

August 2024

VOLUME XIV, ISSUE VIII

PEGASUS

A NEWSLETTER FOR THE CAUX ROUND TABLE FOR MORAL CAPITALISM
NETWORK LOOKING AT BUSINESS ABOVE THE CLUTTER AND CONFETTI



Pegasus

Introduction by David Kansas	Page 2
Immigration, Immigrants and the Sovereignty of Nations by Michael Hartonian	Page 5
What is Just for Those People Who Find Themselves between Sovereigns? by Stephen B. Young	Page 11
Statement of the Ethics of Comity (Adopted October 7, 2018, St. Petersburg, Russia)	Page 17

Introduction

Welcome to the August issue of *Pegasus*. In our three articles, we write extensively about immigration, an issue that seems a hot topic in many places across the globe today, especially in the West.

Immigration is, naturally, a complex issue. For America (and Australia, Canada and other countries), immigration has been elemental to the growth and success of these nations. At the same time, especially recently, debates about immigration, the role of the sovereign and how best to positively engage immigration have devolved into much more fractious conversations.

In this edition, we try to untangle and explain some of these complex debates. As is often the case, our essays not only analyze the issues at hand, but also provide ideas and recommendations about how to improve our approach to immigration, sovereigns within the Caux Round Table's moral capitalism vision.

In our opening essay, "Immigration, Immigrants and the Sovereignty of Nations," by Michael Hartoonian, Michael seeks to move us off the standard views of immigration – the push-pull factor. On the push side, people leave a place because they are pushed by violence, breakdown in government, lack of economic opportunity and a bleak outlook for one's home nation. On the pull side, there's a rainbow on the horizon that seems promising. A better life across the water, perhaps with relatives or friends already ensconced in the land, extolling the benefits of the new place.

"In reality," Michael writes, "the facts and the underlying truths are complex and dynamic."

He also discusses the important differences between citizens and subjects, an issue that is closely wed to immigration. "The citizen, while being a loving critic of the republic, is also the prime creator of both common and private wealth (where wealth is understood as the creation of excellence). The subject, on the other hand, is an individual ready to follow orders, consume wealth and live a life of social isolation."

Lastly, he posits that many think about what they can die for, but we should spend more time thinking about what should live for instead. Such a shift in thinking could make for a healthier debate around immigration.

In his essay, "What is Just for Those People Who Find Themselves between Sovereigns?," Steve Young focuses on immigration and the "push" factor that Micheal discussed in his essay. In myriad ways, governments simply fail to meet their obligations, forcing its own citizens to flee to other locales.

"Only the tie of nationality furnishes the full protection of international law, since individuals, as such, have no rights under that body of law," Steve writes. Maddeningly, international organizations have come up with various policies to try and address this stateless situation.

For instance, through the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. But all these efforts have ultimately failed, fundamentally because individuals can't simply declare their own nationality. For all the international conventions, that power still firmly rests with the sovereigns.

Steve suggests augmenting current conventions to create a status known as "territorial resident." A key element to this approach is that it could give stateless people a pathway toward assimilation and citizenship. A key aspect to this approach is that incoming territorial residents must participate in the local polity in meaningful ways and not separate themselves into enclaves that create different, separate polities.

Given that immigration and movement of people is more likely to rise than decline, Steve's points about stateless people, the concept of a new immigrant status – territorial resident – are strong recommendations about how to edify this current, often messy debate occurring around the world.

Lastly, we republish our "Statement of the Ethics of Comity" (Adopted October 7, 2018, St. Petersburg, Russia).

This statement grew out of the demise of communism and the subsequent challenges that capitalism faced, for a variety of reasons, such as the 2008-2009 financial crisis, to place moral capitalism front and center for nations seeking to evolve away from authoritarianism and communism.

Over the past 25 years, standards of comity and moral capitalism have become increasingly important and increasingly challenged contemporary social systems, supervised by national sovereigns and international agreements, are supported by three pillars: private enterprise, government and civil society.

"Since the collapse of communism, global trade and development have raised the living standards of nearly every people, some dramatically," the statement reads. Indeed, would one choose to live in China from 1948-1988, when communism crushed wealth creation and innovation and left countless people in perpetual poverty? Or would one prefer 1988 to the present, when a stealth capitalism took over, lifting hundreds of millions of citizens out of poverty, as China became the second largest and powerful economy in the world? Other formerly communist countries have tread a similar path.

Still, "What the global community seems to lack is an ethics of comity, which would encourage mutual respect and collaboration," the statement reads. "We live in a world which is complex and multitudinous in spirit and action, but it does not need to be chaotic or confused. The practices of comity permit complexity without it becoming destructive."

In its Latin roots, comity means "to go together."

