCENT LIVES BY THE INSANITIES OF OUR SLOW-TO-LEARN NATIONAL MIND.

**John Vasconcellos to David Boulton and Phil Ryan et al re Ethics - Ethics 10
John is in ALL CAPS**

P
A
R
T

Sent: Saturday, April 06, 2002 12:28 PM
Subject: Re: DAVID BOULTON'S RESPONSE TO airport security PROPOSAL

HELLO AGAIN DAVID - PHIL -

2

In a message dated 3/12/02 6:06:54 PM,

David Boulton writes:

Phil, I like and agree with what you said. I agree 'un-communicated information is conveyed (systemic) ignorance'. I like Callixa's approach and I have actually recommended them to a significant client of mine. I think we should implement such a system for airline security. My only concern is that this kind of intelligence-information power can be abused. Once the disparate systems are subsumed and integrated to provide such on-demand power, the cost of mining that data for other non initially intended uses is comparatively low. The issue that emerges for me is similar to human cloning. Will our society's learning keep pace with and help drive the ethical debate regarding the limits we impose on such systems? I don't know. I think we must proceed here and I think before doing so the advocates should be engaged in a rigorous, non commercially prejudiced, dialogue into these issues with people who advocate the freedoms of privacy.

- Best, David

AMEN, DAVID, AMEN!!

John Vasconcellos to Heather.Barbour re David Boulton's Ethics 11
John responding in all CAPS

P
A
R
T

2

From: Heather.Barbour

John -

I finally got a chance to look at this proposal and the conversation thread spurred by it. At first glance, I am most compelled by David Boulton's critique.

OF COURSE.

Although I appreciate the security issues under debate, and the Callixa software sounds pretty good in that it seems to address civil rights and civil liberties issues as we Americans generally understand them, the larger question David raises -- at what price profit? -- is of increasing concern to me.

FAIR ENOUGH.

It seems to me we need to have an extended conversation about America's economic role in the world and our own values vis-a-vis economics, specifically as these things relate to technology products. Even if we could assure ourselves that Callixa's technology would be used in accordance with our American civil rights values here at home - how might China use it? What is our responsibility to other peoples and cultures?

We need to have an extended exploration of the ethics of emerging technologies and the global business climate.

SO WHO & HOW & WHEN & WHERE MIGHT WE INITIATE SUCH AN EXPLORATION?

John Vasconcellos to all re DAN YANKELOVICH 'TRUST'/INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP FORUM - 4/28/02 Ethics 12

P
A
R
T

Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2002 10:25 PM

Subject: DAN YANKELOVICH 'TRUST'/INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP FORUM;4/28/02

THE MOST POWERFUL SOCIAL TRENDS ARE THOSE THAT CONVERGE

2

They are transforming, and they are enduring!

THE CONVERGING EFFECTS OF 9/11 + 'ENRONITIS' –

Our feeling of greater vulnerability;

More dependence on government;

Rise in patriotism and sense of community

Increasing trust in institutions –

Including government –

1970 - 73% of people trusted (in) government;

1994 - 17% of people trusted (in) government;

2001/Oct - 64% of people trusted (in) government.

'ENRONITIS'

Definition: An institutional propensity to betray the trust of your constituents.

Result - a rise in populism.

What's more notable than failure of Enron itself –

Is the failure of the entire series of watchdog institutions!

Adding to the growing (to epidemic levels) erosion (collapse) of trust is the Catholic Church's current scandals.

Note that the long-standing title of 'used car salesman' as the most distrusted profession –

Has been replaced - by HMO's;

SO ALTOGETHER WE ARE NOTING, EXPERIENCING, A REMARKABLE MAGNITUDE OF THE SHIFT DOWNWARD OF CONFIDENCE AND TRUST –

Both:

In government, +

In corporations.

Therefore we are experiencing an emergency, a profound lowering of, a crisis in trust amongst our people today –

Especially trust in the American brand of capitalism;

Compounded by Enron, Bernadine Healy, and Cardinal Law –

Each and all of whom were/are utterly isolated from all reality except their own!

And society is creating subcultures and siloes that are grounds for further mistrust.

THEREFORE WE HAVE TODAY AN ENORMOUS AND GROWING PRESSING NEED FOR A NEW INSTITUTIONAL MORALTY!

