RESEARCH ARTICLE

THE SECULARIZATION OF NATURAL LAW AND THE THEORY OF BUSINESS ETHICS

Nicolaides, A and CM van der Bank

Vaal University of Technology, Human Sciences Faculty, South Africa

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT

Business Ethics is a relatively new concept in which the theory of the Categorical Imperative, as postulated by Kant, who said that "to a bloodless category, a categorical imperative of a purely formal kind of universal application but without material content" plays a critical role. Utilitarianism or moral philosophy also plays a great role in current business ethics and this view is spearheaded by John Stuart Mill who said "one simple principle, as entitled to govern absolutely the dealings of society with the individual by way of compulsion and control, whether the means used be physical force in the form of legal penalties, or the moral coercion of public opinion". Utilitarianism is essentially teleological. According to utilitarian criteria one ought to do that which will result in the best ends, do the most good or maximize utility. These two views are widely held in the world of business ethics and greatly influence contemporary business conduct. The 19th Century German philologist who studied theories of culture and language theories, and who is renowned for concepts such as 'the Will to power' and 'the Death of God', is surprisingly omitted from literature dealing with the concept of business ethics. This is uncanny given that he wrote a dozen works dealing with moral philosophy. He was the most celebrated and abused philosopher of his era and numerous apocryphal myths and misconceptions surround Nietzsche's work. By encouraging more direct engagement with Nietzsche's work, this article strives to examine Nietzsche's ideas and questions if these would be more suitable as a means of explaining the business world. This article in which the approach taken is descriptive-analytical seeks to evaluate the potentially huge contribution Nietzsche could make in the field of business ethics and also seeks to make his work better known to management scholars.

INTRODUCTION

The business ethics debate is multifarious and somewhat perplexing for many managers and yet it is necessary to consider ethics if we are to try to improve business practice. Business managers cannot afford to be reactive to ethical problems but should rather strive to be pro-active and somewhat entrepreneurial in their approach to ethics in the workplace as well as in dealings with all stakeholders with whom there should be constant communication and towards whom exemplary conduct should be exhibited. The times are changing rapidly: "...that part of man which feels the need to place value on things--himself in the first instance, but on the people, actions, or things around him as well. It is the part of the personality which is the fundamental source of the emotions of pride, anger, and shame, and is not reducible to desire, on the one hand, or reason on the other. The desire for recognition is the most specifically political part of the human personality because it is what drives men to want to assert themselves over other men..." (Fukuyama, 1992). Perhaps the appropriate answer at the present day is that private interests

Corresponding author: pythagoras13@hotmail.com

should always be balanced one against the other and then social interests should be evaluated separately, before a final balance is sought between both types of factor (Lloyd, 1979). The use of the term ethical jurisprudence seems to indicate an evaluation of the legal conceptions which form the subject-matter of analytical jurisprudence. It is therefore the study of moral theory in its relationship to law. In modern ethics, ethical rationalism is the main concept. It is through reason that people are distinct to the rest of God's creation and it is via logical reason that moral tenets are legitimised. Consequently, all moral truths are anchored in human nature and they are self-determining as regards societal conventions. In this manner, the philosophers of the Enlightenment period instituted absolutist systems of ethics that made relativism unimaginable. According to Kant man is only partially or imperfectly rational; man can act in accordance with rational principles but he does not invariably do so. Indeed had man a "holy will" then he would always do what he ought to do. (Hosten *et al*, 1977). The utilitarians maintained that the only test of right or wrong actions is their outcomes. Bentham comes close to conceptualizing a doctrine of judicial review, for, though he thought that enforcement would be extra-legal (moral or religious) he did not rule out the use of legal

sanctions (Lloyd, 1979). According to Kelsen the law only lays down what ought to happen and not what actually does happen. Kelsen himself sums up for us as follows *"Legal theory is a structural analysis, as exact as possi ble, of the positive law, an analysis free of all ethical or political judgments of value"* (Hosten, 1977). It was only Friedrich Nietzsche who developed a totalizing assault on moral values in the 19th century (Christians, 2008).

