Moral Words

MFT Dictionary 1.0

righteous*, moral*, ethic*, value*, upstanding, good, goodness, principle*, blameless, exemplary, lesson, canon, doctrine, noble, worth*, ideal*, praiseworthy, commendable, character, proper, laudable, correct , wrong*, evil, immoral*, bad, offend*, offensive*, transgress*

15) "these studies suggest that anger and disgust are common responses to moral transgressions, but that anger is, in a sense, more open to reason and revision based on new information." - 24

Collective vs Individual Morality

6) "we refer to these two foundations as the individualizing foundations because they are .. the source of the intuitions that make the liberal philosophical tradition, with its emphasis on the rights and welfare of individuals, so learnable and so compelling to so many people." - 1031

6) "we refer to those three foundations as the binding foundations, because they are … the source of the intuitions that make conservative and religious moralities, with their emphasis on group-binding loyalty, duty, and self-control, so learnable and so compelling to so many people." - 1031

Care

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues" from *Daedalus*, Vol. 133, No. 4, On Human Nature (Fall 2004), p. 55-66.

Care/Suffering is triggered by "suffering and vulnerability of one's children" to "baby seals and cartoon characters." It's emotions are "compassion" and virtues "kindness, compassion."[1]

"Suffering/compassion […] when they see others (particularly young others) suffering, and others causing that suffering."[2]

"The prolonged dependence characteristics of primates, especially humans, made it necessary, or at least beneficial, for mothers to detect signs of suffering and distress in their offspring. Mothers who were good at detecting such signals went on to rear more surviving offspring, and over time a communication system developed in which children's stylized distress signals triggered maternal aid."[3]

"The proper domain is the sight of one's own child showing the stereotypical signs of distress or fear. The proper domain may have extended to distress shown by all kin as well. […] This includes the suffering of other people's children, starving adults seen on television, images of baby seals being clubbed to death, and our pet dogs that droop, mope, whine, and break our hearts as we prepare to go off to work each morning."[4]

---

1   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 59.
2   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 59.
3   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 59.
4   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 60.

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," in *The Innate Mind*, Vol 3: Foundations and the Future (Jan 2008), p 367-392.
Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 382.

Harm/Care addresses the challenge to "protect and care for young, vulnerable, or injured kin," is triggered by "suffering, distress, or threat to one's kin" to "baby seals, cartoon characters." It's emotions are "compassion" and virtues "kindness, compassion."[5]

"Mammals by definition face the need to care for vulnerable offspring, and nothing could be more central to evolutionary success than keeping these offspring alive. […] many mammals have innate harm detection modules […] to be responsive to the proper domain signs of suffering in their offspring. […] suffering by or harm to almost any childlike entity is part of the actual domain of this module."[6]

"rearing children and helping kin"[7]

Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations," in *Journal of Personality and Social Philosophy*, Vol 96 No 5 (2009), 1029-1046.

"the widespread human concern with caring, nurturing, and protecting vulnerable individuals from harm fits well with writings about the evolution of empathy (de Waal, 2008) and the attachment system (Bowlby, 1969)."[8]

test questions:
"harmed ... suffered emotionally ... used violence ... cared for someone weak or vulnerable ... mother slapping her child ... kill a human being ... protect all people from harm"[9]

"kick a dog … kill an [endangered] animal … cruel remarks … safe, peace, compassion, empath, sympath, care, protect, shield, shelter, amity, secur, benefit, defen, guard, preserve, harm, suffer, war, … fight, violen, hurt, kill, … endanger, cruel, brutal, abuse, damag, ruin, ravage, detriment, crush, attack, annihilate, destroy, stomp, adandon, spurn, impair, exploit, … wound."[10]

Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians" in Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification, Oxford Scholarship Online (May 2009), p 371-401.
Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 381.

"harm/care: the challenge of protecting and caring for vulnerable offspring and kin made it adaptive for individuals to notice suffering and harm-doing, and to be motivated to relieve suffering … kin altruism [Hamilton, 1964], augmented by research on empathy/compassion [Hoffman, 1982].)"[11]

"opposition to violence … protection from criminals … concerned about exploitation of workers and environment … help victims … concern for oppressed minority"[12]

---

5   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 382.
6   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 383.
7   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 385.
8   Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1031.
9   Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1044.
10   Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1045.
11   Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 381.
12   Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 395.

Haidt, Jonathan and Selin Kesebir, "Morality," in *Handbook of Social Psychology, 5ᵗʰ ed.,* **edited by Fisk and Gilbert, 2009, p 1-46.**

"1. Harm/care: concerns for the suffering of others, including virtues of caring and compassion."[13]

Haidt, Jonathan, and Jesse Graham and Craig Joseph, "Above and Below Left-Right: Ideological Narratives and Moral Foundations" in *Psychological Inquiry,* **Vol 20, No 2/3 (April-September 2009), p. 110-119.**
Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 111

"1. Harm/care: basic concerns for the suffering of others, including virtues of caring and compassion"[14]
"legalizing gay marriage is a straightforward way to reduce harm (to innocent victims)"[15]

Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* **Vol 101, No 2, 2011, 366-385.**

"Harm-related groups were nurses, environmentalist, pacifists, vegetarians, and hunters (r)."[16]
"kind/caring, sympathetic/compassionate, generous/giving, empathy, benevolence"[17]
"suffered emotionally … cared for someone weak or vulnerable … was cruel … compassion ... hurt a defenseless animal … kill a human being"[18]

Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind.* **Vintage Books (New York), 2012.**
Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind,* 2012, 154.

Care:

"When the first mammals began suckling their young, they raised the cost of motherhood. … Mammals make fewer bets and invest a lot more in each one, so mammals face the challenge of caring for a nurturing their children for a long time. Primate moms place even fewer bets and invest still more in each one. And human babies, whose brains are so enormous that a child must [be born] before he or she can walk, are bets so huge that a woman […] needs help […] to deliver the baby, and help to feed and care for the child. … adaptive challenge to care for the vulnerable and expensive child, keep it safe, keep it alive, keep it from harm."[19]

"Mothers who were innately sensitive to signs of suffering, distress, or neediness improved their odds, relative to their less sensitive sisters."[20]

"The suffering of your own children is the original trigger of one of the key modules of the Care foundation … the adaptive challenge of protecting and caring for children."[21]

---

13 Haidt, Jonathan and Selin Kesebir, "Morality," 2009, 41.
14 Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 111-112.
15 Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 112.
16 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 374-375.
17 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 377.
18 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 385.
19 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind,* 2012, 153-154.
20 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind,* 2012, 154.
21 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind,* 2012, 155.

"the beginning of attachment theory, a well-supported theory that describes the system by which mothers and children regulate each other's behavior so that the child gets a good mix of protection and opportunities for independent exploration."[22]

"certain proportions and patterns that distinguish human children from adults. Cuteness primes us to care, nurture, protect, and interact"[23]

"it makes no evolutionary sense for you to care about what happens to … a hungry child in a faraway country, or a baby seal … we care about violence toward many more classes of victims today than our grandparents did in their time."[24]

"save Darfur … protect innocent victims … wounded warrior … conservative caring is somewhat different – it is aimed not at animals or at people in other countries but at those who've sacrificed for the group. It is not universalist; it is more local, and blended with loyalty."[25]

Graham, Jesse, and Jonathan Haidt. "Sacred values and evil adversaries: A moral foundations approach." in M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *The social psychology of morality: Exploring the causes of good and evil*. **American Psychological Association, 2012, 11–31.**

p. 24 apprendix graph:
"harm … nurturance, care, peace … innocent victims, nonviolent leaders (Ghandi, M.L. King) … cruel and violent people … killing of abortion doctors, Weather Underground bombings."