IN LIGHT OF OUR CURRENT SITUATION, AND CRISES - THERE ARE ONLY 4 LIKELY MAJOR SCENARIOS FOR OUR FUTURE:

Deepening cynicism, isolation and fear;

Moral Fundamentalism (a la John Ashcroft);

A 'law & order' repressive government (a la John Ashcroft);

One or a combination of the above 3 scenarios is the inevitable result of our inaction!!!

Correcting the abuses facing us in our society thru strengthening American society!

And the key to accomplishing this #4 is 'RESTORING TRUST!'

We must recognize that the favorite American solutions will not work, will not suffice:

Passing another law;

Adopting more regulations;

A technological fix.

TRUST CAN ONLY BE RESTORED THRU A NEW INSTITUTIONAL MORALITY.

All since our 1960's, we've been making efforts to adjust to and incorporate the blast openings of the 60's;

And we engaged in, achieved, much social learning –

Enabling us to outgrow the excesses of the '60's;

Self-corrective measures have worked at the level of us as individuals,

But have not worked societally!

So it grows clear now that 'TRUST' is much more than a sweet ideal!

It is the only real antidote, the only promising alternative, to the cynicism and chaos we are experiencing today in the United States

Trust has become a necessity for us if we are to rebuild American society

THEREFORE WE ARE EXPERIENCING TODAY STRONG PUBLIC PRESSURE TO:

Curb the excesses of individualism; +

Restore traditional American virtues.

THOSE TRADITIONAL AMERICAN VALUES INCLUDE:

Honesty;

Respect;

Corporate good citizenship;

Paying your taxes, and obeying the law;

Conserving our environment;

Being a good neighbor, having a sense of community;

Transparency;

Humanization.

INSTITUTIONS LEGITIMATE AND ENCOURAGE SOME OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S WORST EXCESSES.

How curb excesses?

Self correction has not proven sufficient;

Such correction must begin at the top

Even as it must reflect the morals of our people themselves.

THE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS OF THE 1960'S & 1970'S TRANSFORMED THE MORAL CLIMATE OF AMERICA:

Civil rights movement –

Including feminism;

environmental movement;

Consumer movement;

Anti-war movement.

SO ALTOGETHER THAT IS AS FAR AS I HAVE PROCEEDED IN MY STUDY AND ANALYSIS OF THE MAJOR TRENDS EMERGING IN THE UNITED STATES TODAY –

I conclude that altogether we are experiencing a crisis of distrust – and

The only real promising hopeful alternative antidote is 'TRUST.'

I HAVE NOT YET PROCEEDED INTO THE NEXT LOGICAL STEP - HOW TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE OF 'TRUST' IN AMERICA

Yet I want to offer you in closing, with the question, 'Is this the way?'

John Vasconcellos quotation, call, challenge, in his LEGACY PROJECT, calling for a new "POLITICS OF TRUST" - 'What will best constitute this (desired, committed to) living legacy (of mine) is the generation of a new movement in American politics, grounded in the belief that (we) human beings are innately inclined toward becoming life-affirming, constructive, responsible and trustworthy. This faithful view of our human nature gives rise to a whole new series of policies, programs and political processes that serve to empower the healthy growth and development of each and every person in our state and nation (as well as that of our communities themselves).'

(FOLLOWING POINTS MADE BY DAN YANKOLOVICH DURING GROUP DISCUSSION)

HOW CAN WE LAUNCH THIS NEW SOCIALMOVEMENT?

How can we make it work, speak to our people –

Speak even to high school students, our citizens of tomorrow?

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS BEGIN WITH A SENSE OF OUTRAGE –

JV - isn't that the old paradigm once again?

Couldn't we envision a new methodology befitting who we are becoming as persons –

An energy, a movement, propelled proactively, by our own growing human yearning for self-realization and deeper sense of community?

Social movements are the result of a combination of:

The passionate expressions of @4% of the people, +

A much larger majority response, who find themselves saying (of the 4%), 'Well, they have a point!'

This majority having no place to go, growing ever angrier, gradually becoming a tinder box.

Our challenge now: how to enlist & mobilize this small impassioned minority?

Inquiry: how come we are not finding such in our college students today, who are largely dispassionate –

Especially incongruous in the face of the hugely passionate Islam kids.

The truth is that there is plenty of passion out there today –

Better yet, in here, within us –

If we could only sound the right call –

Which would speak to them, be heard by them, serve to unify them, serve to organize them altogether.

People insisting on their rights is not the path to the future!

DICK FARSON: HOW ABOUT USING THE INTERNET TO SPREAD THE WORD, AND TO MOBILIZE, AROUND THIS NEW UNIFYING PRINCIPLE OF TRUST?

