The Axioms of Governing Science

The sciences are based on provable laws and axioms. Axioms are unprovable assertions that are nevertheless considered factual for the purposes of the science. The aim of this article is to identify three axioms as the bases for all governing as a science. These are:

1) All Individuals have the equal and inalienable rights of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness and the fundamental freedoms of thought, conscience, religion, belief and self-determination.

2) Governing must maintain and maximize the equal rights, freedoms and self-determination of all as Individuals and as members of their self-recognized groups.

3) All Individuals regardless of their official and unofficial role(s) in governing are individually accountable for their behavior.

These three axioms are considered self-evident and are proposed as the ‘immutable laws of governance’.
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Introduction

For millennia, understandings regarding the fundamental nature of reality and existence have been expressed in philosophy. Yet, even when rigorously reasoned, philosophy provides moral conclusions from premises that are not self-evident, primarily because there are no fundamental facts or ‘laws of philosophy’.

The major differences between philosophies and sciences are that the sciences have provable facts and self-evident assertions called axioms. Axioms’ seamless interplay with provable facts is what makes them self-evident. Another critical difference is that the sciences unlike philosophies have mathematics or specialized notational systems for their representations and communication cores.

Historically, all Governing Philosophies (GP) have struggled being equitable to all being governed. Some inequities have been considered inherent because the ‘greater GOOD’ of the whole is paramount and hence, more important than the ‘lesser GOOD’ of any individual or identifiable sub-group. Thus, some (and in some cases, the vast majority of) individuals and sub-groups are routinely ‘not favored’ or even harmed for the greater GOOD of the whole by the GP practiced. Monarchies with manorialism is an example.

Problems usually arise when GP inequities become EVIL because the inequities are unnecessary and/or are greater than necessary for the greater GOOD of the whole. These situations generally arise from the common practice for determining Justice. Generally, Justice is determined by those ‘favored’ by the GP and they decide what is GOOD for ‘Just Us’, i.e., the ‘favored.’ This
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'Just Us’ generally excludes and/or disadvantages those ‘not favored.’ In these situations Justice is EVIL because it serves the ‘greater GOOD of the favored’ and not the whole.

For GP to become a science, axioms or 'laws of governance' and a specialized notations system for governance must be identified that persistently maximizes the greater GOOD of individuals while minimizing inherent inequities. This does mean that inequities would be eliminated but rather minimized and those disadvantaged acknowledged and compensated.

The US Declaration of Independence, the Nuremberg Principles resulting from World War II and the 1975 Helsinki Accords from the Cold War along with the notational system of Logic may made the emergence of a Governing Science (GS) possible.

This paper offers the two necessary elements to develop a science of governing. Whether Governing Philosophy can be developed into a Governing Science from these immutable axioms and a specialized notational system as its foundation remains to be established.

**Axioms as ‘Immutable Laws ’of Governing Science**

Since there are no provable ‘laws of governing philosophies' the question is: Are there axioms of governing, i.e., premises so self-evident as to be accepted as true without controversy? If so, then these axioms can be the foundation of governing as a science and used to build a notations system for it.

Importantly, in 1931, Kurt Gödel published his famous incompleteness theorems. Basically, they state that there are true propositions about natural numbers that cannot be proved from the axioms . Applied to GS, this means there will be true propositions about governing that cannot be proved from its axioms. Yet, if the vast majority of true propositions are proved by the axioms then these special case propositions may not be problems.

The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 and the Geneva Conventions four treaties and three additional protocols were early attempts to codify GP. Yet, they only applied to war and armed conflicts and did not apply to everyday life. Thus, they can not be generalized to be axioms of GS.

Instead, the 1776 US Declaration of Independence and two mid-20th Century codified sets of widely accepted rules of behavior can be used to identify axioms of GS. The US Declaration of Independence advanced the ‘self-evident’ (axiomatic) basis of some ‘truths ’and ‘unalienable Rights ’by stating the following:

‘We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.’

Fast forwarding past the US Civil War and the Civil & Women’s Rights movements of the last half of the 20th century, this statement can be updated to:
'These truths are self-evident, that all Individuals are equal and have certain inalienable Rights that include Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.'

These 'self-evident' truths can be a basis for an axiom of governing as a science.

Next, the first codified set of widely accepted rules of behavior not limited to war or armed conflicts, The Nuremberg Principles, came from from the Nuremberg Trials after World War II. They are as follow:

Principle I states, ‘Any person who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible therefore and liable to punishment.’