Ditto, Peter et al., "Tracing the Threads: How Five Moral Concerns (Especially Purity) Help Explain Culture War Attitudes." in Journal of Research in Personality, Vol 46 (2012), 184-194.

page 185:
"The harm/care foundation leads us to disapprove of individual that cause pain and suffering and to approve of those who prevent or alleviate harm."

Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory: the pragmatic validity of moral pluralism," November 28, 2012. unpublished manuscript, 1-64..

"The Care/harm foundation: All mammals face the adaptive challenge of caring for vulnerable offspring for an extended period of time. Human children are unusually dependent, and for an unusually long time. It is hard to imagine that in the book of human nature, the chapter on mothering is completely blank … leaving it up to new others to learn from their culture, or from trial and error, what to do when their baby shows signs of hunger or injury. Rather, mammalian life has always been a competition in which females whose intuitive reactions to their children were optimized to detect signs of suffering, distress, or neediness raised more children to adulthood than their less sensitive sisters. … perceptions of suffering to motivations to care, nurture, and protect … triggers … signs of suffering, distress, or neediness … other children, by baby animals … stuffed animals and cartoon characters … suffering people (even adults) far away … compassion for victims … mixed with anger toward those who cause harm."[26]

---

22 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 155.
23 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 155.
24 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 155-156.
25 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 157-158.
26 Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory..." 2012, 12.

"Care foundation (i.e., empathy and nurturance; Iirdy, 2009; Preston & de Waal, 2002) … infants don't like puppets who harm others … like puppets who help others"[27]

p. 58 graph:

Care/harm: Protect and care for children … suffering, distress, or neediness expressed by one's child … baby seals, cute cartoon characters … compassion for victim; anger at perpetrator … caring, kindness

p 61 graph:

Care: playground harm … affective response to cruelty and violence … kin selection Hamilton (1964) … attachment theory Bowlby (1969)

MFT Dictionary 1.0

Care: positive words
safe*, peace*, compassion*, empath*, sympath*, care, caring, protect*, shield, shelter, amity, secur*. benefit*, defen*, guard*, preserve
Care: negative words
harm*, suffer*, war, wars, warl*, warring, fight* violen*, hurt*, kill, kills, killer*, killed killing, endanger*, cruel*, brutal*, abuse*, damag*, ruin*, ravage, detriment*, crush*, attack*, annihilate*, destroy, stomp, abandon*, spurn, impair, exploit, exploits, exploited, exploiting, wound*

MFT Dictionary 2.0

Care:
kindness, compassion, nurture, empathy, suffer, cruel, hurt, harm

181) care – innocent victims

Fairness

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues" from *Daedalus*, Vol. 133, No. 4, On Human Nature (Fall 2004), p. 55-66.

Fairness/Reciprocity is triggered by "cheating vs cooperation in joint ventures, food sharing" to "marital fidelity, broken vending machines." It's emotions are "anger/guilt vs. gratitude" and virtues "fairness, justice, trustworthiness."[28]

"Reciprocity/Fairness […] when they see others cheat or fail to repay favors."[29]

"A readiness for reciprocity evolves to help animals, particularly primates, reap the benefits of cooperating with non-kin. Individuals who felt bad when they cheated, and who were motivated to get

---

27 Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory..." 2012, 39.
28 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 59.
29 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 59.

revenge when they were cheated, were able to engage successful in more non-zero-sum games with others."[30]

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," in *The Innate Mind*, Vol 3: Foundations and the Future (Jan 2008), p 367-392.

<u>Fairness/Reciprocity</u> addresses the challenge to "reap benefits of dyadic cooperation with non-kin," is triggered by "cheating, cooperation, deception" to "marital fidelity, broken vending machines." It's emotions are "anger, gratitude, guilt" and virtues "fairness, justice, trustworthiness (dishonesty)."[31]

"a suite of cultural products, such as virtue and vice words related to fairness, religious injunctions about reciprocity, cultural constructs such as rights, and social institutions related to justice."[32]

"selectively cooperating with non-kin while remaining vigilant for cheaters"[33]

Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations," in *Journal of Personality and Social Philosophy*, Vol 96 No 5 (2009), 1029-1046.

"the human obsession with <u>fairness, reciprocity, and justice</u> fits well with evolutionary writings about reciprocal altruism (Trivers, 1971)."[34]

test questions:
"treated differently than others … denied his or her rights … acted unfairly … profiting more than others, cut in with me on a long line, justice, fairness, equality"[35]

"cheat in a game … steal from poor person … no […] to help [friend] move […] after he help you move … throw out box of ballots … secret-but-binding pledge to only hire people of your race … fair, … equal, justice, … reciproc, impartial, egalitar, rights, equity, evenness, equivalent, unbias, tolerant, equable, balance, homologous, unprejudice, reasonable, constant, honest, unfair, unequal, bias, unjust injust, bigot, discriminat, disproportion, inequitable, prejud, dishonest, unscrupulous, dissociate, preference, favoritism, segregat, exclusion, exclud"[36]

Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians" in Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification, Oxford Scholarship Online (May 2009), p 371-401.

"<u>fairness/reciprocity</u>: the challenge of reaping the benefits of cooperation with individuals who are not close kin made it adaptive for individuals to be cooperative while being vigilant about and punitive towards cheaters (See Trivers' [1971] theory of reciprocal altruism, which suggests that a set of moral emotions is the psychological mechanism by which reciprocity is implemented. See also Brosnan, 2006.)"[37]

---

30 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 59.
31 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 382.
32 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 383.
33 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 385.
34 Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1031.
35 Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1044.
36 Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1045.
37 Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 381.

"punishment should fit the crime … suspicious of mass wealth accruing … concerned about corporate manipulation of government … against giving something for nothing … increase equality … individual rights and autonomy."[38]

Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians" in Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification, Oxford Scholarship Online (May 2009), p 371-401.

"fairness/reciprocity: the challenge of reaping the benefits of cooperation with individuals who are not close kin made it adaptive for individuals to be cooperative while being vigilant about and punitive towards cheaters (See Trivers' [1971] theory of reciprocal altruism, which suggests that a set of moral emotions is the psychological mechanism by which reciprocity is implemented. See also Brosnan, 2006.)"[39]

"punishment should fit the crime … suspicious of mass wealth accruing … concerned about corporate manipulation of government … against giving something for nothing … increase equality … individual rights and autonomy."[40]

Haidt, Jonathan, and Jesse Graham and Craig Joseph, "Above and Below Left-Right: Ideological Narratives and Moral Foundations" in *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol 20, No 2/3 (April-September 2009), p. 110-119.

"2. Fairness/reciprocity: concerns about unfair treatment, inequality, and more abstract notions of justice."[41]
"without hurting anyone else while increasing fairness (including issues of equality and rights)."[42]

Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol 101, No 2, 2011, 366-385.

"fairness-related groups were American Civil Liberties Union members, labor unions, rich people (r)."[43]
"fair/just, social justice"[44]
"treated differently … acted unfairly, denied his or her rights … treated fairly … justice … wrong that rich inherit a lot … poor children inherit nothing."[45]

Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*. Vintage Books (New York), 2012.

Fairness:

"Suppose a coworker offers to take on your workload … it's a big favor, and you can't repay your coworker by bringing back a bottle of rum … if you accept … you're likely to do so while gushing forth expressions of gratitude, praise for her kindness, and a promise to do the same"[46]

---

38 Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 395.
39 Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 381.
40 Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 395.
41 Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 111-112.
42 Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 112.
43 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 375.
44 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 377.
45 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 385.
46 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 158.

