

SUSTAINING ETHICAL LEADERSHIP

good idea --- BUT

***HAVE WE GOT THE CART
BEFORE THE HORSE? ??***

Prepared by
Glenn W. Sinclair Ph.D.
Adjunct Professor
Simon Fraser University
Concordia University College of Alberta

2014©

Perspective

This is not a conversation about being good or even about what makes one good. What is perfect goodness, most moral or ethical is something perhaps best left to the philosopher or the theologian. The challenge for most leaders is to get to better:

- How can my (the leader's) decisions be better made?
- By what means can I better resolve the ethical challenges within my sphere of influence?
- Where might the moral dilemmas facing my team be better resolved?
- How can interpersonal conflicts resulting from ethical issues be dealt with better?
- When my organization faces the *moment of critical choice* are there better ways of getting through them effectively (i.e. ethically)?

There have been classes offered at universities and colleges on ethics for many years (usually by the department containing professional philosophers). There have been countless books written by moral philosophers. In recent years there has been an increase in the attention paid to the practical aspects of moral decisions. Applied ethics is now a more frequent topic of discussion at professional conferences as well as within Faculties & Schools concerned with aspects of leadership. Oft-times though, the approach still seems rooted in the philosopher's camp, or in re-examining earlier examples of bad behaviour. Sometimes new paradigms are helpful, if only to provide added clarity to valid and useful older paradigms. Moreover, through the lens of different prisms, it may be possible to enhance the new paradigm's applicability over the old thus expanding the relevance of the entire concept.

Nowhere does this seem more appropriate than in the field of *applied ethics*. A question long on my mind is: *How can we hope to understand ethical behaviour, if we only look backwards?* By this I simply mean, it may be helpful to study ancient seers, along with thoughtful tomes and various great ethicists **but does it get us knowingly to ethical action?** For the practising leader, knowing a particular philosophical position (for example, neo-Thomism, or existentialism) may be interesting but it may not help her/him recognize a pending moral dilemma or even what options might need to be analysed in order to sufficiently deal with this ethical challenge. Similarly having read extensively about the sins of past individuals (whether leaders or not) and studied the pronouncements of various ethicists on these sins, the leader may have a better sense of what was/is wrong; but it may not help her/him get through the moment of critical choice in a way that is ethical and personally satisfying/consistent.

Simultaneously we need to ask: *Can we get to action before we have come to grips with our ethical reasoning?* Or, at least understand how we reason when facing a moral dilemma? Implied in these questions seemingly is the hope that we can raise the current roof (and thus, concomitantly, the bar) in *Ethical Capital*. It therefore would be helpful to reflect upon a perspective that is, at least, part of any mandatory first [1st] step(s) in moving people to a point where they can sustain ethical leadership!!

Believe it or not, much of what I am about to say, actually appeared almost forty [40] years ago, written by Dr. Lawrence Kohlberg in the professional journal, *The Kappan*, of the Education Fraternity, *Phi Delta Kappan*. And although I have been working with the concepts for about that long¹, I have tended more toward an applied perspective outside the academy, one of leading & inviting learning more than publishing & lecturing as the academy would expect (and oft-times seems to prefer).

To begin with, if we are to better understand how we reason when we are faced with a moral dilemma, it would seem at least somewhat advantageous to consider utilizing (or at least examining) a **Cognitive-Developmental approach**. This would enable us to get at the mind set that leads us into the moment of critical choice:

- The approach is called *cognitive* because we want to address the *active thinking* of the individual about moral issues and decisions.
- It is called *developmental* because we find merit in considering that ethical reasoning can move through these moral stages.

When confronting a moral² dilemma with the requirement of having to make a critical decision, an individual actually can approach the problem from a number of different levels or stages. More importantly, different people will utilize these different levels or stages to resolve the same problem. Where the dilemma actually involves two [2] individuals, sometimes people will fail to resolve the mutual problem because they are operating at different levels and can't properly appreciate the other decision-maker's point of view.

Bearing in mind there are various and multiple levels, it still seems to be a basic tenant that a person cannot get to moral action if s/he is incapable of moral thought. Any action that is not reasoned can only be random and thus when the moment of critical choice confronts the individual again there is no surety whatsoever that s/he will act in the same, or even similar, manner. Thus, if we truly wish to achieve positive, if not consistent, ethical decision-making it is important that we first consider how we can improve, enhance, sharpen our ethical reasoning both by recognizing that there are a variety of stages from which we might operate and by analysing how/when we might utilize them.

