John Henry Newman, the founder of our university in 1854, was noted for his seminal thoughts, one of which is on the board on the second floor in the Quinn School:

“Growth is the only evidence of life”

“To live is to change; to live well is to change often”

“To change is to die a little; not to change at all is to die completely”

Newman had some things in common with another famous academic, Edith Stein, and some differences.

**Incidental difference:** He became famous in later life.

She and her sister were gassed in the ovens of Auschwitz.
Major difference: He became an important and influential Cardinal in the Catholic Church. She became a nun in an enclosed Catholic Religious Order who unsuccessfully lobbied Pope Pius XI to write an encyclical, a letter to the world, denouncing Hitler and the National Socialist regime in Germany.

Incidental factor in common: Both were converts to Catholicism.

Major factor in common: Both followed an interior journey that involved risk, major changes in their lives, and differences with people they had been close to.

Newman was involved in many public debates with former colleagues. Stein resigned as post-doc research assistant to the great philosopher Edmund Husserl, her PhD supervisor, because she disagreed with him.

I would like to explore this aspect with you. In particular, I would like to challenge you to change, but to base your change on deep interior things such as values and ethics. How does one change? One way is to move into unsafe areas. Newman and Stein left the comfort of their original cultures because of their convictions.

In this Business School we are embracing change also, especially in our developing links with China.

In this context I would like to point to the presence here of Professors Shizhong Ai and Rong Du from Xi’an China, who are researching Trust in an Inter-Cultural Context, forming an Inter-Cultural Bridge Between East and West. Here is a worthwhile challenge that embodies the possibilities of personal and societal exploration and change.
In a PhD dissertation on “Edith Stein: Toward an Ethic of Relationship and Responsibility”, Judith Parsons (2005) defined “ethic” as a “harmonious matching of internal thoughts and beliefs with external actions”.

My aim is to present to you a **Common Systems Framework for Culture and Values**, which you might like to use to consider questions of culture, values, ethics, personal growth, etc. in business, politics, one’s career, personal life.

The case that I would like to put to you is that **to be truly human** involves a **deep exploration of one’s own values**, that this will lead you into **conflict**, and into places where there are **no easy answers**.

In Newman’s case he was a senior and influential Anglican clergyman before he decided to become a Catholic. In Stein’s case she was a Jew, and created a great rift with her family and friends, especially her mother by becoming a Catholic and then later a nun.

**A Nomological Systems Framework as Map:**

For the rest of this talk I will use Nomology, the Science of the Laws of the mind, to provide a map to guide one’s inner processes.
Four “self-balancing” dimensions of Committing, Convincing, Adjusting World, and Adjusting Self form a Meta-Adjusting set for all that we do.

Fig. 1: Meta-Model

(The stage numbers refer to a later slide.) The differences between the two sides can explain some of the distinctions between East and West.
Newman, Stein, St. Paul had Strong Views
The four dimensions usually operate embedded within one another, for example, in the case of political activity:
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Fig. 3: Embedded Systems
This system is “open” in the sense that there are no “final positions”. Everything is relative.
And God is hidden. You have to go beyond the Self and Others deep within oneself and the world to find God.
We can visualise this as a “cybernetic” model.

Fig. 4: Cybernetic Model
The subjective aspects combine into a development system, which has numerous facets. Here we show a Hierarchy of Needs, Preferences and Values and a Systems Development Life Cycle.

You can use it to determine the personality types of countries, or to unmask those who might represent politics as religion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Committing (Adducing)</th>
<th>Convincing (Evincing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somatic – Needs – Analysis</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting</td>
<td>1. Physical</td>
<td>2. Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committing</td>
<td>Survey project scope and feasibility</td>
<td>Study the current system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychic – Likes – Design</td>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>Committing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing</td>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>Convincing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting World</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusting Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adapting Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic – Values – Being</td>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Construct the new system</td>
<td>Deliver the new system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding</td>
<td>Adjusting Self</td>
<td>Adapting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evincing</td>
<td>Adapting Self</td>
<td>World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Hierarchy of Levels / Systems Development Life Cycle
Each of these nine stages is implemented by making Adjustments. Adjusting the World is made up of 15 interlocking dilemmas. Here we present Adjusting the World relationships in a political context.

Fig. 5: Adjusting the World

Currently the U.S. rely on unilateralism because of a deterrence dilemma!
Meta-systems can show us our common humanity …
But also our differences …
But knowing one another can help develop mutual understanding.

Conflict Resolution requires a deeper response, adapting (anti-clockwise). Nobody moves unless it is a Win-Win Game.

Confrontation involves “eye-balling” your enemy and honestly expressing your feelings, while listening to the other.

South Africa succeeded in doing this using its Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The two extremes collaborated to write a new constitution.
Refusal to move, i.e. a block or a resistance brings the focus into a fourth layer of decision-making, which also follows an adjusting structure. This leads to differentiating two different kinds of adjusting and corresponding names for the third layer “How I Adjust My World” and the fourth layer “How I Adjust Myself”.

Aspects of adjusting oneself are *Body, Mind, Soul* and *Spirit*. Corresponding feelings are *fear, anxiety, guilt* and *resentment*.

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. 7: Adjusting Ourselves in Northern Ireland**

Ultimately change starts within ourselves.

We in the West don’t even use the word *Righteousness* anymore, whereas in the East “**Right Behaviour**” is hugely important.

i.e. “**Ethics**”: the “harmonious matching of internal thoughts and beliefs with external actions”.
Spaces that we inhabit / things that we do

Lubich: The “Economy of Communion”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Committing (Adducing)</th>
<th>Convincing (Evincing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical</strong></td>
<td>1. Physical Affection</td>
<td>2. Political Comradeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual</strong></td>
<td>3. Economic Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somatic – Needs</strong></td>
<td>4. Social Sexual</td>
<td>5. Cultural Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychic – Likes</strong></td>
<td>6. Emotional Sympathico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committing</strong></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusting World Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saints / Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusting World</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord / God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adducing</strong></td>
<td>7. Artistic Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evincing</strong></td>
<td>8. Religious Communion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pneumatic – Values</strong></td>
<td>9. Mystical Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holy Spirit</strong></td>
<td>7. Artistic Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adapting and Adapting Self</strong></td>
<td>Jesus Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Mystical Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Spaces that People Inhabit and Kinds of Relating

Questions:

1. Are our values socially / culturally constructed?
2. Or is there something real out there / deep within?
3. Is this issue relevant to our ordinary lives?
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