In Nietzsche's writings, particularly *The Birth of Tragedy,* ethics has an "ethological" basis. Only through aesthetic phenomena are life and the world justified. There is a clear demarcation between morality and ethics in what manifests as a fundamental notion of philosophical thought. There is a mode of thought which transcends good and evil and this is beyond any moralistic ontology. Morality is in the world of facades but also exists in deceptions as an error, delusion or veneer. Moral values are in any event worthless as humanity cannot answer the basic question "why" and this nihilistic idea means the end of the moral interpretation of the world. He embraced of a type of rationalism and an approach he called "the Will to Power" **(**Wille zur Macht**).** As a man who questioned the very existence of a creator, he embraced aesthetic values that were not dependent on God's moral codes for humanity. Due to his ideas, universal imperatives have been discredited and ethical rationalism has been exposed as the morality of the ruling class and men in particular, as the dominant gender (Outka and Reed, 1993). To protect an intangible good is basically a type of psycho-social dominance or imperialism over the moral opinions of miscellaneous communities. Nowadays, morality appears to be coming to a gradual and it is somewhat fashionable for many businesses to disavow any moral obligation to society. In the period of Post-Modernity, ethical living is being eroded by materialism and is being replaced by aesthetics (Bauman, 1993). Amongst moral philosophers in history, Nietzsche is unique in scrutinizing the full structure of moral transformation. The contracted heart of traditional ethics makes it virtually unattainable to account for the behaviour of the moral radical as acceptable moral behaviour. Nietzsche's assessment of the distant past and the resultant obstacles presented by the moral and ethical teachings of the world's monotheistic religions, led him to his own interpretation of morality and ethics and resulted in his lengthy work So Sprach Zarathustra**.**

If we are to improve the quality of ethical decision making at the micro-level (individual level), meso-level (level of companies) and macro-level (level of a national economy), we are also required to consider personal, communal and universal value systems and how these interact with one another. To assist us in ethics as a study, we should also be considering Nietzsche's views. Why is it, that Nietzsche is neglected in the study of business ethics and what is the problem with current ethics study? What is the Nietzschean perspective of ethics and morality and why is it that business management students should be learning about his ideas on ethics?

Ethics and the 'hammer beating bell' approach

One of Nietzsche's final works was entitled *How one philosophizes with a hammer*. This emphasizes his rejection of traditional morality and his willingness to seek rigid discipline in promoting moral virtues. The most important question in Nietzsche's diagnosis of the cultural disease he calls "nihilism" is the question about the standing of "morality" in our current time (Schacht, 1983). The term 'Post-modernity' seems to people who purport to be fashionable to express precisely the crisis of morality and it is the crisis of morality which is a direct consequence of the crisis of rationality. The *Ubermensch* (Overman) is a projection of what is best in all humans, and this is what Nietzsche refers to as "nobility". The "will to power" has far more in common with how one is able to control oneself than with seeking to manipulate and dominate others. In his rejection of morality in a traditional sense, Nietzsche strives for excellence as the driving force in ethics. If we are to begin to understand his philosophy, we need to firstly understand the context in which he writes the *Death of God*. He is not an atheist trying to stir up the wrath of believers. If one understands the statement death of God in a religious context, one is undermining its epistemological and ontological inferences which are that the statement defies the ascendancy of Reason (Nietzsche: 1968). In essence what dies is the principle of transcendence that categorically grounds the assertions of traditional epistemology and ontology. The death of God is also a religious proclamation but it is only religious as religion only makes sense by implicitly setting outing the hypotheses of metaphysics and epistemology. What is implied is that all of the presuppositions of religion are defensible only through the approval of Reason, and so it is that, 'God' is simply another expression for Reason which is omnipresent and unconditionally unifying in nature.

We are in an illusion of transcendence and need to be metaphorically awoken with a loud noise such as a bell being struck by a hammer. Nietzsche was opposed to the idea that transcendent categories are binding, and thus the essentialist thought upon which classical moral philosophy was based. He sought to create, enhance and celebrate life and regarded universal essences as being nihilistic. Therefore his shift away from essentialism and the creation, enhancement, and celebration of life, presuppose a shift of mindset. Nietzsche's disengagement from essentialism disturbs the tendency of basing morality on universal principles. To still base ethics on ontology and practice becomes a challenge. What then, is "ethics" and how does it relate to, and distinguish itself from, the notion "morality"?