We owe it to ourselves, we have to learn how to use it for these purposes

SO ALTOGETHER, OUR FORMULA FOR THIS NEW MOVEMENT OF TRUST:

Faithful inspired visionary leadership; +

The outraged and ready masses; +

The Internet to provide us the means, the glue, to find each other, to spread the good news, to all come together, enlist & mobilize, generate this new movement.

IT'S A MYTH THAT PROGRESSIVES ARE HARD TO AWAKEN, MOBILIZE –

Cf woman, civil rights groups, anti-war folks, environmentalists.

All Progressives today are in disarray –

We may have lost our self-confidence –

But it is still there, we are still here.

We have not gotten out act together –

We simply must get our act together!

We desperately need a new organizing unifying principles –

Why not make that - 'TRUST?'

DEMOCRATS HAVE TRADITIONALLY SHIED AWAY FROM DISCUSSION OF VALUES – TO THEIR PERIL –

Democrats have discussed, espoused values - only economically.

But values are all of where it's at today –

And Democrats must go there if they hope to succeed!

(WALT ANDERSON) - WE FACE THE LACK OF VISION OF THE FUTUER TOWARD WHICH WE WANT TO PROGRESS.

A truly compelling new Progressive agenda has to go beyond domestic concerns & challenges –

To Include the international scene –

Including the JIHAD.

How do we include that?

We must recognize we are facing a real clash of civilizations.

(DAN Y) - THIS IS AN EXTRAORDINARY GENERATION OF AMERICANS –

But not being used well now.

WE MUST BE CAREFUL TO RECOGNIZE THE MORE MODERATE VIEWPOINTS EXISTING WITHIN THE CIVILIAN POPULATIONS INTERNATIONALLY.

(JV) - AGAIN, WE MUST RECOGNIZE, OWN UP TO THE REALITY THAT:

We laud our 'new demography,'

We praise our 'new economy,'

We cherish our 'new consciousness' –

And yet we are stuck with our same old cynical divisive politics!

David Boulton to John Vasconcellos re DAN YANKELOVICH 'TRUST'/INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP FORUM - 4/28/02 - Institutional Morality = Ethics - Ethics 13

P
A
R
T

2

From: David Boulton
Sent: Wednesday, May 01, 2002 1:32 PM

Aloha John,

From your notes and comments it seems this was quite an event.

I want to comment (somewhat soapbox) on the threads of 'institutional morality' and 'internationality'. My view is that the deep fulcrum for liberating healthy change here is to address the 'ethic' underlying and organizing the 'morality'. I think that the corporate behaviors we are concerned/outraged by are merely the logical consequences of an underlying ethic we take for granted.

Our most fundamental business ethic assumes that businesses have the right to pursue their economic interests even to the extent of directing the thoughts and emotions of people with the clear intent of manipulating their purchasing behavior. Think about this. Its considered business as usual, 'nothing personal' for business to manipulate our behaviors to serve their profit interests. We take it for granted.

When this ethic becomes empowered by modern behavioral sciences and information technology and excused from responsibility by multi-national legal status, its frightening. We have seen what Madison Ave. can do with tobacco company ethics, Lucasfilm's multimedia, Spielberg's masterful attention direction and with the right 'star attractions'. We have a semi-hypnotized society - hypnotized into accepting manipulation as normal, hypnotized into a lack of respect for their own learning and discernment.

What happens when these incredibly powerful interests, who place the right to make money above the injustice of manipulating people's lives, have access to the kind of intelligence powers tomorrow's information systems will provide?

Its this ethic, in my view, that we must challenge out into the open. So long as it remains the 'American way' we will live in a world of predatory economics where the economies of scale will favor the interests of the corporations.

We abolished slavery in the overt sense. We agreed people shouldn't own people. Every human being has rights as a human being. I think this ethic is the underlying mechanism of today's economic slavery.

----- relatedly -----international ethics of America-----

Why not treat the citizens of the world the way we treat the citizens of the United States? - treat all citizens of the earth as if they have the same rights as US citizens? We obviously don't grant them the financial support entitlements of US citizens. But why not treat them as if their rights as human beings are no different than our own. Regardless of whether their governments do, shouldn't our ethic demand that we do?

Why should products, prohibited by law in the US because they are harmful or dangerous, be sold to people in other countries simply because their governments haven't caught up with our standards?