The Caux Round Table statement puts forward a new approach to ethical principles that embrace the concept of comity, including eight rules that should govern the responsibility of citizen's (and those wishing to become citizens.)

The statement closes with the importance of friends and friendship, as well as the role of a guest.

While adopted in 2018, this statement has deeper salience today. As we grapple with political polarization, governments shifting away from capitalism, a rise in cronyism, an unhealthy focus on highly rigid ideological purity tests and the overall coarser international mood, the need for comity as a key building block of successful societies is more important than at any time since the fall of communism.

We thank you for reading August *Pegasus* and always welcome your feedback and ideas for future issues, as well as the future work of the Caux Round Table.

David Kansas
Editor-at-Large
Pegasus



Immigration, Immigrants and the Sovereignty of Nations

Michael Hartoonian

*They, looking back, all the eastern side
Of Paradise, so late their happy seat,
Waved over by that flaming brand, the
Gate with dreadful faces thronged and fiery arms;
Some natural tears they dropped,
But wiped them soon;
The world was all before them,
And where to choose their place of rest.
With Providence their guide;
They, hand in hand, with wandering steps and slow,
Through Eden took their solitary way.
-John Milton, *Paradise Lost**

Introduction

In the study of geography, there is a generalization regarding the migration of peoples as the *theory of push and pull*. That is, people move from one specific place to another specific place because they are pushed out of location “A” by violence, poverty, war, sickness and other factors that truncate human life or flourishing. They are attracted to location “B” because they see or believe that the new location will lead to a better life. In very simple terms, that is the general rationale for immigration. In reality, the facts and the underlying truths are complex and dynamic. The deeper reasons and political policies, which we will explore here, have more to do with governance/sovereignty, corruption, citizen/subject confusion, lack of human capital and a denial of our generational covenant.

Governance/Sovereignty

Borders – The inability to control its borders is one of the leading reasons that a nation fails. However, borders and immigration are different issues. A nation’s policy regarding immigration is separate from maintaining secure borders. This confusion always leads to governing paralysis, as it does with any serious issue when terms are left undefined.

Citizens – A liberal democratic republic needs citizens who understand self-governance and will welcome immigrants who have the potential for civic competence and wealth creation skills. These will be individuals who would strive for citizenship and not assume the identity of subject. This would be the first criterion for immigration because of the nature of democratic governance. Democratic, self-governing, self-correcting citizens (and moral capitalists) bring together political and philosophical assumptions that form a theory which I call multidimensional engagement.

The first assumption, which is personal in nature, focuses on the role of citizens. This is in opposition to understanding the individual as subject. In a political sense, one can only be a citizen or a subject. This means that an individual, by choice, can be a citizen of a school and at the same time, a subject of the state. The immigrant chooses to want to be a citizen of all the institutions in which he or she is engaged. It is historically rare to even have the choice of being a citizen, for citizenship is only possible within a democratic society. And as we know, democratic structures are complex in their non-formal alliances, subtle in their social constructs and information sharing and extremely slow in developing. Moral and material infrastructures, from roads and public education to assumptions about truthful public dialogues, are all necessary conditions for success. The sufficient condition for democratic governance, however, is the individual’s attitude or mindset that demands political legitimacy in and from the people...people who are capable of coming together and governing themselves and capable of electing representatives who are, in turn, accountable to the electorate.

Thus, the citizen carries a personal or private mind-set that is very different from the worldview of the subject. The citizen, while being a loving critic of the republic, is also the prime creator of both common and private wealth (where wealth is understood as the creation of excellence). The subject, on the other hand, is an individual ready to follow orders, consume wealth and live a life of social isolation.



Education – Education must make the most of these differences (citizen/subject), diminishing the role of subject, while enhancing the identity of citizen. This demands a common education, not simply job training. The immigrant and his or her family must have full access to this education. Education is the only route to full, enlightened citizenship.

A Public Trust – The second assumption, which is public in nature, rests upon the relationships that must exist between individuals and institutions or between and among institutions. The theory, simply stated, is that in a democratic republic, the several institutions that constitute the



community and the individuals within them must understand and practice reciprocal trust/duties with one another. It also asserts that the citizen is a citizen of all the institutions to which he or she belongs. That is, institutions in which they work, play, learn and live. For it is problematic as to whether anyone can be citizens of a city, state or nation simply because the vigor of any one institution must be directly correlated to the constraints of the others. For example, if schools refuse or are less vigorous in

defending their purpose, businesses or families will not be constrained to issue their own rationales. Once we appreciate individual engagement across the several institutions, we can embrace the ethics of reciprocal duty and the complementary nature of institutions, which is the hallmark of citizen responsibility. These things must be taught to immigrants through instruction and example, so they can claim individual sovereignty.