Why Nietzsche is neglected

The majority of ethics related courses begin with in depth surveys of the two leading theories in modern ethics. The first is the "It is one's duty to do what is right" and this theory is based on the writings of the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). Kant distinguished between law and morals, the former being regarded as regulative of external conduct and the latter being regarded as the domain of the internal, his categorical imperative nevertheless dominates both his moral theory and his conception of law (Kant, translated TK Abbott, 1965 .The second theory is utilitarian and is to a large extent based on the philosophy of John Stuart Mill (1806-1873). This pays far more disciplined attention to the consequences of decisions that are made in any given business related situation. Mill was arguing that "physical force in the form of legal penalties" should not itself be used as a direct instrument for improving the citizen (Lloyd, 1977).

While business ethics is included in the curricula of many management related courses, there is a feeling amongst lecturers that the topic is too in accessible. Added to this, many of the students that they teach regard it as irrelevant to contemporary business where the distinction between good and bad or right and wrong is no longer easily apparent. Apart from his rather aggressive approach towards immorality, Nietzsche was also somewhat opposed to business *per se*. This was because he viewed capitalism as a destructive force which promoted greed and exploitation and which reduced the depth of spirituality in people. However as business is part of life, ethics must be driven by business and this is what Nietzsche proposes. How he proposes this is indeed intriguing.

What Nietzsche strives to do

Friedrich Nietzsche does not concern himself with seeking out and applying rational principles and processes in daily conduct. In fact he is bent on the inculcation of values that cultivate, nurture and develop the human character so as to make it more beautiful, so to speak. Nietzsche's philosophical thinking thus unfolds a huge distinction between morality and ethics, a basic notion of thinking which is transcends "good" and "evil", and which in essence goes way beyond any moralistic ontology (Yovel, 1986) and stresses "good" and "bad". In day to day business ethics, the moral action of managers emanates from intentional efforts to realize idealistic conceptions. To Nietzsche, all moral action and ethical behaviour is implicit and the direct result of human character. Consequently, to consider ethics was to Nietzsche nothing more than recalling a nobler more aesthetic past (Rampley, 2007) as was evident in Classical Greece. Nietzsche strives to point out that a good individual is one who complies with authority and upholds the social order as a basic concern but life is somewhat centered around glory and power and right and wrong in various business issues are founded on the assertions of those with legitimate hierarchical power. The primary aim of life is to act with integrity and to be service oriented, committed, loyal, responsible and sensitive the needs of others. Where Kant would say that managers and employees must act in a way that they believe is right and just for any other manager or employee in a similar situation, laws are regarding as prescribing external conduct whereas morals prescribe internal conduct. Nietzsche would say that managers and employees should seize what benefit they are strong enough to exercise without reverence to ordinary social norms and legal requirements.

Early Ethics - Aristotle and Aquinas

The Greek philosopher Aristotle, in the fourth century B.C. for whom nature played a cardinal role in the unfolding of man's social development, was so little interested in natural law in the form of normative rules that he contented himself with a passing reference to the distinction between natural and conventional justice, while immediately qualifying this by pointing out that, among men, even natural justice is not necessary unchanging (Lloyd, 1977). His book *Nicomachean Ethics*, was not merely the exposition of an ethical theory but rather a specific description of a way of life and an ethos that should have existed in Athens. It was incumbent upon man to develop virtues (*aretes*) such as justice, bravery (*andreia*), moderation (*sophrosune*) etc., in order that total happiness

(*eudaimonia*) could be arrived at. Aristotle's ethical system was entrenched in his cultural setting and he discussed the conditions under which moral responsibility could lead to the achieving of happiness in human life and the core concept for him is the question of a person's character or personality. What is it that makes a person good? Virtues are, according to Aristotle, acquired human qualities and an immaculate character, which allow a person to achieve 'the good life'. Virtue is determined by the right reason and the right desire to do good (Aristotle, 1985). In order to building character and moral leadership in today's business world, many managers believe they would benefit hugely by pursuing Aristotle's aphorism : 'always act towards the *right* person, at the *right* time, in the *right* place, in the *right* amount, and in the *right* way' (Aristotle, 1985).