What are the Preliminary Questions?

Do not ask yourself if you are being ethical in your decisions, if you are not first prepared to analyse the reasons that lead you to the decisions:

- *What is it that makes me think a particular decision is better?*
- *How does a critical decision most consistently get justified when I reflect back on it?*
- *Why do I think I am (or am not) facing an ethical dilemma?*

¹ I completed my Ph.D. in Educational Administration in the autumn of 1978; the title of my dissertation: **Developing a Program to Enhance the Moral Reasoning of Educational Administrators**, University of Alberta.

² Throughout this paper the terms **moral** & **ethical** shall be used interchangeably.

There is complexity to all this: these stages do not dictate whether or not an individual is moral in the eyes of the critic, but rather indicate the level of complexity at which the individual is operating in terms of the way he reasons about/through ethical/moral dilemmas. The focus for development is on structure, not content. But there is an end goal in the sense that there is (or at least can be) progression in one's reasoning towards a greater and greater sense of justice.³

No Vacuum Here Awareness: It is also necessary to consider the ethical domain within this context of critical decision-making because, as Mosher points out⁴, *the manager does not operate in a vacuum*. Any organization is a constant source of interaction between all sorts of individuals. This in turn provides challenges that are bound to create dilemmas for the manager or for that matter, any professional leader who faces moments of critical choice in his/her daily work. For example, *the manager must balance his responsibility for the organization's long term survival with his need to care and provide for his staff (particularly his management team), plus respond to the concerns of the community at large*⁵. Attempting to respond to such diverse clients places the manager in situations where conflicting moral decisions will arise. Substitute the word leader for manager and it becomes even clearer that we all face moral dilemmas frequently and from many sources.

Don't Touch Me with that Moral Stuff!!

While it may be true that we all face ethical dilemmas, research (by Sergiovanni, myself and others) demonstrates most executives tend to avoid even talking about moral issues let alone addressing value confrontations. They apply the principle of *least principle* to value conflict, dealing with it at the lowest level of abstraction possible. All too often the ethical dimension is ignored in the hope that it will go away or potentially even worse, there is a false confidence that they are okay, it's the rest of the world that is wrong.

When the Royal Bank was in the midst of a fairly serious scandal and the offer was made to be of assistance, the quick reply was that things were well in hand internally and no outside help was needed.⁶ Similarly when attempting to build a profile for staff involved in family counselling services, the author invited a number of people outside the organization to participate in an initial assessment of levels of ethical reasoning so that the

³ Although even here there is some debate — Carol Gilligan, another student of the Kohlberg schema, contends that there is a gender bias to his work, and that in the case of woman the progression is for a greater and greater *degree of care(caring)*. Nevertheless in the work (& concomitant research) that I have done in the past thirty-seven [37] years, my findings suggest that gender gets trumped by vocation. When dealing with various professions, the ratio of stages is the same between men & women within a particular vocational group, although different groups will have different ratios.

⁴ First given to me by the late Ralph Moser of Boston University in a personal tutorial in the earliest days of my studying this entire subject.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Personal experience of the author in an exchange of correspondence with the executive offices of the Royal Bank of Canada in the 1990's

staff could see where they ranked within the larger provincial population. While public servants, professionals, and leaders in not-for-profit groups willingly got involved, most corporate executives and all politicians who were invited, turned down the offer citing workloads or travel or even bewilderment at why they would be asked to get involved in an ethics research question⁷. And now, very recently, we have learned that leaders at some level(s) at General Motors opted not to change a part costing less than one dollar [\$1.00] even though evidence was mounting that a series of fatal auto accidents were due to an inherent fault in the part's manufacture. Again, it can be assumed with some assurance, at least one [1] individual made what was basically an ethical decision in the moment of critical choice based on the expediency of the moment.

In many instances it becomes apparent that value conflict is treated at the interpersonal level and on a one-to-one basis rather than at the organizational level. It may be inappropriate to claim such evidence shows that the administrator personally is at a very basic stage of development in his moral responsibility. But, it certainly seems reasonable to assert that such leaders too often operate from inappropriate stages of ethical reasoning when dealing with other individuals (whether or not they are face-to-face with them). If the leader had a better understanding of the complexities involved in ethical reasoning, s/he might then be in a position to more adequately deal with value confrontations as they arise in critical dilemmas in the decision-making process.