The Failing State and the Push Factor

Given a choice, people would like to stay in their own country, until that nation becomes a failed state. What are the elements of a failing state? The infrastructure is the first to atrophy. From the decay of roads and bridges to poor education and healthcare to the decline of any sense of an aesthetic landscape. Secondly, the political system becomes self-serving and corrupt. Finally, the economy slides into deep inflation, ubiquitous debt and large divides between the rich and everyone else. At this point, people think about leaving before blood happens.

There is the assumption here that border control is the sole responsibility of the nation receiving immigrants. But this responsibility must be shared by any failing state, as well. Failing states continually make individual and political choices that are unethical and immoral until they turn their country into a hell on earth. Absent a global government, the solution to meaningful

migration patterns would be to promote universal moral standards of political and market systems. The Caux Round Table already has a blueprint for such standards.

Human Capital and Our Generational Covenant

Human Capital – Wealth is created by people, special people with human capital. Human capital is created by aesthetic material and moral infrastructures. You will not have one without the other. Neither will you have institutional or social capital without human capital. The creation of wealth is dependent on these relationships. If a nation does not understand these connections, it will lose population, it will lose its sense of identity and it will fail its people and its future, breaking its covenant with the next generation. And the resolve here is both simple and profound – nations can no longer live in a state of nature (a nod to Thomas Hobbes), where everyone is against everyone else. Humans are better than Hobbes suggested. We have moral leanings. It's part of our nature. We have the innate ability to care and love one another and we should make the most of it. Because it is this love and care that creates the real wealth of nations.



A Global Material and Moral Infrastructure

Purpose – Do we, as a family of nations, have anything that we are willing to live for? We have, forever, been told that we should have something to die for, like our country or family. But can't we ask different questions today? Consider – what is the point and purpose of life? Is it to accumulate stuff? Is it to dominate others? Is it to gain power and the attending corruption? Or is it to love and be loved? Is it to create wealth (aesthetic and moral excellences)? Is it to build the good life and be a good person? Where do you think happiness lives? Immigration is important to any nation wise enough to ask these questions, particularly nations with declining populations.

Merit – A happy life is primarily about giving and about achievement. Above all, being present and doing something that benefits self and others will allow one the harvest of happiness. Because we are not of equal talent, our achievements will be different, but meaningful. Is there merit in the work and stories of immigrants? Can they add to the wealth of the republic and create a happier community? Can they become citizens, fluent in English and knowledgeable about the responsibilities of holding the office of citizen?

Infrastructures (material and moral) – If citizens do not invest in infrastructure, they and their republic will not long endure. Within a moral private or public market, you get what you pay for. That goes for sausage, streets, as well as for seniors. And more importantly, the (tax) payer must know the difference between price and value. They differ in powerplants, as well as with presidents. Given these imperatives, what costs and benefits do immigrants bring to the infrastructures?

Many citizens pay for things that are detrimental to their self-interest. This is even more the case when it comes to voting. Trapped in a world of self-made ignorance, many citizens of many nations simply find it too hard to do the work of searching for ethical and intellectual character in their representatives. If immigrants embrace the same ignorance, the republic will put itself on the fast track to tyranny. To avoid this slide, nations must have in place healthcare and education for all. Remember that the nation and the cities within are all schools. We learn and teach each other every time we walk down the street, broadcast news and cultural programs and behave toward one another. This the immigrant sees and will copy. We should be careful of what we teach others.



Policy Implications

Given the discussion above, I would suggest the following policy suggestion for addressing world migration patterns.

- *Skills-based* – Any immigrant entering a sovereign nation must possess delineated skills to be granted entrance. Said skills will be based on employer surveys and government infrastructure needs. The immigrant will be allowed to bring with him or her their entire immediate family, including children and grandparents.
- *Sanctuary* – Because of the definitional problems with the issue of sanctuary, the concept cannot be addressed in any meaningful way. The real problem is in the country from which the immigrant is moving, thus suggesting more attention be given to what is forcing people to leave their own homes. The answer, of course, has almost everything to do with incompetence and immorality. Out of fear, nations receiving immigrants will turn their backs on the real problem – corruption writ large.
- *A New Global Moral “Marshall Plan”* – The United Nations needs to provide economic assistance to build moral and material infrastructures in failed states whose people are fleeing and to also provide moral training for all economic and governmental officials. The U.N. would also engage in appropriate and proportional force to remove corrupt leaders and establish democratic elections. Since corruption can be imported into these countries, all avenues for such behavior will be monitored. We should do this because all of humanity is connected. As John Donne said, “Ask not for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.” Why? Because no one is alone in the world. Aristotle knew that. Confucius knew that. We all know that.

When your neighbors’ homes are destroyed, the noble thing to do is to help them rebuild, simply because we all live in the same neighborhood.