In a business ethics context, the virtues would allow employees to cooperate and allow the business community to achieve its collective objectives. In order to cultivate virtue in business students, knowledge about virtue needs to be taught and students need to be trained to be virtuous, especially when society at large is unscrupulous (MacIntyre, 1981). Virtues are dispositions to feel and act in a particular manner and according to Aristotle, these needed to be practiced. What the majority of people thought was important, but it was necessary to understand that virtue was a middle ground between two extremes which are vices. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) was born into a very wealthy family near the village of Aquino, between Naples and Rome. In 1244, he was ordained as a Dominican friar. Aquinas's teleological ethics was in a sense similar to Aristotle and concurs with the latter that all events occur to achieve some or other end. Essentially, Aquinas universalized and made more humane, Aristotle's conception of ethics (Davies, 1993). The dogma of the Catholic Church combined with the scholastic philosophy of St Thomas Aquinas has provided the inspiration for a considerable volume of religious-based natural law which may be labeled neo-scholastic natural law theory (Friedmann, 1967). In his view, no human being was excluded from seeking to do universal good. Aquinas presupposed that God created the cosmos, which reveals His purpose in creating it. To arrive at that purpose is to constantly seek the supreme good.' This search for good [Natural law] is the participation of the human person in the divine law of God' (Kenny, 1984). Elsewhere he states that natural law is "nothing other than the light of understanding infused in us by God whereby we see what is to be done and what is not to be done" (Copleston, 1991). Aquinas added faith, hope, and love to the list of virtues espoused by Aristotle. He rejected the idea that civil government was necessary tainted with original sin and argued for the existence of a hierarchy of law derived ultimately from God, and in which human or positive law had a rightful through lowly place and was worthy for its own sake (Lloyd,1977). To both Aristotle and Aquinas, virtue was a quality which when exercised, invariably led to 'the good' and a good life for human beings precedes the concept of a virtue. Humans thus have their own natural ends but can select the way in which they will arrive at their given end. It is ethics which determines which ends are worthy of pursuit. When people do evil they become deficient in fulfilling the natural goal which is to do good and God fulfills their natural end. The human will is to seek what is good, but reason must inform the human will as to what is good and how to obtain it.

Aristotle's moral theory falls short in that it is naturalistic and humans are regarded by him as simply another species in nature. Humans do not have a special relationship with the God and what is good is not necessarily declared so by God. Aquinas believed that Aristotle's moral vision was good but required what Christianity could provide in terms of understanding. The supreme good could only be found in God and one had to be familiar with such ideas. However, the perfect knowledge of God is possible only in the afterlife (Nietzsche, 1966).

Nietzschean ethics

Nietzsche was essentially a moral relativist and in his *Genealogy of Morals'* and *The Will to Power,* he argues that man has two main drives, namely, a drive for total power and fear. He stresses that people unconsciously do whatever they believe they need to do in order to become more potent human beings (Nietzsche, 1967). Morality is when people become powerful, and not do not want others to become more powerful than them (Leiter and Sinhababu, 2009). Consequently they impose rules on others and seek to limit their drive for power. Nietzsche rejected the notion of obedience-oriented philosophies in which individuals either obey or fail to obey God's moral codes. He was in favour of a more utilitarian approach in which individuals independently evaluate the ethical implications of their actions towards other human beings. He wrote: *"Most of the conscious thinking of a philosopher is secretly guided and forced into certain channels by instincts"* (Nietzsche, 1968). What they conclude from their reasoning and purport to be truth is based on assumptions and hunches. It is this 'gut-feeling' on issues that makes individuals do the right or wrong thing at any given time. Once the world is rid of the notion of God, it will be able to revert to nature, which is a level surface of immanence within there are many and diverse forces but no beyond. Nietzsche also asserted that if all morality is a nothing more than a lie, it remains a needed one for the advancement of civilization. Consequently, even if moral systems are relative and random, compliance to such imperatives is the foundation of civilization itself and it is this which makes one's existence meaningful and life worth living. He warns: *'He who fights with monsters should look to it that he himself does not become a monster. And when you gaze long into an abyss the abyss also gazes into you'.*(Nietzsche, 1966).