"'selfish' genes can give rise to generous creatures, as long as those creatures are selective in their generosity. Altruism toward kin is not a puzzle at all. Altruism toward non-kin, on the other hand, has presented one of the longest-running puzzles … Robert Trivers published his theory of reciprocal altruism."[47]

"individuals … remember their prior interactions with other individuals and then limit their current niceness to those who were likely to repay the favor. … Trivers proposed that we evolved a set of moral emotions that make us play 'tit for tat'"[48]

"human life is a series of opportunities for mutually beneficial cooperation. If we play our cards right, we can work with others to enlarge the pie that we ultimately share … for millions of years, our ancestors faced the adaptive challenge of reaping these benefits without getting suckered."[49]

not "help anyone who needs it" or "take but don't give"[50]

"the original triggers of the fairness modules are acts of cooperation or selfishness that people show towards us. we feel pleasure, liking, and friendship when people sow signs that they can be trusted to reciprocate. We feel anger, contempt, and even sometimes disgust when people try to cheat us or take advantage of us."[51]
"on the left, concerns about equality and social justice are based in part on the fairness foundation – wealthy and powerful groups are accused of gaining by exploiting those at the bottom while not paying their 'fair share' of the tax burden." i.e. occupy wall street[52]

"on the right, the tea party movement is also very concerned about fairness. … who take money from hardworking Americans and give it to lazy people … and to illegal immigrants."[53]

"on the left, fairness often implies equality, but on the right it means proportionality-- people should be reward in proportion to what they contribute, even if that guarantees unequal outcomes."[54]

"it seems to take more than just a high level of social intelligence to get reciprocal altruism going … gossiping, punitive, moralistic community"[55]

"why did most players pay to punish? In part, because it felt good to do so. … we want to see cheaters and slackers 'get what's coming to them.' we want the law of karma to run its course."[56]

"Fairness … no longer about equality *and* proportionality. It is primarily about proportionality."[57]

47 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 158.
48 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 158-159.
49 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 159.
50 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 159.
51 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 159.
52 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 159.
53 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 160.
54 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 161.
55 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 207.
56 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 209.
57 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 209.

"look beyond *individuals* trying to choose partners … protect their *communities* from cheaters, slackers, and free riders, who, if allowed to continue their ways without harassment, would cause others to stop cooperating, which would cause society to unravel."[58]

"everyone gets angry when people take more than they deserve."[59]

"retribution causes harm, and harm activates the Care/harm foundation."[60]

"see cheaters punished and good citizens rewarded in proportion to their deeds."[61]

Graham, Jesse, and Jonathan Haidt. "Sacred values and evil adversaries: A moral foundations approach." in M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *The social psychology of morality: Exploring the causes of good and evil*. American Psychological Association, 2012, 11–31.

p. 24 apprendix graph:
"fairness … justice, karma, reciprocity … the oppressed, the unavenged … racists, oppressors capitalists … vengeance killings, reciprocal attacks, feuds"

Ditto, Peter et al., "Tracing the Threads: How Five Moral Concerns (Especially Purity) Help Explain Culture War Attitudes." in Journal of Research in Personality, Vol 46 (2012), 184-194.

page 185:
"The fairness/reciprocity foundation makes us sensitive to issues of equality and justice and leads us to frown upon people that violate these principles. … relates to a concern for inequality"

Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory: the pragmatic validity of moral pluralism," November 28, 2012. unpublished manuscript, 1-64..

"The Fairness/cheating foundation. All social animals face recurrent opportunities to engage in non-zero-sum exchanges and relationships. … sensitive to evidence of cheating and cooperation, and to react with emotions that compel them to play 'tit for tat' … triggers … cheating or cooperation by one's own direct interaction partners … interactions with inanimate objects (e.g. you put in a dollar, and the machine fails to deliver a soda), or interactions among third parties that one learns about through gossip … good partners for exchange relationship are praised with virtue words such as fair, just, and trustworthy."[62]

"precursors of Fairness (Brosnan, 2006), but it is more anecdotal, and the limited lab evidence (e.g., Brosnan & de Waal, 2003) has been disputed (Brauer, Call, & Tomasello, 2009; see also Hammerstein, 2003). … infants are also sensitive to third-party fairness violations … this sensitive predicted infants' own altruistic sharing behavior … children as young as three are adept at sharing rewards equally, but only when they both cooperated to produce the benefit."[63]

p. 58 graph:

---

58 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 210.
59 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 212-213.
60 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 213.
61 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 215.
62 Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory..." 2012, 13.
63 Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory..." 2012, 39.

Fairness/cheating: reap benefits of two-way partnerships … cheating, cooperation, deception … marital fidelity, broken vending machines … anger, gratitude, guilt … fairness, justice, trustworthiness

p 61 graph:

Fairness: cheating cheaters … affective response to cheating; unfairness and inequality

MFT Dictionary 1.0

<u>Fair: positive words</u>
fair, fairly, fairness, fair-*, fairmind*, fairplay, equal*, justice, justness, justifi*, reciproc*, impartial*, egalitar*, rights, equity, evenness, equivalent, unbias*, tolerant, equable, balance*, homologous, unprejudice*, reasonable, constant, honest*
<u>Fair: negative words</u>
unfair*, unequal*, bias*, unjust*, injust*, bigot*, discriminat*, disproportion*, inequitable, prejud*, dishonest, unscrupulous, dissociate, preference, favoritism, segregat*, exclusion, exclud*

MFT Dictionary 2.0

Fairness:
fairness, equality, justice, rights, cheat, fraud, unfair, injustice

12) practices of reciprocal gift exchange – Mauss – reciprocal altruism – Trivers – 368
14) "reciprocal gift-giving as a means of forging relationships" - Malinowski - 5
14) "evolutionary dicussions of 'reciprocal altruism'" - Trivers – 5

181) fairness – money from hardworkers for cheaters, slackers, irresponsible fools

196) emergence of two types of fairness – not all equality, some proportionality: "people who work hard should get to keep the fruits of their labor. People who are lazy and irresponsible should suffer the consequences."

are both about reciprocal altruism?

197) "the desire for equality seems to be more closely related to the psychology of liberty and oppression tan to the psychology of reciprocity and exchange"

<div align="center">

<u>Loyalty</u>

</div>

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues" from *Daedalus*, Vol. 133, No. 4, On Human Nature (Fall 2004), p. 55-66.

<u>Loyalty</u>: "an 'ingroup' module whose proper domain is the boundaries of a co-residing kin group, and whose actual domain now includes all the ethnic groups, teams, and hobbyist gatherings that contribute

to modern identities. To the extent that people feel a bond of trust or loyalty toward strangers, the operation of such an ingroup module seems likely."[64]

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," in *The Innate Mind*, Vol 3: Foundations and the Future (Jan 2008), p 367-392.

<u>In-group/Loyalty</u> addresses the challenge to "reap benefits from group cooperation," is triggered by "threat or challenge to the group," to "sports teams one roots for." It's emotions are "group pride, belongingness; rage at traitors" and virtues "loyalty, patriotism, self-sacrifice (treason, cowardice)."[65]

"human tendency to aggregate into tribes, gangs, and teams that compete with other tribes, gangs, and teams. […] people will form such groups on the basis of even trivial similarities; groups based on shared blood, religion, or language are vastly more powerful. Conflicts over territory or attacks from other groups seem to call particularly keenly upon virtues related to this foundation […] vigilant about and punitive towards traitors, profiteers, and slackers […] moralization of unity during wartime."[66]

"initiation rites that create a strong in-group"[67]

"forming strong in-groups for the purpose of cross-group competition"[68]

"De Waal suggests that a building block of human morality visible in chimpanzees is the desire for peace and harmony within the group. Celebrations break out when long-simmering power struggles are resolved […] prefer harmony within the cooperative groups upon which they depend both for material sustenance and for intergroup defense."[69]

Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations," in *Journal of Personality and Social Philosophy*, Vol 96 No 5 (2009), 1029-1046.