Michael Hartoonian is Associate Editor of Pegasus.

What is Just for Those People Who Find Themselves between Sovereigns?

Stephen B. Young

Forty-two years ago, as the dean of the Hamline University School of Law, I wrote an article on immigration. It was published in volume 3, issue 1, of the Michigan Journal of International Law. The title was “Between Sovereigns: A Reexamination of the Refugee’s Status.”

Part of that article was to link refugees and today’s emigrants from one country who become immigrants in another to a failure of sovereignty. The sovereign authority in the land of their birth has failed them and so they seek better lives in another country. Sometimes the failure is political repression, discrimination based on religion or ethnicity or just elite incompetence in governance. Sometimes it is incompetence in economic development, leading to persistent poverty, lack of education and no opportunity to live decently, usually where elite families extract rents from the economy and corrupt officials use government to fund their families’ lifestyles. Sometimes, it is a failure of governance to overcome the effects of war and insurgency, droughts, floods, storms and climate change.

In any case, there is failure of sovereign responsibility. Thus, emigrants leave the country of their national origin because the political community will not or can no longer vouchsafe the emigrant’s life, liberty or peace of mind. In many cases, the sovereign of national origin actively and coercively deprives the refugee of those basic components of human dignity. By taking flight, emigrants, especially refugees, enter a precarious realm between sovereigns. They may no longer rely upon the solicitude of their native sovereign, yet international law gives them no effective replacement for that power.



Breakdown of law and order, through declared war, insurrection, anarchy or institutionalized arbitrary oppression, also destroys the social contract. If the power of the collective cannot provide even a modicum of personal security, people have little interest in sticking around. The government has failed to meet its obligations. Samuel Pufendorf argued that sovereignty was conferred only to secure the common weal. Thus, a person may leave a state if its

administration has little value for his or her private interests. The safety of the people should be the supreme law. Consequently, when sovereignty fails, it may be renounced.

Such people may be said never to have joined the national community. Without a developed economy to provide the means for rapid recovery, people may prefer to move with their relatives and neighbors to avoid the conditions following upon natural or other disasters and find new circumstances more sustaining of life, liberty and personal property without regard for national boundaries. The tie of nationality, so important in international law, has little, if any meaning in their lives. They stand outside the social contracts supporting the sovereigns of the world.



Refugees and stateless persons exist in the interstices between sovereign nation states because they are products of the breakdown of a nation state as a sustaining political community. Only the tie of nationality furnishes the full protection of international law, since individuals, as such, have no rights under that body of law. Covenants on the status of refugees and stateless persons and the organization of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees have not changed this aspect of the world order.

Perhaps the high point of modern citizenship denial occurred in Nazi Germany, when the citizenship of Jews was revoked by the Nuremberg law of September 1935. Supplemental decrees stripped the Jews of entitlements to property and then to police protection. The Final Solution was but the logical extension of a nationality characterization imposed on people who had thereby been denied all rights, privileges, claims and sufferances within the Nazi order. In most of these situations where citizenship was denied to classes of people, large refugee movements have occurred. With the bond of nationality broken by official ostracism, the refugees found themselves between sovereigns in a no-man's-land of international law.

As persons in flight, refugees and illegal emigrants take themselves beyond the pale of protection offered by their original sovereign to its own nationals. Often, a change of government precipitates a refugee exodus, as certain inhabitants of a national territory despair of receiving that solicitude for life, liberty and personal advantage which is the aspiration of most people and is the due of every citizen living under a government that acknowledges the rule of law. Refugees and emigres leave the jurisdiction most responsible for their welfare and as stateless individuals, enter the territory of a foreign sovereign.

Under international law, therefore, refugees and other stateless persons have no effective bond to any sovereign political community which is recognized under the law of nations. They can only be considered in their capacity as individuals, not as nationals. The tie of nationality in legal theory is a reciprocal exchange of loyalty and political commitment from the individual for a warrant from the collective national authority of full and complete succor and protection. When a person becomes a refugee and emigrants leave their homeland, the act of flight acknowledges the failure of that reciprocal relationship.

While there have been those who find higher principles of humanism in the law of nations, the practice of sovereign nation states has confirmed the preference of governments to appropriate unto themselves exclusively the burdens and the benefits of international law. The traditional rule is that states are the subjects of international law and individuals only



the indirect objects of international legal rules. Individuals were recognized by international law in the past only in so far as they were nationals of a sovereign state. John Austin wrote that every human being who has rights and duties is either a citizen or a foreigner. That is, either a national of the domestic sovereign or of some other sovereign. Rights, he believed, were created by the positive law of a sovereign only for the members of the independent political community of which the sovereign is the paramount authority. Those without nationality under Austin's scheme of positive law had no rights.