Nietzsche also insisted on the necessity of conflict in any society and the prohibition of anything remotely resembling compassion, *"he who climbs upon the highest mountain laughs at all tragedies, real or imaginary"* (Nietzsche, 1968). He also stated that the more passionate one is about their cause the stronger they become, and the more powerful they are, the wiser they become. Power is a matter of how much of it one has and it emanates from nature and is a "primitive form of affect, that all other affects are only developments of it" (*Will to Power*: 688). He placed great value on the conception of the will to empower itself and stated *"But what is life? Here we need a new, more definite formulation of the concept 'life.' My formula for it is: Life is will to power"* (*Will to Power*: 254). Nietzsche's criticized both Aristotle and Aquinas and opposed the notion that the word 'good' was initially applied to altruistic action as a socially useful idea. According to Nietzsche who was an altruist who was concerned with others,

everything that is done by people has an egoistic basis as the self is nothing more than a system of urges. All ethical and moral actions and beliefs are relative. When an action is un-egoistic it is described as moral, and therefore no such act has existed. Morality exists only in a fictitious world. Altruistic in nature, Nietzsche wanted to see that moral authority and motivation would produce the greatest good for the largest number of human beings (Parsons, 1973) and thus uphold the integrity of the community at large. Nietzsche's views demonstrate that he perceives issues on ethics from the standpoint of human life which exists beyond what is considered good or evil. He confronts the basic moral view that when some people dominate and exploit others who are less powerful than they are, that they are acting in an unacceptable way. All people have a "will to power" which is based on their relentless energy and this is not based on them being deficient in any way but rather on a natural striving for authority and control.

To Nietzsche there is no single moral code which applies to all people equally. There are numerous moralities-some for the 'overman' of 'noble' rank and some for the plebeians in society. As such, certain moralities are appropriate for the upper echelon or the leaders in society. Managers for example, would be subjected to different types of morality and ethical conduct on their part and this could be considerably different to the expected moral and ethical conduct of the employees they manage. The important consideration in determining morality and individuals is what kind of person any individual is and whether or not that person is strong or weak. Nicomachean Ethics and those of Nietzsche differ in that virtue and vice have similarities in that irrespective of which we opt for, the choice is based on personal desires and it is not dependent on the merits or otherwise of our selection. Nietzsche elucidates that our concept of what is deemed right or wrong is crafted by society and the cultural grouping within which we reside (Nietzsche, 1968). Beyond our culture and the society in which we live, both morality and ethics may have different interpretations. Nietzsche demonstrates according to his perceptions, how western views of morality are defective. Essentially, Nicomachean Ethics is a means by which individuals or even the collective society generates an effective system of ethical beliefs that currently influences Western culture. However, Nietzsche demonstrates that preconceived notions and biases in the Western systems of morality taint ethics as such, so that all actions and beliefs could be wide of the mark in other ethical systems. So Nietzsche does not seek to propose or begin to suggest an explicit positive moral code but strives to confront post-Enlightenment moral beliefs upon which present-day business ethics bases itself.

Using Socrates as sort of role model, Nietzsche wanted to expose *"how much hypocrisy, comfortableness,"* and lack of self-discipline is in fact concealed beneath contemporary morality. On the surface morality appears to be good, but in essence it is a festering wound in need of healing. What is required are new aims and objectives that will give reason to life. Every age requires a thinker to dissect the virtues of the society in which he/she lives (Schacht, 1983). Individual virtue and the character of a person are the primary concern of Nietzsche: *"The greatest perhaps also possess great virtues, but in that case also their opposites... I believe that it is*

precisely through the presence of opposites and the feelings they occasion that the great person, the bow with the great tension, develops." In this context, all universal moral codes that hinder character and suppress the notion of equality between humans must be discarded as each individual should be able to achieve wholeness and live a holistic life. Our impulses and urges must be managed without impeding the development of others but must rather be integrated with them (Acampora, 2006). Those who are stronger and more spiritually inclined owe it to themselves to have compassion for the weak and this is nothing less than a demonstration of a higher level of attainment on the evolutionary ladder (Kaufmann, 1968). The level of tolerance and compassion one has also demonstrates their real power. However, selflessness does not necessarily benefit society, and can actually harm it if not correctly handled and egoism *per se* does not need to debase society but can and should aid it. The body is inferior and should be submissive to the dictates of the mind. In Nietzsche's *Nachlaß* we read: *"The human body, in which the most distant and most recent past of all organic development again becomes living and corporeal, through which and over and beyond which a tremendous inaudible stream seems to flow: the body is a more astonishing idea than the old "soul".* In his *Beyond Good and Evil,* Nietzsche states that: *"The world viewed from inside, the world defined and determined according to its 'intelligible character' – it would be 'will to power' and nothing else" (Beyond Good and Evil*: 36). Consequently, the importance of the will to supremacy is itself the very significance of human life and this is an unquestionable ontological reality. Nietzsche attempts to destroy the old way of thinking and acting so as to commence a new phase in the dialectical progression of human values. He differentiates between *healthy* and *sick* ways of evaluating life and thus between healthy and unhealthy lifestyles. To Nietzsche, the soul, which is equal to the body, is then where time is experienced and where we can gain authority over it (Loeb, 2005).