"virtues of <u>loyalty, patriotism</u>, and self-sacrifice for the group, combined with an extreme vigilance for traitors, matched recent work on the evolution of 'coalitional psychology' (Kurzban, Tooby, & Cosmides, 2001)."[70]

test questions:
"betray his or her group … action was done by a friend or relative of yours … showed a lack of loyalty … action affected your group … put the interests of the group above his/her own … turn [my brother] in [for murder] … friendships and romantic relationships [with] only members of their own ethnic or religious group … well-being of people in our nation [...] at the expense of people in other nations"[71]

"bet against your favorite sports team … burn your country's flag … say something bad about your nation … break off all communications with […] family, renounce your citizenship, leave the social group, club, or team, together, nation, homeland, family, families, familial, group, loyal, patriot,

---

64   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 63.
65   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 382.
66   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 383.
67   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 384.
68   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 385.
69   Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 391.
70   Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1031.
71   Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1044.

communal, … cadre, collectiv, joint, unison, unite, fellow, guild, solidarity, devot, member, cliqu, cohort, ally, insider, foreign, ene, betray, treason, traitor, treacher, disloyal, individual, apostasy … deserted, … deceiv, jilt, imposter, miscreant, spy, sequester, renegade, terroris, immigra"[72]

Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians" in Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification, Oxford Scholarship Online (May 2009), p 371-401.

"ingroup/loyalty: the challenge of reaping the benefits of cooperation in groups larger than dyads, particularly in the presence of intergroup competition for resources, made it adaptive for people to value belonging to groups while being vigilant about and hostile toward cheaters, slackers, free-riders, and traitors. (see the emerging literature on the evolution of 'coalitional psychology,' e.g. Kurzban, Tooby, & Cosmides, 2001. See also Wright [2000] on the ever-expanding 'non-zero-sumness' of social life.)"[73]

"dislike of freeloaders within the group … valuation of 'our' traditions … take care of their own … American is a Christian nation … gays seen as outsiders"[74]

Haidt, Jonathan and Selin Kesebir, "Morality," in *Handbook of Social Psychology, 5th ed.*, edited by Fisk and Gilbert, 2009, p 1-46.

"3. Ingroup/loyalty: concerns related to obligations of group membership, such as loyalty, self-sacrifice and vigilance against betrayal."[75]
"Ingroup/loyalty is associated with racism, ethnocentrism, and nationalism"[76]

Haidt, Jonathan, and Jesse Graham and Craig Joseph, "Above and Below Left-Right: Ideological Narratives and Moral Foundations" in *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol 20, No 2/3 (April-September 2009), p. 110-119.

"3. Ingroup/loyalty: concerns related to obligations of group membership, such as loyalty, self-sacrifice and vigilance against betrayal."[77]

"gay people as members of a different culture (attacking or infiltrating the heterosexual ingroup)"[78]

Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol 101, No 2, 2011, 366-385.

"Ingroup-related groups were Americans, U.S. Government, flag burners (r), and illegal immigrants (r)."[79]
"loyalty, national security, family security, loyal/faithful"[80]

---

72 Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1045-1046.
73 Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 381.
74 Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 395.
75 Haidt, Jonathan and Selin Kesebir, "Morality," 2009, 41.
76 Haidt, Jonathan and Selin Kesebir, "Morality," 2009, 42-43.
77 Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 111-112.
78 Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 112.
79 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 375.
80 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 377.

"showed love for his or her country … betray his or her group … showed a lack of loyalty … proud of my country's history … loyal to their family members … more important to be a team player"[81]

Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*. Vintage Books (New York), 2012.

Loyalty:

"marking territory and creating tribal identities."[82]

"norms, songs, rituals, and distinctive identities began to form in each group … about to face a rival group that claimed the same territory."[83]

"all activities which might now become competitive (tent pitching, baseball, etc.) was entered into with more zest and also with most efficiency … tribal behavior increased … hung [flags] in contested territory … raided and vandalized … made weapons."[84]

"boy and men *enjoy* doing the sort of things that lead to group cohesion and success in conflicts between groups (including warfare). The virtue of loyalty matters a great deal to both sexes, though the objects of loyalty tend to be teams and coalitions for boys, in contrast to two-person relationships for girls."[85]

"chimpanzees guard their territory, raid the territory of rivals, and, if they can pull it off, pull the males of he neighborhood group and take their territory and their females. … warfare has been a constant feature of human life … forming and maintaining coalitions that could fend off challenges and attacks from rival groups."[86]

"original trigger … anything that tells you who is a team player and who is a traitor, particularly when your team is fighting with other teams. But because we love tribalism so much, we seek out ways to form groups and teams that can compete just for the fun of competing … a trophy is evidence of victory."[87]

"the love of loyal teammates is matched by a corresponding hatred of traitors, who are usually considered to be far worse than enemies … far worse than lust, gluttony, violence, or even heresy is the betrayal of one's family, team, or nation."[88]

"sensitive to signs that another person is (or is not) a team player."[89]

Graham, Jesse, and Jonathan Haidt. "Sacred values and evil adversaries: A moral foundations approach." in M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *The social psychology of morality: Exploring the causes of good and evil*. American Psychological Association, 2012, 11–31.

81 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 385.
82 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 161.
83 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 162.
84 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 162.
85 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 162.
86 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 163.
87 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 163.
88 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 164.
89 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 178.

p. 24 apprendix graph:
"ingroup … loyalty, self-sacrifice for group … homeland, nation, flag, ethnic group … traitors, outgroup, members and their culture … ethnic grudges, genocides, violent punishment for betrayals"

Ditto, Peter et al., "Tracing the Threads: How Five Moral Concerns (Especially Purity) Help Explain Culture War Attitudes." in Journal of Research in Personality, Vol 46 (2012), 184-194.

page 185:
"The ingroup/loyalty foundation is based on our attachment to groups (e.g. our family, church, or country), leading us to approve of those who contribute to the group's well-being and cohesion."

Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory: the pragmatic validity of moral pluralism," November 28, 2012. unpublished manuscript, 1-64..

"The Loyalty/betrayal foundation. Chimpanzee troops compete with other troops for territory (Goodall, 1986); coalitions of chimps compete with other coalitions within troop for rank and power (de Waal, 1982). But when humans develop language, weapon, and tribal markers, such intergroup competition became far more decisive for survival. … form cohesive coalitions … winning teams in such competitions. … sports fandom and brand loyalty are examples"[90]

"the Loyalty foundation (coalitional behavior and inter-coalitional conflict; de Waal, 1982) … infants notice markers of ingroup membership and prefer members of their ingroup … and even prefer those who help similar others and harm dissimilar others"[91]

p. 58 graph:

Loyalty/betrayal: form cohesive coalitions, threat or challenge to group, sports teams, nations, group pride, rage at traitors … loyalty, patriotism, self-sacrifice

p 61 graph:

Loyalty: the black sheep effect … affective response to ingroup betrayals … multi-level selection D.S. Wilson (2002); Tribalism, Richerson & Boyd (2005)

MFT Dictionary 1.0

<u>Loyal: positive words</u>
together, nation*, homeland* , family, families, familial, group, loyal*, patriot*, communal, commune*, communit*, communis*, comrad*, cadre, collectiv*, joint, unison, unite*, fellow*. Guild   , solidarity, devot*, member, cliqu*, cohort, ally, insider
<u>Loyal: negative words</u>
foreign*, enem*, betray*, treason*, traitor*, treacher*, disloyal*, individual*, apostasy. Apostate, deserted, deserter*, deserting, deceiv*, jilt*, imposter, miscreant, spy, sequester, renegade, terroris*, immigra*

MFT Dictionary 2.0

---

90   Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory..." 2012, 13.
91   Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory..." 2012, 39.