Principle II states, ‘The fact that internal law does not impose a penalty for an act which constitutes a crime under international law does not relieve the person who committed the act from responsibility under international law.’

Principle III states, ‘The fact that a person who committed an act which constitutes a crime under international law acted as Head of State or responsible government official does not relieve him from responsibility under international law.’

Principle IV states: ‘The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him. This principle could be paraphrased as follows: ‘It is not an acceptable excuse to say I was just following my superior's orders.’ ”

Principle V states, ‘Any person charged with a crime under international law has the right to a fair trial on the facts and law.’

Principle VI states,

‘The crimes hereinafter set out are punishable as crimes under international law:

(a) Crimes against peace:

(i) Planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances;

(ii) Participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the acts mentioned under (i).

(b) War crimes:

Violations of the laws or customs of war which include, but are not limited to, murder, ill-treatment or deportation of slave labor or for any other purpose of the civilian population of or in occupied territory; murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war or persons on the Seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns, or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity.

(c) Crimes against humanity:

Murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhumane acts done against any civilian population, or persecutions on political, racial, or religious grounds, when such acts are done or such persecutions are carried on in execution of or in connection with any crime against peace or any war crime.’

Principle VII states, ‘Complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity as set forth in Principle VI is a crime under international law.’
These codes can be summarized as: ‘All are individually accountable internally and/or internationally for their behaviors and the behaviors they are complicit in.’ This too can be a basis for an axiom for governing as a science.

The second codified set of widely accepted rules of behavior, the 1975 Helsinki Accords, reaffirmed international law that includes ‘respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief.’ These Accords cover the following ten points:

I. Sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty
II. Refraining from the threat or use of force
III. Inviolability of frontiers
IV. Territorial integrity of States
V. Peaceful settlement of disputes
VI. Non-intervention in internal affairs
VII. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief
VIII. Equal rights and self-determination of peoples
IX. Co-operation among States
X. Fulfillment in good faith of obligations under international law

Of note, Point VII affirms but does not delineate human rights. Nevertheless, inalienable human rights are described in the US Declaration of Independence as noted above.

The Axioms of Governing Science

From the Declaration of Independence and Point VII and VIII of the Helsinki Declaration three foundational axioms of governing science can be identified:

Axiom #1: All Individuals have the equal and inalienable rights of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness and the fundamental freedoms of thought, conscience, religion, belief and self-determination.

From the Nuremberg principles and Helsinki Declaration, the following axioms of governing science are self-evident:

Axiom #2: Governing must maintain and maximize the equal rights, freedoms and self-determination of all as Individuals and as members of their self-recognized groups.

Axiom #3: All Individuals regardless of their official and unofficial role(s) in governing or self-recognized groups are individually accountable for their behavior and, under internal and/or international law, at risk in a fair trial on the facts and law of forfeiting any or all of their rights and freedoms if they violate all or part of Axioms #1 and/or #2.
These three axioms are self-evident and are proposed as the ‘immutable laws of governing science.’

Immediate Complexities of these Axioms

Critical issues regarding these Axioms are: Who is an Individual? Is the Individual more important than the whole? What is governing? What are self-recognized groups? and How is Justice to be determined?

Individuals for purposes of these Axioms are legally accountable (under internal and/or international law) single human beings as distinct from a group, class, or family. Countless issues such as age and mental capacity of accountability and the like regarding Individuals arise that require detailed exploration but are beyond the scope of this preliminary paper. However, equal rights and freedoms does not mean equality. A minor has equal rights and freedoms like an adult but is not equal to an adult. Governing sciences must make distinctions like these.

Commonly, Individuals usually identify with more than one self-recognized group. Such Individuals may have different governing rules base on that groups application of the axioms of governing science.

For example, in order to be accredited all US Post-Graduate Medical Training (‘Residency’) Programs in Obstetrics-Gynecology must teach abortion techniques to their trainees. A Conservative, Pro-Life and Religious Physician Faculty member could participate in this training valuing Professional over Political and Religious governing rules or not participate valuing Religious and/or Political governing rules over their Professional ones.

On the other hand, they could participate having one set of Professional Governing Rules for work and another set for Political and Religious activities that apply in those situations. Competing sets of conflicting governing rules are the most frequent source of ethical dilemmas.