In order to begin to comprehend Nietzsche's view of selfishness, we need to come to grips with two terms, namely, self-development and self-expression. The egoism of the strong in society, whose contentment exists because of their philanthropy is distinct to that of the weak: *"Insatiably your soul strives for treasures and gems, because your virtue is insatiable in wanting to give. You force all things to and into yourself that they may flow back out of your well as the gifts of your love. Verily, such a gift-giving love must approach all values as a robber; but whole and holy I call this selfishness. There is also another selfishness, an all-too-poor and hungry one that always wants to steal--the selfishness of the sick: sick selfishness. With the eyes of a thief it looks at everything splendid...and always it sneaks around the table of those who give....What do we consider bad and worst of all? Is it not degeneration? And it is degeneration that we always infer where the gift-giving soul is lacking. Upward goes our way, from genus to overgenus. But we shudder at the degenerate sense which says, "Everything for me."* (Nietzsche, Thus Spoke Zarathustra).

Thinking ethically in business

An excerpt from Nietzsche has obvious links with management literature on contemporary business leadership of

the 1980s and early 1990s: *"To give style to one's character- a great and rare art! He practises it who surveys all that his nature presents in strength and weakness and then moulds it to an artistic plan until everything appears as art and reason, and even the weakness delight the eye...It will be the strong, imperious natures which experience their subtlest joy in exercising such a control, in such a constraint and perfecting under their own law"* (Nietzsche, 1999). When a business manager contemplates the question "why do I need to act ethically", and reflects on Nietzsche, he could probably conclude that Nietzsche would in all probability respond by saying that there are no moral occurrences but rather only moral explanations of occurrences. Consequently, if no moral occurrences exist, nothing whatsoever could be considered to be good or evil. In *The Will to Power* we read: *"to demonstrate the absolute homogeneity of all events and the application of moral distinctions as conditioned by perspective; to demonstrate how everything praised as moral is identical in essence with everything immoral"* (Nietzsche, 1967). Conversely, in *Beyond Good and Evil,* he states that despite his assessment that all moral systems are relative and subjective, life is only worthwhile when rules are obeyed to. Obeying is what makes life significant.

In questioning what is right and what is wrong Nietzsche refers to the heroic nobleman in the theory of perfectionism and he maintains that there are simply no objective values. What does exist in abundance are a random set of values that do not objectively exist. Ethically speaking, Nietzsche certainly makes us more aware of the significance of perspective. This is basically the necessity to see all values and concepts in the right moral and ethical perspective. This view has very important connotations for the principles of corporate social responsibility and corporate social investment which suggest that businesses should modify their aims and actions and move away from the limiting focal point of increasing their bottom-lines and returns to shareholders, and shift towards serving the more philanthropic interests of the much broader community and in so doing, serve the interests of all stakeholders. Businesses should thus be engaged in what is advantageous for the majority, while still making profit. Nietzsche also states: *"My idea is that every specific body strives to become master over all space and to extend its force (its will to power: and to thrust back all that resists its extension. But it continually encounters similar efforts on the part of other bodies and ends by coming to an arrangement ("union") with those of them that are sufficiently related to it: thus they then conspire together for power. And the process goes on…"*(Nietzsche, 1967).