Individuals do not have the power to determine their own nationality. Under international law, the characterization of a person as a subject of this or that state is left to the discretion of municipal laws. For all his or her Anglophilia, one can never become a subject of the British Crown in the eyes of international law unless and until such person complies with the laws in force on naturalization in Great Britain and has some meaningful personal tie to that territory.

Refugees and stateless persons are not given a right of asylum. Sovereign governments may deny access to their territories to aliens who displease them. The Universal Declaration on Human Rights is silent on the obligations of states to grant nationality when it is requested. The Convention on Refugees suggests only that contracting states "facilitate" the assimilation and naturalization of refugees "as far as possible." This is an instruction to be helpful, not a mandate to lite high the lamp beside a golden door, as the U.S. Statue of Liberty claims to do.

De facto stateless persons, who are not refugees under the relevant convention, still have no status. People may flee their native land because they do not feel they can be full participants in that community. While not the objects of persecution, they may still feel that they have been denied opportunities for social or economic advancement. Among these people are Haitians, Mexicans and Cubans seeking entrance to the U.S. and citizens of the People's Republic of China fleeing to Hong Kong. These people are not the victims of conscious political persecution, but of a socioeconomic order. Or, as members of a minority religious or ethnic group, they may perceive that the government of their territory will not provide them with a supportive environment. Now living in the U.S. are more than 12 million illegal immigrants – stateless persons between sovereigns – who have entered the country during the last three and a half years. They have abandoned their birthright sovereign, but have no claim to become citizens of the U.S.



In the U.K., with its recent episodes of street violence, Muslim immigrants have created for themselves social and cultural stand-alone sub-cultures of their own. They are not, in a full sense, citizens of the national community, participants in the social contract of the U.K. They live in a kind of solitude, not open to assimilation into another implied communal contract reciprocally uniting them with native citizens.

So, how can we best describe the status of those who emigrate from one sovereignty and immigrate into the territory of another? I suggested in 1982 the status of territorial resident – something more than a tourist or employee on a work visa or with a work permit, but less than citizen.

The 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons provides for rights of judicial access, livelihood, religion and education suitable for a reasonable life, short of the advantages provided by participation in the political community of the territory of residence.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in article 21, provides that only nationals have the right to take part in the government of their country. The status created by the Universal Declaration has three principal aspects. First, the state may not abuse any individual and may not deny him or her access to the courts. Secondly, individuals may surround themselves with intellectual, emotional and physical privacy free from arbitrary interference by the state. Part of this sphere of privacy consists of freedom of thought, conscience,

religion, opinion and expression. The “nuclear family” is also protected, with provisions for freedom of marriage. Thirdly, the Universal Declaration provides, in several articles, for the economic and social advancement of individuals. These articles provide for the ownership of property, social security, employment opportunities, food, clothing, housing, medical attention and education. The Universal Declaration thus holds out the possibility of a dignified and rewarding life for individuals, even though they may not participate as nationals in the political process of their country of residence.

The two international covenants on individual rights proposed after the Universal Declaration was adopted do not significantly detract from the status of territorial resident there provided. Article 2 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights commits each signatory state to ensure the rights enumerated in the covenant to “all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction.” In general, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights provides for the first two aspects of territorial resident status-protection from abusive state action and a sphere of personal privacy.

The status of territorial resident, provided by human rights documents, is not one of license. The Universal Declaration says in article 29(1) that everyone has duties to his or her community. The rights and freedoms of others must be respected by individuals and the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare must be met. There is, then, a reciprocal aspect to being a territorial resident. Refugees and stateless persons are already under such an obligation. Article 2 of the Convention on Refugees and article 2 of the 1954 Convention on Stateless Persons both prescribe duties of individuals under the protection of those covenants to obey the laws, regulations and measures taken to maintain the public order of countries of refuge.

All people on the territory, without regard for nationality, deserve protection and opportunities to support themselves and their children.

The application of human rights standards to the problem of refugees and immigrants does require a shift in the conception of the nation state. It appears, in the new perspective, less a self-selected community of citizens, sharing a common subjective corporate sentiment and more a custodian



of territory and all the people therein. Under a territorial scheme, within each state there would be two classes of residents – citizens and residents with different rights of political participation.

Sudden intrusions of refugees who then immediately acquired citizenship would also frustrate the expectations for their society of those already living in the territory and shaping its communal life, leading to friction, unrest and resentment of persons-citizens and territorial residents.

The status of territorial resident provides for a journey to assimilation and citizenship. Historic experience in nations with citizenship communities, built from immigration like the U.S., Canada and Australia, has shown how the values, religious beliefs and practices and mores of immigrants, over time, make accommodations with the pre-existing values, religious beliefs and practices and mores of the citizens and the citizens make accommodations with the new arrivals and their children and grandchildren.