Governing in the broadest sense is by any Individual (alone or within an organization) with any authority and/or control over any other Individual’s equal rights and/or freedoms. This includes all levels of governments and regulatory agencies and all public and private socio/political, educational, spiritual/religious and for-profit/nonprofit business organizations with supervision, teaching, management, executive and/or leadership positions that have authority over any other Individuals. And, it includes parenting!

Self-recognized groups usually have an implicit or explicit general governing philosophy. Any public and private formal and informal organization with members is by definition a self-recognized group.

Paradoxically, in order to advance their overall rights an Individual may voluntarily and without duress consent to waive (and when desired, reclaim) some well delineated freedoms when associating or joining organizations such as the military, a religious or social organizations, businesses and the like.

In these circumstances, governing must adhere to their explicit and implicit engagement contracts leading to the Individual’s association. They must also
minimize the rights and freedoms needing to be waived and honor the Individual’s residual rights and freedoms. Changes to the engagement contract must be explicitly agreed to and non-punitive rules for disassociating with the organization clearly delineated and known by the Individuals.

Ethical problems arise when self-recognized groups like American Conservatives declare their set of governing principles (so called ‘American Values’) as the governing rules for the whole US citizenry and then call for ‘assimilation’, i.e., acceptance of their governing principles, by all.

In the USA, Women’s and Civil Rights of the 50’s, 60’s and 70’s and the more recent LBGT Same Sex Marriage initiatives are examples of inherent governing tension between self-recognized groups and those ‘favored’ at the time in the US governments. That women are still not paid equally for equal work, the ‘Black Lives Matter’ movement exists and recent anti-LGBT laws suggest that there are still issues with Axiom 2 within the US.

Controversy involving proofs and axioms exists in all sciences and it is obvious that controversy will accompany these axioms of governing as a science. Controversy that leads to further elucidations and clarification of the axioms is necessary if governing is to become a science.

A Notational Systems for Governing as a Science

The dichotomy of GOOD and EVIL in governing

GOOD (all caps) is defined as actions respecting all Individuals' equal rights, freedoms and self-determination as noted in Axiom #1. In contrast, EVIL (all caps) is defined as actions that unnecessarily violate and/or incite the violation of the equal rights, freedoms and/or self-determination of any Individual as noted in Axiom #1. As will be explained below, establishing the times and/or locations of the exercise of rights or freedoms is not the same as violating them.

Since ideas are intangible, an individual’s freedoms thoughts, consciences, religions or beliefs that are kept private are neither GOOD nor EVIL. On the other hand, thoughts, consciences, religions or beliefs made public are by definition actions and actions may be deemed as GOOD or EVIL.

For example, a pedophile who never acts on their inclination nor expresses their private thoughts, consciences, religions or beliefs regarding pedophilia is neither GOOD nor EVIL. Publicly expressing their private thoughts, consciences, religions or beliefs regarding pedophilia is an action and is protected by their rights and freedoms unless these expressions are or are complicit in pedophilic acts. If directly or indirectly complicit in pedophilic acts, their public expressions are EVIL.

Similarly, just be opposed to a behavior does not make it EVIL. Anti-abortion, a.k.a., Pro-Life, advocates have none of their own rights or freedoms violated when women choose abortions. Their beliefs that a fetus’ ‘rights’ (if
any) are violated have been adjudicated in fair trials based on the facts and law and deemed non-applicable to all individual women.

Axiom #3: individual EVIL actions accountability

EVIL doers risk their own rights and freedoms and have the right to a fair trial on the facts and law. Self-recognized groups members are individually responsible for their EVIL doing and should be individually prosecuted. Mass prosecutions of entire recognized groups in toto is EVIL since participation in EVIL doing is rarely equal.

States must adjudicate EVIL actions internally. When it doesn't and the EVIL action is a crime under international law, the EVIL doers and the complicit Officials are subject to international law.

Accountability for EVIL actions may result in partial or complete loss of rights and/or freedoms for EVIL doers. Paradoxically per Axiom #3 the appropriately and proportionately adjudicated losses of rights and/or freedoms by EVIL doers are a GOOD. Depending on the Individual’s EVIL actions, accountability may even include capital punishment and this may still be considered a GOOD.