Loyalty:
loyal, team player, patriot, fidelity, betray, treason, disloyal, traitor

181) loyality – patriotism, military values

<p style="text-align:center">Authority</p>

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues" from *Daedalus*, Vol. 133, No. 4, On Human Nature (Fall 2004), p. 55-66.

Authority/Hierarchy is triggered by "physical size and strength, domination, and protection" to "bosses, gods." It's emotions are "resentment vs. respect/awe" and virtues "obedience, deference, loyalty."[92]

"Hierarchy respect […] when they see others who are disrespectful or who do not behave in a manner befitting their status in the group."[93]

"Psychological preparation for hierarchy evolved to help animals living in social groups make the most of their relative abilities to dominate others. Given the unequal distribution of strength, skill, and luck, those individuals who had the right emotional reactions to play along successfully and work their way up through the ranks did better than those who refused to play subordinate role or who failed to handle the perks of power gracefully."[94]

"arrogant behavior by subordinates triggers contempt"[95]

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," in *The Innate Mind*, Vol 3: Foundations and the Future (Jan 2008), p 367-392.

Authority/Respect addresses the challenge to "negotiate hierarchy, defer selectively," is triggered by "signs of dominance and submission" to "bosses, respected professionals." It's emotions are "respect, fear" and virtues "obedience, deference (disobedience, uppitiness)."[96]

"life in dominance hierarchies. Many primates live in such hierarchies […] common display pattern of dominance and submission […] authority ranking is a two-way street: subordinates must show respect and deference, but superiors must then protect them from external threats and maintain order within the group. […] virtues govern the behavior of superiors (e.g. impartiality, magnanimity, fatherliness) and subordinates (e.g. respect, deference)"[97]

"the ways hierarchy and submission are marked"[98] "organizing themselves hierarchically"[99]

---

92 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 59.
93 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 58.
94 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 59.
95 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 60.
96 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 382.
97 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 384.
98 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 384.
99 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 385.

Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations," in *Journal of Personality and Social Philosophy*, Vol 96 No 5 (2009), 1029-1046.

"virtues of <u>subordinates</u> (e.g. obedience and respect for authority) paired with virtues of <u>authorities</u> (such as leadership and protection) matched writings on the evolution of hierarchy in primates (de Waal, 1982) and the ways that human hierarchy became more dependent on the consent of subordinates (Boehm, 1999)."[100]

test questions:
"same rank or status … fulfill the duties of his or her role … lack of respect for legitimate authority … authority failed to protect his/her subordinates … respected the traditions of society … different roles to play in society … obey [commanding officer] anyway because that is my duty … respect for authority … respect the traditions and heritage of a country."[101]

"curse your parents … curse the founders or early heroes of your counry … disrespectful hand guesture to your boss, teacher, or professor … throw a rotten tomato at a political leader … slap your father … obey, obedien, duty, law, lawful, legal, duti, honor, respect, … order, father, mother, … tradition, hierarch, authorit, permit, permission, status, rank, leader, class, bourgeoisie, caste, position, complian, command, supremacy, control, submi, allegian, serve, abide, defere, defer, revere, venerat, comply, defian, rebel, dissent, subver, disrespect, disobe, sediti, agiat, insubordinat, llegal, lawless, insurgent, mutinous, defy, dissident, unfaithful, alienate, defector, heretic, nonconformist, oppose, protest, refuse, denounce, remonstrate, riot, obstruct"[102]

Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians" in Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification, Oxford Scholarship Online (May 2009), p 371-401.

"<u>Authority/respect</u>: The challenge of negotiating rank in social hierarchies that existed throughout most of human and earlier primate evolution made it adaptive for individuals to recognize signs of status and show proper respect and deference upward, while offering some protection and showing some restraint towards subordinates. (Note that human hierarchies depend much more strong on 'freely conferred deference' [Henrich and Gil-White, 2001] than on the threat of force, which plays such a large role in chimpanzee hierarchies. See Boehm, 1999, and Fiske, 1991, on how human authority ranking is a two-way street with mutual obligations and limitations on power.)"[103]

"favoring police powers to keep order and punish deviants … favoring hierarchy based on hard work and earned wealth … fear that 'subversive' art and music encourages rebellion in youth … laws are most effective when they match the laws of God … gays seen as nonconformists and threats to traditional family structure"[104]

Haidt, Jonathan and Selin Kesebir, "Morality," in *Handbook of Social Psychology, 5th ed.*, edited by Fisk and Gilbert, 2009, p 1-46.

---

100 Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1031.
101 Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1044.
102 Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1045-1046.
103 Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 381-382.
104 Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 395.

"4. Authority/respect: concerns related to social order and the obligations of hierarchical relationships, such as obedience, respect, and proper role fulfillment."[105]
"authority/respect is associated with oppression, authoritarianism, and system justification (Jost & Hunyady, 2002)"[106]

Haidt, Jonathan, and Jesse Graham and Craig Joseph, "Above and Below Left-Right: Ideological Narratives and Moral Foundations" in *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol 20, No 2/3 (April-September 2009), p. 110-119.

"4. Authority/respect: concerns related to social order and the obligations of hierarchical relationships, such as obedience, respect, and proper role fulfillment."[107]
"who subvert gender roles (rejecting the authority of church, law, and tradition)"[108]

Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol 101, No 2, 2011, 366-385.

"Authority-related groups were soldiers, police officers, U.S. Marine, U.S. Military, people who spank their children, and anarchists (r)."[109]
"social order, authority, respect for tradition, honoring parents, obedience, traditionalism, authoritarianism"[110]
"lack of respect for authority … someone conformed to the traditions of society … action caused chaos or disorder … respect for authority … children need to learn … men and women each have different roles … disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyways because that is my duty."[111]

Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*. Vintage Books (New York), 2012.

Authority:

"cultures vary … demand that respect be shown to parents, teachers, and others in positions of authority … the urge to respect hierarchical relationships is so deep that many languages encode it directly."[112]

"addressed strangers and superiors using titles … intimates and subordinates were called by first name … distaste when a salesperson called you by first name … awkwardness when an older person you have long revered asked you to call him by first name."[113]

"evolution … pecking orders and dominance hierarchies … displays made by low-ranking individuals are often similar across species … to appear submissive … small and nonthreatening."[114]

---

105 Haidt, Jonathan and Selin Kesebir, "Morality," 2009, 41.
106 Haidt, Jonathan and Selin Kesebir, "Morality," 2009, 42-43.
107 Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 111-112.
108 Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 112.
109 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 375.
110 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 377.
111 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 385.
112 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 165.
113 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 166.
114 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 166.

"oppression of the weak by the more powerful … alpha male … taking on the 'control role.' he resolves disputes and suppresses much of the violent conflict that erupts when there is no clear alpha male. … without agreement on rank and a certain respect for authority there can be no great sensitivity to social rules."[115]

"human authority, then, is not just raw power backed by the threat of force. Human authorities take on responsibility for maintaining order and justice. … authorities often exploit their subordinates for their own benefit while believing they are perfectly just."[116]

"mutual expectations that are more like those of a parent and child than those of a dictator and fearful underlings"[117]

"subordinates defer, respect, and (perhaps) obey, while superiors take precedence and take pastoral responsibility for subordinates."[118]

"forging beneficial relationships within hierarchies … to play the game … to rise in status while cultivating the protection of superiors and the allegiance of subordinates."[119]

"triggers … appearance and behavior that indicate higher versus lower rank … people track and remember who is above whom … when people … negate or subvert that order, we feel it instantly … obedience … respect … submission … rebellion, with regard to authorities perceived to be legitimate. … subvert the traditions, institutions, or values that are perceived to provide stability."[120]

"authority is in par about protecting order and fending off chaos … everyone has a stake in supporting the existing order and in holding people accountable for fulfilling the obligations of their station."[121]

Graham, Jesse, and Jonathan Haidt. "Sacred values and evil adversaries: A moral foundations approach." in M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *The social psychology of morality: Exploring the causes of good and evil*. **American Psychological Association, 2012, 11–31.**

p. 24 apprendix graph:
"authority … respect, tradition, honor, authorities, social hierarchy, traditions, institutions … anarchists, revolutionaries, subversives … right-wing death squads, military atrocities, Abu Ghraib"

Ditto, Peter et al., "Tracing the Threads: How Five Moral Concerns (Especially Purity) Help Explain Culture War Attitudes." in Journal of Research in Personality, Vol 46 (2012), 184-194.

page 185:
"The authority/respect foundation is based on our tendency to create hierarchically structured societies of dominance and subordination. This foundation includes approval of individuals who fulfill the duties associated with their position on the social ladder, for example by showing good leadership, or obedience … a preference for stability versus change."