Human artistic creativity, innovation and power, are paramount. It is this creativity which creates ethical values (Yovel, 1986), but very few individuals have the capacity to create while others must follow the lead of the creative few and afford them space to be creative and innovative. After all, things exist primarily for them. Clearly, for Nietzsche, 'might is right' but to have ethics in place is an aesthetic option rather than an objective truth. Not all people can be managers and so most people who are not in managerial roles lack real value. Those who are ordinary and do not rise above the others merely exist (Allison, 2000). Do ethics really have anything to do with what we think as individuals or is right simply right and wrong always wrong? Nietzsche's analysis is highly

naturalistic and he does seem to adopt his ideas from nature and his view on the cosmos and knowledge to an extent echo this adoption. Interestingly, in especially Existentialism, Nietzsche's ideas are gradually been taken more seriously and business leaders must act with a greater sense of morality and respect towards all stakeholders and not exploit especially their employees if they wish to be truly effective. It would be highly irresponsible for managers for example, to try to do the work of their employees as this would ultimately lead to inefficiency and promote corruption and unethical conduct. Business managers as the elite group must be innovative and inventive and not seek to diminish their value by unethical conduct.

Comprehension and knowledge are conditioned in an intricate manner by the circumstances in which what we refer to as facts are faced up to, and also by the cerebral processes that are referred to as interpretations. In any case, 'facts' and moral actions are not always what they seem to be and are in any event interpreted differently by different people in diverse contexts and situations. Some interpretations offered by people are better than those offered by others. What makes some interpretations superior is less distortion. One should evaluate an interpretation and further develop it so as to improve it. To simply accept an interpretation is not acceptable and to *"blindly indulgence of an affect, totally regardless of whether it be a generous and compassionate or a hostile affect, is the cause of the greatest evils"* (Nietzsche, 1966). For managers, egoism is highly creative and implies prioritizing the self-interest but this is altruistic and diverts one's thinking if not carefully controlled. In *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, he says that one should love oneself *"so that one can bear to be with oneself and need not roam. Such roaming baptizes itself `love of the neighbor': with this phrase the best lies and hypocrisies have been perpetrated so far"* (Nietzsche, 1968). Once managers are unhappy with themselves, they take their ill feeling out on their employees. However those who are content with themselves, and somewhat egotistical, will ultimately benefit others. Essentially then, in a business context, Nietzsche calls on people to better themselves so that they can also serve the interests of others who are weaker. It is also true to an extent that not all creative people act ethically all the time but nonetheless, says Nietzsche, they do have a great role to play in making the world a better place.

Conclusion

Friedrich Nietzsche believed that the source of all 'human potential' is in the atheistic glorification of the self and he encouraged this belief. Managers should thus act ethically and this implies that they use their creativity to improve themselves and society. Nietzsche differentiates between two types of morality: firstly the "master morality" and secondly the "slave morality". The initial type applies to the leaders of a society, who tend to formulate personal values. On the other hand, "slave morality" is applies to the herd according to whose values the behaviour of leaders is considered to be devoid of any good and borders on evil. However it is the masters, upholds Nietzsche, who are located beyond good and evil. They are bound to their own values and these differ to those endorsed for the herd that support mediocrity in all actions and thus contribute to the hindering of the development of the 'overman'.

It is thus very Nietzschean for ethical and moral managers to focus on each employee's independent and autonomous growth. However good self-development may be to ethical conduct, this should not be in isolation, but rather in concert with others. The correct way to approach the arena of business ethics is that managers must radically shift their emphasis from only profit-making and envisage the conduct of work as a vital and necessary part of what leads to a good life. Happiness in the workplace and indeed in life is based on the manner in which one works and lives their life. Managers without a moral guidance are simply in power and the higher the level of power and authority that they possess the greater the possibility that it can be used for evil as well as good. Clearly then, all leadership which seeks to be ethical in nature requires a moral compass. Nietzsche assists in providing a moral compass for managers and employees as he presents us with his views of personal characteristics in ethical action and the element of managerial and employee decision-making which is perhaps what management students and managers are seeking to address in their work.

To Nietzsche, people who think in terms of "good" as opposed to "bad" epitomize a superior mentality which is suitable for a leadership role, while those who think in terms of "good" as opposed to "evil," epitomize an acquiescent mentality and are suitable only to be led by others.
'Say not: I will do unto others as I would they should do unto me. What thou doest, that can no man do to thee again. There is no requital'. http://www.nietzsche-quotes.com/.