Axiomatic GOOD and EVIL vs good, bad and neutral

Self-recognized groups ‘governing codes routinely deem specific actions as acceptable/good (no caps), unacceptable/bad’, or when they have no established code, i.e., neutral, for their groups ‘members. Frequently, unaddressed by these self-recognized groups is whether these actions are GOOD or EVIL since they always believe them to be GOOD.

An example of self-recognized groups ‘good behaviors that could be GOOD or EVIL is circumcision. Male circumcision that does not permanently violate the rights or freedoms of a man is considered GOOD. Some self-recognized groups consider male infant circumcision as good (GOOD/good) and routinely circumcise their male infants. Other self-recognized groups have determined it as bad and do not circumcise their male infants (GOOD/bad). Finally, other recognized groups are neutral (GOOD/neutral) on male circumcisions and let Individual members decide for themselves.

On the other hand, the purpose of female child circumcision is to prevent the pursuit of happiness in womanhood and is therefore EVIL. Self-recognized groups that perform female child circumcisions are performing EVIL/good and individuals complicit in female child circumcision are accountable for their EVIL actions under internal and/or international law.

On a larger scale, terroristic actions deem ‘good by self-recognized terror-ist groups are always EVIL. The terrorist actions may be deemed justifiably good (EVIL/good) based on real or perceived experienced EVIL; yet, the bottom line is EVIL for EVIL is never GOOD.
Right or wrong: methodology assessments for GOOD/EVIL

Now GOOD and EVIL can be done right or wrong. For example, regardless whether it is GOOD or EVIL, capital punishment by lethal injection is the ‘right’ way to execute a properly convicted felon while it is considered ‘wrong’ to do it by firing squad, hanging or electric chair. Also, regardless whether it is GOOD or EVIL, safe, sanitary conditions with appropriate anesthetics and by an experienced person is the ‘right’ way to do infant/child circumcisions.

Ironically, EVIL like the mass exterminations of the Nazi Holocaust of WW II were done the ‘right’ way (EVIL/good/right) when compared to the Rwandan genocide of 1994 which was done the ‘wrong’ way (EVIL/good/wrong).

Governing: Live and Let Live Directives

Organizations are never comprised of only one homogenous self-recognized group with a single homogenous governing code. There are at least minimal and usually marked variations within self-recognized group governing rules that result in variations in good and bad actions.

Governing these various groups requires that all EVIL be prevented and GOOD be promoted. When any individual’s or self-recognized group’s good is EVIL it must be legally stopped and EVIL doers prosecuted.

Yet, what if one self-recognized group’s GOOD/good exposes another self-recognized group to GOOD/bad actions? In these circumstances, the job of governance is to imposed restrictions where and/or when a self-recognized group can exercise its GOOD/good so to prevent another self-recognized groups experiencing it as GOOD/bad. Notwithstanding, the private GOOD/good of consenting adult Individuals cannot be proscribed just because others believe these expressions are GOOD/bad.

For example, face mask mandates during an airborne transmitted pandemic is GOOD/good/right. Ironically, those who believe it violates their ‘rights and freedoms’ (GOOD/bad) have accepted other public health mandates like seat beat wearing and prohibitions on smoking in public places. Governing science would counter the politicization of public safety mandates when they benefit all.

Gun ownership (GOOD) in the USA is a prime example of the politicization of a public health issue. Unfortunately, blind adherence to ‘the right to bear arms’ has deprived many of their Right to Life through their unnecessary deaths (GOOD/bad). This is especially heinous when weapons designed and manufactured to only kill people and nothing else (‘assault rifles’) are deemed part of this right to bear arms. (GOOD/bad). Governing has already prohibited automatic weapons (‘machine guns’) and other weapons intended for war only (GOOD/good) and must deal with assault rifles in a similar fashion. Mandated background checks, licensing, registrations and/or training on the use of any weapons may be a GOOD/good compromise.
Another example, pornography and nudity that are a GOOD by judicial
rulings have been deemed GOOD/bad by some and GOOD/good by others.
Restricting the time and/or place where pornography and nudity can be experi-
enced can prevent the experience by those who consider it GOOD/bad while
making it available to those who consider them GOOD/good.

Thus, ‘adult ’magazines are plastic wrapped to cover nudity and placed
high on the magazine shelves where only ‘adults ’can reach them is such a
compromise. Designated, secluded ‘nudist ’areas allows those who believe nud-
ism is GOOD/good to be nude away and out of sight from those who believe it
is GOOD/bad. Choice rather than inadvertent circumstances allows these
groups their GOOD/good and allows groups not to inadvertently experience
GOOD/bad. Groups that consider a behavior GOOD/bad and knowingly go to
areas specified for these behaviors do so at their sole expense.