---

115 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 166.
116 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 167.
117 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 167.
118 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 167.
119 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 168.
120 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 168.
121 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 168.

Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory: the pragmatic validity of moral pluralism," November 28, 2012. unpublished manuscript, 1-64..

"The Authority/subversion foundation. Many primates, including chimpanzees and bonobos, live in dominance hierarchies, and … navigate such hierarchies effectively and forge beneficial relationships upwards and downwards have an advantage over those who fail to perceive or react appropriately in these complex social interactions (de Waal, 1982; A. Fiske, 1991). … people interact with and grant legitimacy to modern institutions such as law courts and police departments, and to bosses and leaders of many kinds. Traits such as obedience and deference are virtues in some subcultures … can be seen as neutral or even as vices or others"[122]

"the Authority foundation (rank and deference; Boehm, 1999; 2012)."

p. 58 graph:

Authority/subversion: forge beneficial relationships within hierarchies … sign of high and low rank … bosses, respected professionals … respect, fear … obedience, deference

p 61 graph:

Authority: disrespect for authority … affective response to subversion … rank and dominance

MFT Dictionary 1.0

Authority: positive words
obey*, obedien*, duty, law, lawful*, legal*, duti*, honor*, respect , respectful*, respected, respects, order*, father*, mother, motherl*, mothering, mothers, tradition*, hierarch*, authorit*, permit, permission, status*, rank*, leader*, class, bourgeoisie, caste*, position, complian*, command, supremacy, control, submi*, allegian*, serve, abide, defere*, defer, revere*, venerat*, comply
Authority: negative words
defian*, rebel*, dissent*, subver*, disrespect*, disobe*, sediti*, agitat*, insubordinat*, illegal*, lawless*, insurgent, mutinous, defy*, dissident, unfaithful, alienate, defector, heretic*, nonconformist, oppose , protest, refuse, denounce, remonstrate, riot*, obstruct

MFT Dictionary 2.0

Authority:
authority, obey, respect, tradition, subversion, disobey, disrespect, chaos

181) authority – respect parents, teachers, elders, the police, traditions

Sanctity

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues" from *Daedalus*, Vol. 133, No. 4, On Human Nature (Fall 2004), p. 55-66.

---

122 Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory..." 2012, 13.

Sanctity/Purity is triggered by "people with diseases or parasites, waste products" to "taboo ideas (communism, racism)." It's emotion is "disgust" and virtues "cleanliness, purity, chastity."[123]

"Profound moralizing of the body and bodily activities, such as menstruation, eating, bathing, sex, and the handling of corpses […] regulating purity and pollution."[124]

"a purity module evolved to deal with the adaptive challenges of life in a world full of dangerous microbes and parasites the proper domain of the purity module is […] rotting corpses, excrement, and scavenger animals. Such things […] trigger a fast, automatic feeling of disgust […] elaborated by many cultures into sets of rules […] regulating a great many bodily functions and practices, including diet and hygiene."[125]

"stories about eating one's dead pet dog, about harmless cases of cannibalism, or even about homosexuality may elicit feelings of disgust."[126]

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," in *The Innate Mind*, Vol 3: Foundations and the Future (Jan 2008), p 367-392.

Purity/Sanctity addresses the challenge to "avoid microbes and parasites," is triggered by "waste products, diseased people" to "taboo ideas (communism, racism)." It's emotion is "disgust" and virtues "temperance, chastity, piety, cleanliness (lust, intemperance)"[127]

"the original adaptive challenge was not social, but nutritive. […] the omnivorous food strategy of human beings, combined with our relatively large group sizes […] means that we have long been exposed to very high levels of threat from bacteria and parasites […] wary but flexible about the kinds of things we eat […] food evaluation and rejection […] track contagion and value purity seems to contribute to ideas about sacredness – about keeping religious objects set apart from pollutants and profane objects, about overcoming carnal desires and treating the body as a temple […] ethnic 'cleansing'"[128]

"purity and pollution rules that so often regulate biological processes such as menstruation, birth, and defecation."[129]

"attending to each other's physical states, and altering interactions and contacts accordingly."[130]

Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations," in *Journal of Personality and Social Philosophy*, Vol 96 No 5 (2009), 1029-1046.

"virtues of purity and sanctity that play such a large role in religious laws matched writings on the evolution of disgust and contamination sensitivity (Rozin, Haidt, & McCauley, 2000). Practices related

---

123 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 59.
124 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 60.
125 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 60.
126 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 61.
127 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph. "Intuitive Ethics..." 2004, 59.
128 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 384.
129 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 384-385.
130 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph, "The Moral Mind," 2008, 385.

to purity and pollution must be understood as serving more than hygenic functions. Such practices also serve social functions, including marking off the group's cultural boundaries (Soler, 1973/1979) and suppressing the selfishness often associated with humanity's carnal nature (e.g., lust, hunger, material greed) by cultivating a more spiritual mindset."[131]

test questions:
"unnatural or degrading … virtuous or uplifting way … control his or her desires … revolting to others … unnatural or disgusting … chastity … live virtuously and avoid sin."[132]

"i hereby sell my soul … cook and eat your dog … plastic surgery that adds a 2-inch tail … blood transfusion […] from a convicted child molester … crawling around naked and urinating on stage … piety, pious, purity, pure, clean, steril, sacred, chast, holy, holiness, saint, wholesome, celibat, absention, virgin … austerity, integrity, modesty, abstinen, abstemiousness, upright, limpid, unadulterated, maiden, virtuous, refined, intemperate, decen, immaculate, innocent, pristine, humble, disgust, deprav, diseas, unlcean, contagio, indecen, sin … slut, whore, dirt, impiety, impious, profan, gross, repuls, sick, promiscu, lwed, adulter, debauche, defile, tramp, prostitut, unchaste, wanton, profligate, filth, trashy, obscen, lax, taint, stain, tarnish, debase, desecrat, wicked, blemish, exploit, pervert, wretched"[133]

Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians" in Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification, Oxford Scholarship Online (May 2009), p 371-401.

"Purity/sanctity: The challenge of avoiding deadly microbes and parasites, which are easily spread among people living together in close proximity and sharing food, made it adaptive to attend to the contact history of the people and potential foods in one's immediate environment, sometimes shunning or avoiding them. This foundation is different from the others in that its origins are in our physical nature – as omnivores – rather than in our social nature (see Rozin, Haidt, & McCauley, 2000). However, once humans beings developed the emotion of disgust and its cognitive component of contagion sensitivity, they began to apply the emotion to other people and groups for social and symbolic reasons that sometimes had a close connection to health concerns (e.g. lepers or people who had just touched a human corpse), but very often did not (e.g., people of low status, hypocrites, racists). When moral systems are built upon this foundation, they often go far beyond avoiding 'unclean' people and animals; they promote a positive goal of living in a pure, sanctified way, which often involves rising above petty and carnal desires in order to prepare one's mind and body for contact with God (see Haidt, 2009, Ch. 9)."[134]

"dislike of overtly sexual or 'degrading' art … desire to live in a sacralized nation … gays seen as lustful sexual deviants"[135]

Haidt, Jonathan and Selin Kesebir, "Morality," in *Handbook of Social Psychology, 5th ed.,* edited by Fisk and Gilbert, 2009, p 1-46.