REFERENCES

Acampora, C. D. (ed.), 2006. Nietzsche's "On the Genealogy of Morals": Critical Essays, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham.

Allison, D. 2000. Reading the New Nietzsche. Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield Publishing, Maryland.

Aristotle, 1985. Nicomachean Ethics, Terence Irwin, trans. Hackett Publishing Company: Indianapolis.

Bauman, Z., 1993. Postmodern ethics, Blackwell, Oxford.

Christians, C.G., 2008. 'The Ethics of Universal Being' in Media Ethics Beyond Borders - A Global Perspective, Ward, J.A and Wasserman, H., eds., Heinemann Publishers, Johannesburg.

Copleston, F.C. 1991. Aquinas, Penguin, New York.

Davies, B., 1993. The Thought of Thomas Aquinas, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Deleuze G., 1988. Spinoza: Practical Philosophy, trans. by Robert Hurley, City Light Books, San Francisco.

Friedmann, W., 1967. Legal Theory, 5th edition, Stevens and Sons Ltd, London.

Fukuyama, F. 1992. The End of History and the Last Man, Free Press, New York.

Hood, J.M., (1996). The Heroic Enterprise: Business and the Common Good, Free Press, New York.

Hosten, W.J. et. al. 1977. Introduction to South African Law and Legal Theory. Heer Drukkers (Edms) Bpk, Pretoria.

Janaway, C. 2007. Beyond Selflessness: Reading Nietzsche's Genealogy, Oxford University Press, Oxford:

Kant, I. 1965. Translated by TK Abbott. Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Ethics, 10th ed., 56.

Kant, I. 1993. translated by James W. Ellington. Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals, 1783, 3rd ed., Hackett, 30.

Kaufmann, W., 1968. Nietzsche, Random, New York.

Kenny, A. 1984. Aquinas, Oxford University Press Past Masters series.

Leiter, B, and Sinhababu, N., (eds.), 2009. Nietzsche and Morality, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lloyd of Hampstead, 1979. Introduction to Jurisprudence 4th Edition. Stevens and Sons, London

Loeb, P.S., 2005. 'Finding the Übermensch in Nietzsche's Genealogy of Morality' in *The Journal of Nietzsche Studies,* 30 (Autumn 2005): 70-101.

MacIntyre, A., 1981. After Virtue, University of Notre Dame Press, Indiana.

Nietzsche, F. 1968. 'Twilight of the Gods', in The Portable Nietzsche, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann, Viking Press, New York.

Nietzsche, F. 1966. Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future, trans. by Walter Kaufmann, Vintage, New York.

Nietzsche, F. 1967. The Will to Power, trans. Walter Kaufmann, Vintage Books, New York.

Nietzsche, F. 1968. 'Thus Spoke Zarathustra', in The Portable Nietzsche, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufman, Viking Press, New York.

Nietzsche, F. 1982. Daybreak, trans. R.J. Hollingdale, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Nietzsche, F. 1983. Untimely Meditations, trans. R.J. Hollingdale, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Nietzsche, F. 1999. 'Die Frohliche Wissenschaft', quoted in Hollingdale, R.J.: Nietzsche: The Man and His Philosophy, Cambridge University Press; Cambridge.

O'Toole, J. 1996. Leading Change: An Argument For Values-Based Leadership, Ballantine Books, New York.

Parsons, K.P. 1973. 'Nietzsche and Moral Change,' in Robert Solomon, ed., Nietzsche: A Collection of Critical Essays, Garden City, Anchor Books, New York, 169-193.

Rampley, M. 2007. Nietzsche, Aesthetics and Modernity, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rosen, F. 2003. Classical Utilitarianism from Hume to Mill, Routledge, 28.

Schacht, R. 1983. Nietzsche, Routledge, New York.

Stark, A. 1993. "What's the Matter with Business Ethics?" Harvard Business Review, May-June 1993, 38-48.

Wilson, J.Q. 1993. The Moral Sense, Free Press, New York.

Yovel, Y. 1986. 'Nietzsche and Spinoza: *amor fati* and *amor dei*.' In Nietzsche as Affirmative Thinker, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Dordrecht. http://www.nietzsche-quotes.com/

****