Sometimes restrictions of GOOD need to be creative to promote equality,
rights, freedoms and/or self-determination. For example, those who believed
marriage sacred and only between a man and a woman sought to prevent all
same-sex marriages based on religious grounds. These restrictions are EVIL to
the LGBT communities because they unnecessarily limit their equality, rights,
freedoms and self-determination.

Unfortunately, a GOOD/good solution for all was not instituted. This
GOOD/good solution would have been to declare marriage sacred, declared it
unconstitutional based on the principal of the separation of Church and State
and require States to perform only civil unions and provide civil union licenses.
This decision would have equalized all civil unions and preserved the equal
rights and freedoms of all groups, i.e., a GOOD/good. It would then been left
up to individual Churches to determine if they would marry same-sex couples
or not. In addition, marriages by Churches could be recognized as civil unions
by States and registered as such.

Instead the US Supreme Court struck down the Defense of Marriage Act
(DOMA) and allowed States to ‘marry ’same sex couples. This is a GOOD/
good for some but is still considered GOOD/bad by others. More creative gov-
ernance by States may be needed to implement the GOOD/good solution for
all.

Abortion is another situation where GOOD/EVIL and good/bad complexi-
ties have led to confusion. Pro-Life adherents will not accept abortions even
though declared a GOOD in 1973 by the SCOTUS Roe v. Wade decision. Pro-
Choice adherents believe a woman’s right to choose to have an abortion is a
GOOD/good. These are two different issues and the ethical dilemma arises
from the confusion between different rights and freedoms.

The Pro-Life groups believe that ‘life begins at conception’. To them, an
Individual, i.e., a woman, loses her rights and freedoms over her own body just
because she becomes pregnant. This is unequal and misogynistic since no man
automatically loses any rights or freedoms when he impregnates a woman. Pro-
life adherents rank fetal life over a woman’s rights to life, liberty and pursuit of
happiness by choosing an abortion. Thus Pro-Life adherents are imposing their ‘Justice’ on others against their will.

On the other hand, the Pro-Choice groups do not advocate for abortions but instead believe as GOOD/good a woman’s right to choose an abortion based on her rights and freedoms. Pro-Choice adherents can be Anti-Abortion without contradiction since it ranks Choice over abortions.

The Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision made abortions a GOOD when it was previously an EVIL for women who wanted abortions. Pro-Life adherents want to make abortions illegal which would violate women’s equality, rights and freedoms, i.e., EVIL again. No woman is compelled to have an abortion if she doesn’t want one. On the other hand, imposing ones ’Anti-Abortion beliefs on woman’s choosing abortion was (and is) EVIL.

GOOD vs. EVIL, good vs. bad and right vs. wrong in governing are rarely adequately defined and delineated. The framework noted defines and delineates these in relation to the Axioms of Governing Science offered.

The variables and form of an governing specialized notational systems

Governing symbols can be relatively self explanatory: ‘G ’(cap) is for GOOD; ‘E ’(cap) is for EVIL; ‘g ’(no cap) is for self-recognized group’s good; ‘b ’(no cap) is for self-recognized group’s bad; ‘n ’is for when a self-recognized group has no opinion or is neutral; ‘r ’for actions done right and ‘w ’for actions done wrong.

Thus, actions according to the Axioms are either G or E. At the same time, self-recognized groups actions can be good, bad or neutral (G/g, G/b, G/n, E/g E/b, E/n) [Evil can never be neutral!] Finally, these actions can be done right or wrong, (G/g/r & G/g/w, G/b/r & G/b/w, G/n/r & G/n/w, E/g/r & E/g/w, E/b/r & E/b/w, E/n/r & E/n/w).

Next, since ranking or a hierarchy of good is common, it may be necessary to use subscripts and the greater than (>) or less than (<) symbols to denote order. For example, Pro-Choice individuals rank Choice over abortion, i.e.

\[ G_{(Choice)} > G_{(Abortion)} \]

Alternatively for conciseness, the variables \( g_1, g_2, \ldots g_x \) can be used, e.g.,

\[ g_1 \geq g_x \] In these circumstances, these are specifically denoted, e.g., \( g_1 = \) Choice, \( g_2 = \) abortion so that i.e. \( G/g_1 > G/g_2 \)

Based on the above, male child circumcision can be designated as G/g, G/b or G/n and female child circumcision E/g or E/b. The E/b determination designation only makes sense if EVIL is the norm and specific self-recognized groups determine it as bad and work to change it.