An adjustment of cultures is necessary for the human rights of individuals to not override the cultural and political rights of other individuals to be protected in their cultures, religions and politics as citizens in good standing in their sovereign society.

Immigration does not trump the rights of sovereign people to live as they wish to live in accordance with their traditions, histories and accepted legal arrangements.

It is most effectively ethical if there is provided a process of 1) transition from the failure of sovereignty, 2) flight, 3) residence in a new sovereign territory and finally 4) assimilation with full citizenship and inclusion the social contract legitimating that new sovereignty.

International law, we might say, proposed a both/and rather than an either/or solution to the life choices of those who find themselves between sovereigns.



Stephen B. Young is Global Executive Director of the Caux Round Table for Moral Capitalism.

Statement of the Ethics of Comity

(Adopted October 7, 2018, St. Petersburg, Russia)

In the industrial age of early capitalism, social justice advocates argued over the right to control the means of production. The left would give control to the state. Liberals preferred to have private owners using free markets make allocation decisions about risk, investment, quality of goods, methods of production and distribution and wages. As the industrial age gave way to a post-industrial global economy, a compromise had been reached between these alternatives. With the failure of Communism and the disappearance, one by one, of Communist regimes, nation states adopted a multi-faceted approach to wealth creation: government and private owners would mutually engage in tempering extremes of private initiative with restrictions and regulation for the common good. For most purposes, such common good was defined in the Charter of the United Nations and subsequent agreements, such as the International Declaration of Human Rights and the subsequent covenants on political, economic and social rights.

Contemporary social systems, supervised by national sovereigns and international agreements, are supported by three pillars: private enterprise, government and civil society. Under the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations, these three sectors are to collaborate in fairly creating and distributing the goods and services made possible by investment and ingenuity under conditions which do not degrade our natural environment. Fairness is a standard to be applied within countries and between countries.

Since the collapse of Communism, global trade and development have raised the living standards of nearly every people, some dramatically. Where economic and social progress has not occurred, failures of governance – corruption, violence, intolerance of rights – are to blame. But at the same time, the benefits of such remarkable growth have not been evenly distributed. Those with the most wealth and income did much, much better than those with less access to cash flows. The collapse of credit markets in 2008, a major failure of the global system of finance and growth, triggered a loss of confidence in the competence and compassion of the most senior executives in business, government and iconic cultural institutions.

In the U.S., U.K. and in several E.U. member states, the elite, which managed the mixed system of private enterprise and social welfare regulation, lost its prestige. Many not of the elite grew resentful of its privileges and powers and turned to populist nationalism to protect middle and lower classes from a new form of psycho-social exploitation. Perhaps as a result of these various shortfalls, in recent years, the temperament of affairs in many nations has shifted away from reasoned arguments over the right way to do economics to sometimes bitter resentment of others – be they of a different religion, ethnic group, gender or class.

The ability of the tripartite alliance of private enterprise, government and civil society to deliver optimal results has been compromised by gridlock and partisan antagonisms in politics, short-sightedness in the private sector and strident cultural campaigns seeking identity justice or ideological correctness, narrowly defined, on the part of civil society.

What the global community seems to lack is an ethics of comity, which would encourage mutual respect and collaboration. We live in a world which is complex and multitudinous in spirit and action, but it does not need to be chaotic or confused. The practices of comity permit complexity without it becoming destructive and provide a spontaneous order in which differences can be symbiotic.

In its Latin roots, comity means “to go together.” It presumes action and decision-making and a being together. Comity implies both autonomy and sharing of mutual respect. Each defers to another and receives similar deference in return. Comity was used in early international law to describe the regime of mutual tolerance among independent sovereign nations, which allowed for divergence and peace.

The ethical ideal of comity resonates with the ethics of friendship and with being a good neighbor. Within a nation, comity is achieved by making everyone equal in citizenship. Citizens are expected as members of a commonwealth to act as friends and good neighbors towards one another.

The Caux Round Table, therefore, recommends that new ethical principles for comity in community be proposed, which would apply to citizens, those hoping to become citizens and those who are merely residents in a nation. Such ethical principles would address and reduce the resentments that some now feel for others.

The calling of the human person is to community. No one is an island unto themselves. Each is part of the main. Our special destiny, opportunities unlike those given to any other and our individual gifts is and are in relationships with others, from our birth until we leave this life. Trust and responsibility set us apart as worthy of consideration. Showing respect for others brings us respect and honor in return.

Our character reveals our values and our courage to live for ourselves and for others in the right proportions and with grace and dignity. Citizenship in community makes justice triumph over evil.

