

Labelling People As Haters And Losers?

Ethics, Reality, Truth, Compassion, And Life Philosophy

(To be edited, but the points are understandable and should be useful for your deciding what is valid or not.)

The ultimate test for actions in life lies in producing **outcomes** that do the greatest good (or at least some good) in total for the people affected. (That is [Ethics](#), which is different than morality, at the core.). Another way of saying this is “will it produce good or not?”. And if one is operating at a higher level, one would ask “will this produce the highest good for my efforts?” Read [Good/Bad, Right/Wrong Vs. Workability.](#))

In response to a current discussion, this is being written for the exploration of ideas and how to shift our perspective (and then check in to see when we humans go into our “[stories](#) about” and leave the world of “what is [actually, factually happening](#)”, viewed objectively). I, myself, would not vote for trump because of my surmising that he would probably be ineffective, and possibly damaging, in the role of President.

Yes, Trump is foolish in many ways, but is he actually a hater (flat out, is that accurate and completely true?)? And/or a defender, inappropriately? When he sends his plane to carry a “stuck” person across the country when there was no other medical transport available to carry the person to high level medical care... Did he ever say all Mexicans were “bad”? (No, I researched it, and nowhere could that be found - only some comments on illegal immigrants, some of which he was sure were “good people”...). When he took over and finished the ice rink project for NYC in record time and far under budget, a fete repeated many times... Is he then a loser or just a person who loses sometimes, perhaps too much at times?

Is there room for objectivity, where we do not have a strong emotion about a person, but where we are purely seeking objective answers and good outcomes? (See [The Difference Between Ethics And Morality.](#))

IS THERE A LESSON HERE?

I am sure there is a lesson, with value, here that would be useful for your readers...though I am not sure how good I would be at creating it versus you with your ability to communicate at a very high level.

This is all very interesting, how we create evaluations and then hold them as truth (ala the

conversation in The Believing Brain, by Michael Shermer; my summary [here](#)) and then we, justifiably, become righteous about it (e.g. do a discussion of “ain’t it awful” and/or a version of “againstness” in lieu of the positive energy of being “for” some greater good), as in The Righteous Mind, by Jonathan Haidt. (See article [The Righteous, Unthinking Mind Vs. The Thinking Mind](#).) The sign of such “thinking” is that we use justifications, a form of defense - when we actually do not need to defend ourselves (or defend a position that we are attached to and think of as part of our “self” or “ego”). (Note that something is not true if a part of it is untrue!)

Surely, we are ALL, in a number of ways, “unaware”, in a state of “not yet knowing”, as is Trump, though [our blindspots](#) and unknowingness are likely not the same as his. And, yes, we want to encourage people to create better outcomes, for that is all that matters. **It’s about “[what works](#)”, not about right/wrong (pejoratives).** (Holy books encourage us to hate the sin and not the sinner, perhaps actually forgiving them “for they know not what they do”. But the truly wise person does not need to forgive, for he/she does not blame in the first place as he/she is aware of the tautological truth of [Zero Fault...Just Not Knowing, Yet](#). Embracing that truth has one completely give up “againstness”, in any form, defensiveness, anger, blame, etc. and etc., so that one can be freed up to think more constructively and objectively.)

Another piece for perspective and consideration: [The Acceptance Of Reality And All Of Life - A Profound Viewpoint](#)

MY PROPOSITION

My proposition is that we will do more good for ourselves and for the world when we have first ascertained what is the truth (precisely and accurately), coupled with sound logic, AND from that base (only!) can we establish what is it that we truly want AND then couple it with action to cause that outcome - instead of engaging in any “againstness”.

(A good example might be No Labels...)

See the initial emails, below.

Response to 1st email below, with comment in caps:

In 99% of cases I'd agree with you that words like that are judgments. But if you were president would you be tweeting to demand public gratitude from the parent of a child you helped? Or any other such nonsense about the size of your inauguration crowd? CLEARLY FOOLISH ON HIS PART, YES...BUT TO BRAND/LABEL A HUMAN BEING AS SUCH...AND NOT LOOK AT ALL HUMAN BEINGS WITH [COMPASSION](#) AND UNDERSTANDING, KNOWING THAT THEY ARE DOING THEIR BEST (YES. WITH LIMITED AWARENESS) AND THAT THEY TOO WANT TO ELIMINATE SUFFERING AND TO HAVE HAPPINESS FOR THEMSELVES, AS THOUGHT THE BUDDHA AND THE "STRAIGHT THINKER" [L. S. BARKSDALE](#) (HIS VERY UNIVERSAL STATEMENT (in footnote¹) AND ANOTHER ONE: [THE INSANITY OF VALUE JUDGING](#))

No because you're not a hater or a loser. Sometimes words are objective. WHEN THEY ARE USED SPECIFICALLY ENOUGH, INSTEAD OF WITH A BROAD BRUSH (GENERALIZATION IS A CLASSIC THINKING ERROR) THE TEST MIGHT BE: WOULD AN OBJECTIVE, [SCIENTIFIC METHOD](#) PERSON COME UP WITH THAT CONCLUSION? AND, FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF ETHICS, IS THAT OUTCOME OF THAT STATEMENT GOING TO CAUSE A GOOD VALUE FOR INDIVIDUALS?

Lots to take away philosophically from this time of Trump. YES!!! But things also have to be called as they are. YES...AND THAT WOULD SEEM TO ONLY HAVE TRUTH IN IT, WITHOUT THE STORY, PERCEPTION, PEJORATIVES, EMOTION CHARGE, ETC. (YES???) The Stoics insisted on truth, even at the risk to their lives. It's the most sacred thing.

¹ From [L.S. Barksdale's materials](#), paraphrased from [Affirmations For Sound Self Esteem](#):

Everybody does the best they can at the time, given the current limits of their awareness. They are not to be expected to or to be blamed for not doing better than their best. They have simply learned what they have learned and are missing a piece of what it takes to do anything more. None of it is personal.

First email: Nov 23, 2017, at 12:03 PM, Keith > wrote:

Out of respect for your writing and intellect:

As I observe Trump, it is with acceptance, sure, but not “tolerance” (where we make people’s behavior “wrong” as opposed to what is appropriate for their level of awareness - we can, surely, do no better than our awareness). To classify him as a hater is a judgment, most likely based on a gross exaggeration and much misinformation - surely, he has some such traits, but the facts do not line up with the actual things he said, plus we do not know his inner intentions in all things.

Certainly, he is a winner in many ways, more than most people (or at least at a higher level in some cases).

Encouraging (almost in a complaining way) such hate (or put down) of such an individual is still coming from a negative place, one of blame or a level of anger. See No Fault

I wonder what can be learned here, applying the stoic philosophy???