Again, all circumcisions should be performed by experienced practitioners under safe and sanitary conditions and with appropriate attention to pain control, i.e., right. Otherwise the circumcisions are done ‘wrong’. Thus, circumcision processes can be denoted as \( /r \) or \( /w \). Note that the G, E, g, b and n variables can be omitted when the variables are not directly addressed.
In addition to the above variables, the “Subject” of the governing may proceed the ethics variables and the “Group” holding the views may follow them. For example: Abortion:G/g:Pro-Choice and Abortion:G/b:Pro-Life. Specificity to the Subject can be added in parenthesis, e.g., Capital Punishment (hanging) ://w when addressing specific right or wrong processes.

Examples are necessary to better understand the variables. A common example describes a situation of a self-recognized group fleeing another self-recognized group whose intent is to kill them. An adult with a severe cough in the fleeing group cannot stop coughing and this coughing threatens to expose their hiding place of the fleeing group. The coughing person takes another’s hand and puts it over their mouth and suffocates to death. How does one consider the governing rules of this situation?

Since the whole group was at risk for Death if the person continues coughing, some would consider his suffocation E/g while others consider it E/b since all killings are bad. Yet, is there another way to look at it? If the coughing person was violating the fleeing group members ’rights to Life, then the coughing could be considered E which is subject to a fair trial based on the facts and laws. Obviously, this trial could not be held; yet, this person's self-inflicted punishment to save the group is usually considered laudable, i.e., G/g and even heroic and not unlike a soldier who jumps on an explosive to save their fellow soldiers lives. Others may consider this E/b and believe some sort of punishable crime occurred, e.g., manslaughter or involuntary homicide. Depending on the country, prosecutors may or may not have the option to charge the accomplice/assailant.

Another example of variable use is in the elimination of poverty in the USA. Both Republicans and Democrats believe the elimination of poverty to be GOOD and good (G/g). Yet, the ’trickle down” method of cutting taxes for the rich considered right [Poverty (trickle down):G/g/r:Republicans] by Republicans is considered wrong [Poverty (trickle down):G/g/w:Democrats] by the Democrats.

Conversely, the wealth redistribution policies consider right [Poverty (wealth redistribution):G/g/r:Democrats] by the Democrats is considered wrong [Poverty (wealth redistribution):G/g/w:Republicans] by the Republicans. So, the right and wrong ways of doing GOOD/good is the major ethical issue and this methodology denotes them.

Another example of short hand variables would be lethal injections for capital punishment. It is either a GOOD or EVIL depending on the State. Yet, all agree that to execute criminal by lethal injections is right, i.e., Capital Punishment (lethal injection)://r and to execute by hanging, firing squad or electrocution wrong, i.e., and Capital Punishment (hanging, firing squad or electrocution)://w. As before since there is agreement by G/E and g/b combinations, the first two variable can be omitted.

The variables and forms for a governing specialized notational systems will need further elucidation and extensions which are beyond the scope of this preliminary paper.
Examples of governing axioms and notations usage in everyday life

In Business: The current mantra of 'maximizing shareholder returns' is EVIL since it violates the equal rights, freedoms and self-determinations of workers. What is E/g for corporate executives, boards and shareholders by returning disproportionate gains to them has become E/b for workers since it has left them truly or relatively destitute.

Over the last few decades, workers have been: a) stripped of their company funded retiree pensions and health care, b) have had their wages decoupled from increased productivity and decreased with many not getting living wages and any benefits, c) denied respect from management and d) scheduled for and/or release from work on cost savings ('just in time') basis.

These business practices are EVIL because they do not allow workers the pursuit of happiness and they are basically under-compensated 'at will' servants. For example, Walmart employees were so underpaid at one time that they received billions in food stamps.

A business mantra that maximizes company stability, provides fair wages and benefits for employees and has acceptable (but not obscene) shareholder returns is G/g for all.

In Medicine: Few clinicians practice with the conscious acknowledgement that the only prerequisite for life is death. Thus, they provide aggressive clinical care even when death is imminent. The cost/benefit ratio of clinical care provided when the benefits are zero are infinite.