It is an insight, common to all religions, that we are called to rise above mean selfishness and act for higher purposes. We always live by our values – be they good or bad – but it is better for us and for those whose lives we influence that we live by good values.

This is especially true for democracies, societies that depend on the quality of their citizens for their success and prosperity. George Washington concluded that, “Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. ... It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government.”

Annex I

The Ethics of Citizenship, Residence and Immigrant

Sovereign nation states, as communities, are inhabited by citizens and residents. Citizens have a legal right to residence and other rights, privileges and benefits under the laws of the sovereign. Residents either have permission from the sovereign to remain in the territory or they do not. Immigrants to a nation state either have permission to reside in the territory or they are trespassers. Immigrants may choose to become citizens under the nationality laws of the nation state or they may choose not to or do not qualify for becoming citizens.

The Ethics of Citizenship: An Office of Service to Self and Society

Not every citizen shares commonalities of language, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, political views, social status and more attributes, ascriptive or achieved, with other citizens. Some nations are very homogenous. Others are very pluralistic and multicultural. But the status of citizen is common to all, regardless of other identifications and personal preferences.

The primary ethical obligation of a citizen is to contribute to civil order by going beyond the letter of the law to build the social capital of a community. In Christian terms, this reflects love of neighbor with neighbors to include all citizens, to some degree, and to do unto other citizens as we would have them do unto us. Love of neighbor does not take away from a proper love of self. We each have our dignity, our own worth. Being a good neighbor is an office of service to a just common good, respectful of human dignity and the moral sense.

Thus, a citizen is self-empowered to be a friend. The office of a friend is most necessary for the well-being of community. It is the bond that sustains relationships through strife and adversity. The capacity to be a friend provides for the internal moral vindication of each person and thereby sustains, in psychological comfort, each person, as they confront the ups and downs of fortune. The best friendships bring forth love and trust, which promote the highest quality of community, where simultaneously and reciprocally, individuals are honored for who they are and community efforts thrive.

The Ethics of a Resident: The Office of a Friend and the Office of a Guest

Residents are subjects of the sovereignty under which they live and which, in its proper office, secures their domestic tranquility. Unlike citizens, they have no role in sovereign decision-making, but, as residents, share in the fortunes of the national community. Thus, as recipients of benefits and privileges provided by the government, society and culture, residents assume ethical obligations in return. These obligations are to assume the office of a friend, as much as possible, and to be gracious and charitable in the office of a guest.

The ethics of friendship, noted above, for citizens are not limited to those who already have citizenship. Residents are participants in the national community. They, too, therefore, should carry out the office of friend towards citizens and others alike.

The status of guest comes with its own special duties of showing goodwill and thanks, of honoring the host with appreciation and never imposing on those who have welcomed us into their homes.

Some residents intend to become citizens and thus, assume the duties of citizenship. They may prepare for enjoyment of this status with its privileges and obligations by incorporating into their behaviors the traits of good citizens, as noted above.

The Ethics of an Immigrant: Serving as Prospective Citizen and Holding the Offices of Friend and Guest

Immigrants – refugee, asylum seeker, worker, student, retiree – become residents of a nation state with the intention of making a life as part of that community. As such, they have the status of prospective citizen, learning how to assume the privileges and obligations of citizenship and the status of friend, obligated to perform the office of friend in their new homeland.

In gratitude for receiving permission to become a resident and then, perhaps, a citizen, immigrants should be particularly alert to being a gracious guest.

Conclusion

These ethical standards for the offices of citizen, friend and guest can be placed in the context of great wisdom traditions. They invoke the principles of human dignity, solidarity and subsidiarity of Catholic Social Teachings. Under Protestant social teachings, they stand on the moral goodness of finding a vocation for self to sustain God's created realm of common grace. They embody the *paramitras* of Buddhist teachings: generosity; proper conduct; renunciation; insightful wisdom; effort; forbearance; truthfulness; resolution; goodwill; and equanimity. They reflect Qur'anic guidance to make of yourselves a community that seeks righteousness and enjoins justice and to follow the counsels of only those who enjoin charity,

kindness and peace among men. These ethical standards fully comply with the wisdom of Confucius that “reciprocity” is an ideal which will serve us all life long and the commitment of Mencius to only guide us towards humanness and mutual engagement. The relationships of citizen, friend and guest embody the Japanese ethic of *kyosei*, symbiosis.

Annex II

Guidelines for the Offices of Citizen, Friend and Guest

Public power constitutes a civic order for the safety and common good of its members. The civic order, as a moral order, protects and promotes the integrity, dignity and self-respect of its members in their capacity as citizens and therefore, avoids all measures, oppressive and other, whose tendency is to transform the citizen into a subject. The state shall protect, give legitimacy to or restore all those principles and institutions which sustain the moral integrity, self-respect and civic identity of the individual citizen and which also serve to inhibit processes of civic estrangement, dissolution of the civic bond and civic disaggregation. This effort by the civic order itself protects the citizen’s capacity to contribute to the well-being of the civic order.