In the US, no matter how 'wanted' the mass murderer in one house the police wouldn't think of getting him or her by using weapons that would kill people walking around the neighborhood. Why does this sensible, ethical restraint to the use of lethal force stop at our borders? Does not being a citizen of the United States, change the rights a human being is entitled to in the conscience of the United States? WHY?

Developing an international ethic for our governmental and US based corporate behaviors would, I believe, go a long way toward opening up the international dialogue - would -precipitate the beginnings of our trustworthiness beyond our self-interests.

**John Vasconcellos to David Boulton re Institutional Morality = Ethics - Ethics 14
John in ALL CAPS**

P
A
R
T

2

ALOHA DAVID -

In a message dated 5/1/02 4:32:38 PM, dboulton@implicity.com writes:
<< Aloha John,>From your notes and comments it seems this was quite an event.

IT WAS!

I want to comment (somewhat soapbox) on the threads of 'institutional morality' and 'internationality'. My view is that the deep fulcrum for liberating healthy change here is to address the 'ethic' underlying and organizing the 'morality'. I think that the corporate behaviors we are concerned/outraged by are merely the logical consequences of an underlying ethic we take for granted.

THAT'S LIKELY TRUE OF JUST ABOUT EVERYTHING IN OUR LIVES, DAVID - -

Our most fundamental business ethic assumes that businesses have the right to pursue their economic interests even to the extent of directing the thoughts and emotions of people with the clear intent of manipulating their purchasing behavior. Think about this. Its considered business as usual, 'nothing personal' for business to manipulate our behaviors to serve their profit interests. We take it for granted.

THAT'S OUR SAD TRUTH OF OUR LIVES TODAY IN THIS CULTURE!

When this ethic becomes empowered by modern behavioral sciences and information technology and excused from responsibility by multi-national legal status, its frightening. We have seen what Madison Ave. can do with tobacco company ethics, lucasfilm's multimedia, Spielberg's masterful attention direction and with the right 'star attractions'. We have a semi-hypnotized society - hypnotized into accepting manipulation as normal, hypnotized into a lack of respect for their own learning and discernment.

HOW SAD, HOW TRUE!

What happens when these incredibly powerful interests, who place the right to make money above the injustice of manipulating people's lives, have access to the kind of intelligence powers tomorrow's information systems will provide?

OUCH - THAT'S FRIGHTENING! AND ISN'T THE ONLY TRULY REAL EFFECTIVE SUSTAINING ANTIDOTE - THE PREPARATION OF EACH OF OUR CHILDREN TO SO FULLY BE OPEN TO KNOWING AND BEING THEMSELVES, THAT THEY HAVE THE VISION TO RECOGNIZE & SEE THRU ALL OF THIS, AND THE RESILIENCE TO MOVE ON THRU & BEYOND IT - HEALTHFULLY?

It's this ethic, in my view, that we must challenge out into the open.

ABSOLUTELY!

So long as it remains the 'American way' we will live in a world of predatory economics where the economies of scale will favor the interests of the corporations.

YEP!

We abolished slavery in the overt sense. We agreed people shouldn't own people. Every human being has rights as a human being. I think this ethic is the underlying mechanism of today's economic slavery.

AND IT IS NOW TIME THAT EACH AND ALL OF US COME TOGETHER INTO A MOVEMENT THAT CHALLENGES THIS ETHIC, RECLAIMS OUR LIVES!

Heather Barbour & David Boulton Thread re: Ethics and The Intrusion Explosion - Ethics 15

Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2002 8:28 AM

Subject: NYTimes.com Article: The Intrusion Explosion

This article from NYTimes.com

From Heather to David

David - the more I read from you about this stuff the more I think we are using the same brain. :-) Thought you might appreciate this piece.

Heather Barbour (w/Sen. Vasconcellos) hbarbour@earthlink.net

The Intrusion Explosion

May 2, 2002

By WILLIAM SAFIRE

President Bush's retreat on privacy was a triumph for the intrusion lobby.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/05/02/opinion/02SAFI.html?ex=1021364087&ei=1&en=f77dc7c64480e80c>

From David to Heather

On Thu, 2 May 2002 14:09:32 -1000 David Boulton wrote:

We are using the same brain :-) - thanks - good piece - it's amazing to me that this dog can sleep so well - David

From Heather to David

It's the culture - we're becoming a nation glued together by greed and encouraging the world to do the same in global historic turns -- we're leading the way into the post-human rights period. homo economus.

People just don't see this conversation for what it is - they think it's about spam, when it's really about defining a new notion, applied across all cultures, of a universal "person;" and establishing human rights that transcend geographical and national boundaries, and therefore escape sovereign power.