---

131 Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1031.
132 Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1044.
133 Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek, "Liberals and Conservatives…" 2009, 1045-1046.
134 Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 382.
135 Haidt, Jonathan and Jesse Graham, "Planet of the Durkheimians," 2009, 395.

"5. Purity/sanctity: concerns about physical and spiritual contagion, including virtues of chastity, wholesomeness, and control of desires."[136]
"purity/sanctity is associated with homophobia and other disgust-based restrictions on the rights of women and some minority or immigrant groups (Nussbaum, 1999.)"[137]

Haidt, Jonathan, and Jesse Graham and Craig Joseph, "Above and Below Left-Right: Ideological Narratives and Moral Foundations" in *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol 20, No 2/3 (April-September 2009), p. 110-119.

"5. Purity/sanctity: concerns about physical and spiritual contagion, including virtues of chastity, wholesomeness, and control of desires."[138]
"while pursung a carnal and hedonistic lifestyle (including 'impure' sexual acts that trigger feelings of disgust)."[139]

Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol 101, No 2, 2011, 366-385.

"Purity-related groups were virgins, highly religious people, spiritual people, atheists (r), prostitutes (r), homosexuals (r)."[140]
"self-discipline, clean, devout, disgust, religious, purity"[141]
"someone violated standards of purity and decency … something disgusting … acted in a way God would approve of … should not do things that are disgusting … unnatural … chastity"[142]

Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*. Vintage Books (New York), 2012.

Sanctity:
"revolting … disgusting … unsettling ….atrocity … stain … expunged … pollution, purification … monstrously"[143]

"omnivore has the enormous advantage of flexibility … disadvantage that new foods can be toxic, infected with microbes, or riddled with parasitic worms. The 'omnivores dilemma' … is that omnivores must seek out and explore new potential foods while remaining wary of them until they are proven safe."[144]

"individuals who had a properly calibrated sense of disgust were able to consume more calories than their overly disgustable cousins while consuming fewer dangerous microbes than their insufficiently disgustable cousins."[145]

---

136 Haidt, Jonathan and Selin Kesebir, "Morality," 2009, 41.
137 Haidt, Jonathan and Selin Kesebir, "Morality," 2009, 42-43.
138 Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 111-112.
139 Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 112.
140 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 375.
141 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 377.
142 Graham, Jesse et al., "Mapping the Moral Domain," 2011, 385.
143 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 171.
144 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 172.
145 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 172.

"when early hominids came down from the trees and began living in larger groups on the ground, they greatly increased their risk of infection from each other, and from each others' waste products."[146]

disgust is a "behavioral immune system … signs of infection or disease in other people … make you want to get away from those people … effective to prevent infection by washing your food, casting out lepers, or simply avoiding dirty people than it is to let the microbes into your body."[147]

"the need to avoid pathogens, parasites, and other threats that spread by physical touch or proximity. … triggers … smells, sights, or other sensory patterns that predict the presence of dangerous pathogens in objects or people … excrement, scavengers … visible lesions or sores."[148]

"plagues, epidemics, and new diseases are usually brought in by foreigners – as are many new ideas, goods, and technologies – so societies face an analogue of the omnivore's dilemma, balancing xenophobia and xenophilia."[149]

"prejudice and discrimination … untouchable … dirt or polluted … so hallowed, so sacred, that we want to protect it from desecreation … if we had no sense of disgust, I believe we would also have no sense of the sacred."[150]

"mysteries is how people every came together to form large cooperative societies … interest in the psychology of sacredness … infinite value … bind individuals into moral communities … desecrates one of the sacred pillars supporting the community, the reaction is sure to be swift, emotion, collective, and punitive."[151]

"carnal desire … noble, pure, elevated; others are base, polluted, and degraded."[152]

"the body as a temple, housing a soul within, rather than a machine to be optimized, or as a playground to be used as fun. … virgin mary … purity … chastity … treasure to be guarded."[153]

"uptight pleasure-fearing prudes"[154]

"impurity-avoidance function in New Age grocery stores … cleanse you of 'toxins' … environmental movement … degradation of nature, of humanity's original nature, before it was corrupted by industrial capitalism"[155]

"repugnance … warning us not to transgress what is unspeakable profound … shallow are the souls that have forgotten how to shudder."[156]

146 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 172.
147 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 172-173.
148 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 173.
149 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 173.
150 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 173-174.
151 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 174.
152 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 175.
153 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 175.
154 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 176.
155 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 176.
156 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 177.

"makes it possible for people to invest objects with irrational and extreme values-- both positive and negative – which are important for binding groups together."[157]

Graham, Jesse, and Jonathan Haidt. "Sacred values and evil adversaries: A moral foundations approach." in M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *The social psychology of morality: Exploring the causes of good and evil***. American Psychological Association, 2012, 11–31.**

p. 24 apprendix graph:
"purity ...chastity, piety, self-control … body, soul, sanctity of life, holy sites … atheists, hedonists, materialists … religious crusades, genocides, killing abortion doctors"

Ditto, Peter et al., "Tracing the Threads: How Five Moral Concerns (Especially Purity) Help Explain Culture War Attitudes." in Journal of Research in Personality, Vol 46 (2012), 184-194.

page 185:
"the purity/sanctity foundation is based on the emotion of disgust in response to biological contaminants (e.g. feces or rotten food), *and* to various social contaminants like spiritual corruption, or the inability to control one's base impulses."

Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory: the pragmatic validity of moral pluralism," November 28, 2012. unpublished manuscript, 1-64..

"The Sanctity/degradation foundation. Hominid history includes several turns that exposed our ancestors to greater risks from pathogens and parasites, for example: leaving the trees behind and living on the ground; living in larger or denser groups; and shifting to a more omnivorous diet, including more meat, some of which was scavenged. The emotion of disgust is widely thought to be an adaptation to that powerful adaptive challenge (Oaten, Stevenson & Case, 2009; Rozin, Haidt, & McCauley, 2008). … develop a more effective 'behavioral immune system' (Schaller & Park, 2011) … disgust and the behavioral immune system have come to undergird a variety of moral reactions, e.g., to immigrants and sexual deviants … People who treat their bodies as temples are praised in some cultures for the virtues of temperance and chastity."[158]

"no evidence that non-human primates have any building blocks of the Sanctity foundation, such as the emotion of disgust, or even contamination sensitivity … perhaps co-evolving with human religiosity in the last one or two hundred thousand years. … cooties games tend to emerge around the age of 7 or 8 (Opie & Opie, 1969), which is the age at which disgust sensitivity becomes pronounced (Rozin & Fallon, 1987)."[159]

p. 58 graph:

Sanctity/degradation: avoid communicable diseases … waste products, diseased people … immigration, deviant sexuality … disgust … temperance, chastity, piety, cleanliness

p 61 graph:

---

157 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 179.
158 Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory..." 2012, 14.
159 Graham, Jesse et al., "Moral Foundations Theory..." 2012, 39-40.