Public power, however allocated by constitutions, referendums or laws, shall rest its legitimacy in processes of communication and discourse among autonomous moral agents who constitute the community to be served by the government. Free and open discourse, embracing independent media, shall not be curtailed, except to protect legitimate expectations of personal privacy, sustain the confidentiality needed for the proper separation of powers or for the most dire of reasons relating to national security.

Therefore, citizenship is an office of service to the public weal. The honor which comes from being a citizen lies in fidelity to duty and responsibility. Entitlements may accrue to individuals for personal enjoyment, but duties are the price paid for membership in the national community. To hold a share of power in the civic order is to assume a status, to have the dignity of positional responsibility above and beyond personal preferences and desires, angers and delights. As must any agent or other fiduciary, the citizen has an obligation to consider the good of others as a check on each and every personal interest or prejudice.

- 1) A citizen uses discourse ethics in the resolution of community difficulties and the promotion of community well-being. A citizen must not act from petulance or any other tyrannous instinct.
- 2) A citizen makes a commitment to learn, to seek good values, to be open and fair minded.
- 3) A citizen will reflect and deliberate in good faith, not giving sway to prejudice or ignorance, to find means to use their best skills and abilities.
- 4) A citizen will tell the truth, making integrity and sincerity the basis for all relationships.

- 5) A citizen will not be afraid of debate or discussion of differences, expecting the same in return from other citizens. What is done together is often more consequential than what a citizen can do alone.
- 6) A citizen shall use power wisely, seeking to leave the world a better place for having been alive, caring for others, alert to serve whenever possible.
- 7) A citizen will use wealth responsibly to enhance the future capitals which provide for community and individual well-being – financial, environmental, social and human.
- 8) A citizen will be self-reliant and not easily transfer responsibility for disappointments and frustrations to the intentions of others or the blind forces of history and fate.

The Office of a Friend

Friendship arises from the moral nature of the person out of benevolence and the seeking of companionship from the disposition of our minds and hearts. It is more than convenience or obtaining transactional advantage. It may further our self-love or interest, but is not limited to only furthering selfish aims. Oddly, the more one is conscious of intrinsic personal merit, the better a friend one can be to others. Aristotle proposed that we each “ought to strain every nerve” to avoid wickedness and try to be a person of good character, “for in that way, one can both be on good terms with oneself and become the friends of somebody else.”

The putting of self in service of another through feelings of amity creates an office of responsibility through deliberate self-control.

Friendship is sustained by character. When a friend’s character changes or the depths of that person’s character are revealed, the office of friendship may terminate. A friend never values others simply for their utility.

For the self, forms of friendship which do not impose serious obligations of reciprocity and so are a lower form of office are based on the utility to one of the other as a friend and the pleasure one takes in being with another. Friendships based on utility and pleasure are more easily dissolved. Their partnerships are potentially very vulnerable to dissolution, as are friends on Facebook.

- 1) A friend provides succor and sustenance when necessary, material and emotional.
- 2) A friend identifies with others as if they were similar in purpose and need.
- 3) A friend does not expect others to put aside merely for friendship’s sake what is most important to them, but rather, finds noble sympathy in bearable differences.
- 4) It is the obligation of a friend from time to time to admonish and reprove with full honesty out of goodwill.
- 5) A friend may expect reciprocal offices and be prepared to reciprocate in turn.
- 6) A friend is steadfast and reliable, especially in times of distress and hardship.
- 7) As friendship depends on character, a change in character will change the friendship.

The Office of a Guest

A guest is welcomed into a home or a community by an act of kindness. The welcoming creates a relationship, a mutuality of interdependence. Reciprocating such kindness is the office of a guest. Host and guest participate in a joint venture, to which each partner contributes to its success.

- 1) A guest should express thanks and appreciation.
- 2) A guest should offer to share the burdens of the journey in some way.
- 3) A guest should be attentive to the values, beliefs and practices of the host.
- 4) A guest should not impose on the host, have undue expectations as to the host's responsibilities of care and patronage, nor should a guest seek to take advantage of a host in any way.



www.cauxroundtable.org | Twitter: @cauxroundtable | Facebook: Caux.Round.Table

Steve Young	David Kansas	Michael Hartoonian	Jed Ipsen	Patrick Rhone
Editor-in-Chief and Publisher	Editor-at-Large	Associate Editor	Assistant Editor	Layout & Design

We hope you enjoyed this issue of Pegasus. Please feel free to share it with others. They can sign up to receive it directly at: <https://www.cauxroundtable.org/pegasus/>