The problem is - different cultures handle these issues in very different ways and our inability to accept this results in increased conflict.

Josh Holcomb to John Vasconcellos and David Boulton: The Ethic of Trust? Ethics 16

P
A
R
T

From: Josh Holcomb
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2002 1:23 PM

Subject: The ethic of trust?

2

John V, John Steiner, Fred, David:

Conversations like these continually deepen my understanding of the Politics of Trust.

- (1) Fred refers to 'the ethic of compassion' in the Dalai Lama book.
- (2) David Boulton recently wrote about our ethics informs our sense of ourselves/others.

The two emails have given rise to a very basic question: Is trust an ethic?
Aren't we looking at how 'the ethic of trust' informs our sense of ourselves/others?

Joshua

David Boulton to Josh Holcomb and John Vasconcellos et al: The Ethic of Trust? Ethics 17

From: David Boulton
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2002 5:18 PM
To: John Vasconcellos
Cc: John Steiner; Subject: RE: The ethic of trust?

Joshua,

Good to read you. Great question.

"Is trust an ethic?"

I would love to flesh this out in greater length with all who are interested. I would come back to the relationship between ethics and our sense of ourselves another time.

For the moment, in my view, the simple answer would be 'I don't think so'.

Trust is a natural phenomena of beings. We are born unconditionally trusting. We learn not to trust - we learn to be on self-alert in areas where our trust has proven insufficient to our needs.

Trust is 'inside' - ethics is 'outside'

Ethics are the 'fine print', implicitly, of our relationship covenants and agreements (expressed and unexpressed). On the one hand its against the law for children to be employed to do dangerous work. On the other, its perfectly OK for corporations to manipulate the emotions of children so as to provoke in them a desire to consume things known to be dangerous to their health and well being. Its very insidious and intricate.

In the middle of 19th century we, as a nation, had a conversation about our 'ethics' – we decided that people couldn't 'own' people. We decided that human beings are entitled to a freedom befitting their human beingness – that human beings can't be property –can't be slaves.

150 years later we must again take up this conversation. Today we face the question are human being's 'assets'? Do we agree that a person or group of people, may, in the pursuit of their separate economic interests, engage in the intentional manipulation of the behavior of other human beings?

This is the primary regulating ethic of international business and, at its deeper levels, it is the very same ethic we outlawed, in its earlier form, in our civil war.

Today, we have a new kind of Madison Ave: supported by the financial muscle of wall street, informed by state-of-the-art-behavioral-science using Lucasfilm like media effects under Spielberg-like mastery of attention direction To manipulate the emotions and thoughts of people toward spending their money on whatever it is that is being sold. On top of all of this, we now add the power of modern information technology to inform how the whole system tailors itself to each individual and maximizes the relevancy of its 'pitch'.

This is what we human are really up against. As most of the world's money and power is aligned behind it.

There is no question about the basic legitimacy of business. Developing ever better ways to exchange with one another so as to support and enrich the lives of all is necessary. The question is whether business is legitimate, ethically, when its intention is to manipulate a buying behavior, rather than to resource learning in a customer initiated buying process. I say no. Its out of line for a business to operate from such an orientation. To do so is to reduce people to the status of manipulable assets – a subtler, better hidden ethic, but essentially the same as: people are property.

All over the world corporations are coming into existence with a new and different ethic. The new ethic is based on mutual respect and mutual learning. In this ethic, a company's business is based on a learning oriented dialogue with their existing and potential customers. They are learning to ever more optimally evolve the value they bring their customers and they are supporting their customers in ever more optimally learning to differentiate and appreciate the value they are bringing.

We need to bring the ethical differences I am pointing towards to the attention of our nation. And, to the world. We need to call out into the open, like the issues of abortion or ecology, how our politicians think about this.

I believe this distinction in ethics can form the basis for galvanizing the 'cultural creatives' whose values, I believe, would for the most part, align with the mutuality ethic. In other words there is a market waiting to be identified for the products of companies who function ethically.

I think the way to change the balance of power, to free ourselves from the tyranny of the prevailing ethic, is to call it out into the open, co create a new ethic and then help it become the ever more significant basis for competitive distinction. Until there is a fundamental shift in this prevailing ethic, in what do we trust? How do you connect the deep human interior meaning of 'trust' to institutions, that by their constitutional ethic, function by reducing human beings to assets? I don't trust people or organizations coming from that ethic.

Thanks Joshua,
David