Sanctity: food and sex taboos … affective response to sexual violations … disgust …. behavioral immune system

MFT Dictionary 1.0

<u>Sanctity: positive words</u>
piety, pious, purity, pure*, clean*, steril*, sacred*, chast*, holy, holiness, saint*, wholesome*, celiba*, abstention, virgin, virgins, virginity, virginal, austerity, integrity, modesty, abstinen*, abstemiousness, upright, limpid, unadulterated, maiden, virtuous, refined, decen*, immaculate, innocent, pristine, church*
<u>Sanctity: negative words</u>
disgust*, deprav*, disease*, unclean*, contagio*, indecen*, sin, sinful*, sinner*, sins, sinned, sinning, slut*, whore, dirt*, impiety, impious, profan*, gross, repuls*, sick*, promiscu*, lewd*, adulter*, debauche*, defile*, tramp, prostitut*, unchaste, intemperate, wanton, profligate, filth*, trashy, obscen*, lax, taint*, stain*, tarnish*, debase*, desecrat*, wicked*, blemish, exploitat*, pervert, wretched*

MFT Dictionary 2.0

Sanctity:
purity, sanctity, sacred, wholesome, impurity, depravity, degradation, unnatural

14) "human behavior now includes a rather strong tendency to invest [stuff] with extraordinary importance that is no way justified by practical or utilitarian considerations" - 2-3

16) "they parse disgust into three fundamental domains: pathogen avoidance, sex/mating, and morality" - 367

16) "disgust figures prominently in Norbet Elias' account of the 'civilizing process,' by which societies develop rules and practices of self-restraint – a 'second nature' - that distinguish them from primitive societies and animals." - 367

16) "disgust maps to a particular subset of moral concerns … that involve sanctity, divinity, and the protection of what are perceived to be sacred values and objects." "violators are seen as 'polluted' … with gods at the top and demons and animals at the bottom. RHM argued that moral disgust is felt when people judge others to have moved downward on that vertical dimension." - 367-368

14) "just as something is seen as worthy of ultimate protection, there is a vision of what it must be protected from: this is a vision of evil" - 9

15) Leviticus is the same, avoid disease, avoid disgust, "keeping categories pure or not mixing things together"

15) "cleanliness is next to godliness."

15) sexual prudes of the right vs. organic free-range food of the left - "pose a greater threat spiritually than biologically."

120) understood ethic of community more; "emphasis on bathing, food choices, and concerns about what or whom a person has touched… christians believe that 'cleanliness is next to godliness.'

121) disgust "keeps us away from dirty and contaminating things' - repurposed for some moral violations but not others

theory "vertical dimension of social space, running from God or moral perfection at the top down through angles, humans, other animals, monsters, demons, and then the devil, or the perfect devil, at the bottom."

"Rituals, laws, and other constraints work best when they are sacralized,"[160] that is, set apart from and above the mundane. Likewise, Roy Rapaport notes that "to invest social conventions with sanctity is to hide their arbitrariness in a cloak of seeming necessity,"[161] inclining individuals to participate in the construction of social unity.

117): divinity: "people are … temporary vessels within which a divine soul have been implanted. People are not just animals … the body is a temple, not a playground. Even if it does no harm and violates nobody's rights …. [taboos] degrade him … and violates the sacred order of the universe. ...sanctity and sin, purity and pollution, elevation and degradation."

Liberty

Narratives and Moral Foundations" in *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol 20, No 2/3 (April-September 2009), p. 110-119.

"libertarians are ever vigilant against infringements of <u>liberty</u>, even infringements motivated by the most sincere commitments to other worthy values, such as equality (see, e.g., Fried, 2007). … socialis oppression of the individual … rugged individualist who refuses to conform … restoration of freedom."[162]

Iyer, Ravi, et al., "Understanding Libertarian Morality: The psychological roots of an individualist ideology," August 20, 2010, unpublished manuscript, 1-29.

"individual liberty … cerebral as opposed to emotional intellectual style … lower interdependence and social relatedness."[163]

"the right to be left alone."[164]

---

160 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 299.
161 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 299.
162 Haidt, Jonathan, et al., "Above and Below Left-Right..." in *Psychological Inquiry*, 2009, 116.
163 Iyer, Ravi, et al., "Understanding Libertarian Morality…" 2010, 1.
164 Iyer, Ravi, et al., "Understanding Libertarian Morality…" 2010, 6.

"the only emotional reaction on which libertarians were not lowest was reactance – the angry reaction to infringements upon one's autonomy – for which libertarians scored higher than both liberals and conservatives."[165]

"individualistic and independent"[166]

Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*. Vintage Books (New York), 2012.

<u>Liberty</u>

"nomadic hunter-gatherers are always egalitarian … no hierarchy … no chief, and the norms of the group active encourage sharing resources … our ancestors lived for hundreds of thousands of years in egalitarian bands of mobile hunter-gatherers."[167]

"hierarchy only became widespread … groups take up agriculture or domesticate animals and become more sedentary … private property … put an end to equality."[168]

"were our minds 'structured in advance of experience' for hierarchy or for equality? … extraordinary similarities in the ways that humans and chimpanzees display dominance and submission. … some point in the last million years our ancestors underwent a 'political transition' that allowed them to live as egalitarians by banding together to reign in, punish, or kill any would-be alpha males who tried to dominate the group."[169]

alphas "are better described as bullies who take what they want. Yet even among chimpanzees, it sometimes happens that subordinates gang up to take down alphas … must know their limits … have enough political skill to cultivate a few allies and stave off rebellion."[170]

"the balance of power is likely to shift when physical strength no longer decides the outcome of a fight." - Christopher Boem[171]

"once early humans had developed spears, anyone could kill a bullying alpha male."[172]

"uncannily similar to Marx's dream of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'"[173]

"fragile state of political egalitarianism achieved by cooperation among creatures who are innately predisposed to hierarchical arrangements"[174]

"was a process of 'self-domestication.'"[175]

---

165 Iyer, Ravi, et al., "Understanding Libertarian Morality…" 2010, 20.
166 Iyer, Ravi, et al., "Understanding Libertarian Morality…" 2010, 20.
167 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 197.
168 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 197.
169 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 198.
170 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 198.
171 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 198.
172 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 199.
173 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 200.
174 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 200.
175 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 200.

"adaptive challenge of living in small groups with individuals who would, if given the chance, dominate, bully, and constrain others. … triggers … signs of attempted domination … aggressive, controlling behavior … righteous anger … called *reactance* … the feeling you get when an authority tells you you can't do something and you feel yourself wanting to do it even more strongly."[176]

"the rise of a would-be dominator triggers a motivation to unite as equals wit other oppressed individuals to resist, restrain, and in extreme cases kill the oppressor. Individuals who failed to detect signs … and respond to them … faced the prospect of reduced … things that make individuals (and their genes) successful in the Darwinian sense."[177]

"the Liberty foundation obviously operates in tension with the Authority foundation"[178]

"crossed the line into self-aggrandizement and tyranny."[179]

"supports the moral matrix of revolutionaries and 'freedom fighters' … american declaration of independence … French revolutonaries … had to call for *fraternite* and *egalite* if they were going to entice commoners to join them in their regicidal quest for *liberte*."[180]

"'*sic semper tyrannis*' (thus always to tyrants)"[181]

"original triggers … bullies, tyrants … current … imposing illegitimate restaints … don't tread on me."[182]

"the current triggers can expand to encompass the accumulation of wealth … capitalism is … predatory … social justice … hatred of oppression … in the service of underdogs, victims, and powerless groups everywhere."[183]

"conservatives … liberal nanny state and its high taxes … oppressive regulations … United Nations … sovereignty-reducing"[184]

"resent any sign of attempted domination … band together to resist or overthrow bullies and tyrants … egalitarianism and antiauthoritarianism … don't-tread-on-me antigovernment anger"[185]

15) John Jost came up with the liberty and oppression foundation – 34

176 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 200-201.
177 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 201.
178 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 201.
179 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 201.
180 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 201.
181 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 202.
182 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 202-203.
183 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 203-204.
184 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 204.
185 Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind*, 2012, 215.