



Person P: founder/CEO of company I've worked at

(1) what behaviors does your subject engage in that suggest they are a friend to humanity? does this person seem happy/fulfilled in their friendship to humanity?

BEHAVIORS: P founded the company for two reasons: (1) to **eliminate the purposeless, fevered, rat-race, exploitive freneticism that wasted much energy and caused much suffering in employees** at companies he had worked at (in a highly skilled role) in the past; and (2) to prove that, as someone who grew up in a trailer park, he was not inferior to others who did not.

Prima facie, of course, (1) seems altruistic and (2) neurotic; and, by an easy slip, the former seems philanthropic and the latter misanthropic. But in practice the two harmonized well.

Abstract justification: Snobbery wastes energy on self-worship. Entitlement engenders sloth. The slothful self-worshiper hates themselves because they accomplish nothing (because they are slothful) and consider accomplishing nothing worthless; but they cannot admit this (because they worship themselves). So they blame the world's lack of accomplishment on others that do not resemble them; but this doesn't actually make them think much of themselves. So they identify accomplishment with feverishness and force the fever onto themselves and others.

Anger against snobbery (motivation 2) and desire to accomplish things with skill not enervated by fever (motivation 1) respectively attack these two pillars that do no good and make people suffer.

APPEARANCE OF HAPPINESS/FULFILLMENT: P is equanimous; that's as close I can get to answering this question. He neither rages on failure nor ego-strokes on success. If others magnify a non-problem, P neither takes the problem seriously nor ignores others' feelings; but he does decouple the third-person problem from the second-person emotion. P does not, however, treat 'baseless' emotions as problems to be fixed by a non-defective human via condescension to a defective one. Rather, P expends considerable effort trying to uncover the full causal nexus of the emotional response, and is always neutrally open to the possibility that what he thought was a non-problem is actually a real problem.

(2) what do you imagine informs your subject's friendliness to humanity? does it come from a sense of duty? an adherence to a certain religion or philosophy? or does it seem like a spontaneous/natural impulse?

I'm not sure, but Buddhist philosophical reading, Zen meditation, and bonsai cultivation have something to do with it. It is neither spontaneous (rather it is disciplined and deliberate) nor catechetically adherent (rather it is freely explored). Some sense of duty is clearly involved, but the link between duty and enthusiasm seems external to P: that is, it is precisely because both the work and the people of the company seem objectively worthwhile to P (enthusiasm) that P feels a sense of duty.

P comes across more 'cowboy' than 'hippie', but in P such a contrariety appears evidently silly.

(3) would you describe this person as a philanthropist, a word, originally from ancient Greek, that literally means a "friend to humans"?

Not in English, since I know neither how wealthy he is nor how much he gives away 'to charity'. Yes in Greek. Employees and clients trust him, and this trust seems to come (sometimes in so many words) rather from the judgment that he 'is a good person' (a non-Kantian, virtue-focused picture) than that he 'keeps contracts' (a Kantian, rule-focused picture). Others' immediate reaction, which

persists through multi-year relationships, is that he is himself 'philos' and considers them 'philos'.

John Esposito

July 2, 2020

Carrboro, NC