This makes futile care EVIL since it denies liberty and pursuit of happiness, i.e., respect and dignity at the end of life. Ironically, this futile care is E/g for clinical services providers since it is well reimbursed while being E/b for patients and their families due to the unnecessary costs and pain and suffering it causes.

In Governance: Any efforts to limit equal rights, freedoms and/or self-determination are EVIL. Thus efforts to limit voter participation in elections is EVIL. It is E/g for those who win elections by denying others their vote and it is E/b for those denied their right to vote since it limits their equal rights and freedoms. Also, gerrymandering to win a disproportionate number of positions in relation to the votes received is also EVIL.

In addition, cutting taxes and limiting the safety nets of support during economic crisis is EVIL. It is E/g for the wealthy since it enriches them more and it is E/b for workers who are impoverished by current EVIL business practices. The GOOD way to reduce government Safety Net services and costs is to have organizations provide living wages and benefits to their workers. This would make these Government services unnecessary.

Any laws that make abortion more difficult are EVIL because the make the life, liberty and pursuit of happiness more difficult for women wanting abortions.

Also, progressive taxes on incomes and property must be emphasized over regressive taxes such as sales tax. Value-added taxes used in most of the world is a better option not used in the USA. Tax revenue must then be used to re-
store safety nets and affordable college education (GOOD) for those in need.

The institutional racism that led to safety nets being cut and colleges being unaffordable should be countered.

Finally, Plutocracies are EVIL since they favor the wealthy and maintains their wealth, power and control. Governments should take all measures to assure that wealth does not provide more governance influence than it does basic citizenship. Thus, the US Supreme Court Citizens United decision is EVIL. If corporations are 'citizens', then corporate leaders should be individually accountable for any crimes by the corporation. Allowing corporations to pay fines for their crimes in a violation of equal protection under the law since Individual felons are not allow to just pay fines.

In Society: It is EVIL to believe that the systematic political, social and economic impoverishment of certain groups is no longer occurring. Systemic racism and dog whistle politics remain the norm. Declaring historically impoverish and underserved subpopulations such as Black Americans and Appalachian whites 'equal' because of the passage of Civil Rights laws is self-deluding and self-serving. They must be assisted up to the starting line where the historically politically, socially and economically advantaged populations are currently. Without this assistance they will never catch up to those who had a head start.

Thus, Affirmative Action efforts based on socio-economic status are GOOD. Socio-economic status rather than race should be the basis of assistance since there are small yet significant numbers of these groups that have 'caught up' and do not need these services. Also, the historic identification of 'Latino' or 'Hispanic' allowed many foreign children of wealthy parents to take advantage of these social assistance programs. That is not the intentions of these programs.

In Education: Though laudable, to believe and plan for every child to go to college, it EVIL. It is EVIL because it encourages high schools student who know that they don’t want to or can’t go to college to drop out of High School.

Instead a GOOD system would identify these students by the 10th grade and offer advanced work skills training and apprenticeships in the high paying trades. Those identified as college bound can then have more intensive education to bypass the need for the common first year college remediation programs.

In addition, all students by the 10th grade should have ‘Life Skills Training. These skills should include: 1) daily living skills training like cooking, laundering, house keeping, child care, etc.; 2) work skills training like interviewing, customer service, etc.; and 3) common legal skills training like rent/lease/mortgage agreement understanding, credit card applications implications, etc.

Finally, the ‘Zero Tolerance’ policy in Education is equivalent to ‘Absolute Intolerance’ and EVIL. In all schools, a football player that fights on the football field may be ejected from the game at worse. On the other hand in some of these schools a student who fights on the playground is arrested and
treated as a felon. Zero tolerance is basically EVIL since it does not provide a ‘fair trial’ to each individual.

Conclusions

The axioms enumerated and specialized notational system described are suggested as beginning elements for transforming Governing into a science. Disputes will be the norm in not only the axioms suggested but also in determining what is GOOD and EVIL. Not unexpectedly, the few who do EVIL will provide the most push back. It will take the will of all Individuals who are equal to protect and gain/regain their inalienable rights of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness and preserve their freedoms of thought, conscience, religion, belief and self-determination. The uncertainty of these rights and freedoms is always constant and vigilance is required. Governing as a science is advanced as a way to assist in this vigilance.