What we are advocating here is the acquisition of an ethical tool or moral reasoning aid that would enhance our opportunity to get us to a better level of justice & greater degree/sense of caring. Within the **stages theory as developed by Kohlberg** it is important to realize that there is an implicit assumption that the higher levels are more complex (though not necessarily more moral). Recognizing this aspect of the paradigm and thereby adopting it primarily as a tool to help the leader better manage his/her team &/or domain of influence and the concomitant decision-making process, can facilitate the development of an organization that promotes a more just AND caring environment through decision-making made at a higher stage of moral reasoning.

The Basic Paradigm

Kohlberg posits six (6) levels/stages to his theory of moral reasoning. It was originally spelled out in *The Journal of Philosophy*, October 25, 1973 from which much has been excerpted, even sometimes edited; and, subsequently quoted and/or used in countless academic journals, papers and presentations by numerous individuals besides this author⁸.

⁷ Personal experience of the author while CEO of CFSA #12 (Child & Family Services Authority) in Alberta 2000.

⁸ The basic article can be found in its entirety in Purpel David & Kevin Ryan, *Moral Education...It Comes With the Territory*, McCutchan Publishing, Berkley 1976 — Chapter 12.

Pre-Conventional

At the *pre-conventional level* Kohlberg sees primarily the child: responsive to cultural rules and labels of good and bad, right or wrong, but understands these labels only in terms of the physical consequences of action (punishment/reward or exchange of favours) or in terms of the physical power of those who control the rules and labels.

The level is divided into the following two stages:

Stage One [1] — the punishment & obedience orientation (or *fear*). The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness, regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power are valued in their own right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order supported by punishment and authority (the latter being Stage Four [4]).

Stage Two [2] — the instrumental-relativist orientation (or *let's make a deal*). Right action consists of that which rather quickly satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. Human relations are viewed in terms like those of the marketplace.. Elements of fairness, of reciprocity, and of equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in a physical, pragmatic way. Reciprocity is a matter of *you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours*, not loyalty, gratitude or justice.

Conventional

The *conventional level* sees maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, group or nation as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences. The attitude is not only one of *conformity* to personal expectations and social order, but of loyalty to it, of actively *maintaining*, supporting and justifying the order, and of identifying with the persons or group involved in it. It is the perspective that wants to keep things *normal*, the *way things are* (or at least, *have always been*).

At this level, there are the following two stages:

Stage Three [3] — the interpersonal concordance or good boy/nice girl orientation (it's the image: what will people think of me?). Good behaviour is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. Image is all important — the individual tries to conform to stereotypical images of what the majority considers to be *natural* behaviour. A person's action gets frequently judged by intention — *he means well* becomes important for the first time. One understands when one is good because s/he earns approval by being told s/he is *nice*. Perception becomes more important than reality.

Stage Four [4] — the law & order orientation (just give me the rules — what do people do around here?). This is the commonsense orientation towards authority, fixed rules and the maintenance of the social order. Right behaviour consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake. It's the **norm**: *this is the way we do things around here!!* Reality emerges from the group and one's place in that group is better acknowledged the greater the degree of conformity on one's part.

Post-conventional

At the *post-conventional, autonomous (or) principled level*, there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles that have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles and apart from the individual's own identification with these groups. There is a sense of creative indifference to the world as it is and a search, if not full belief, in something more just, more care-worthy — the good actually becomes ***something better***. The individual most comfortable in this context is always looking for a better resolution, a better response, a better ethical state of action as well as reasoning.

This level also has two stages:

Stage Five [5] — the social-contract, legalistic orientation, generally with utilitarian overtones — it is found, in one [1] form or another in all major world religions — *The Golden Rule: do unto others as you would they would do to you (or don't do anything that you would want done to you)*. Right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights and standards which have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society. There is a clear awareness of the relativism of personal values and opinions and a corresponding emphasis upon procedural rules for reaching consensus.

But it is more than simply rights — there are responsibilities and mutual obligation within the purview of personal *values* and *opinion*. The result is an emphasis beyond the *legal point of view*, an emphasis upon the possibility of changing law in terms of rational considerations of social utility (rather than freezing it in terms of Stage 4 *law & order*). Outside the legal realm, free agreement and contract is the binding element of obligation. In many ways this is the *official* morality of the government & constitution (in Canada & USA) although not necessary the morality that is practised by the leaders in those governments!

Stage Six [6] — the universal-ethical-principle orientation. Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen *ethical principles* appealing to logical comprehensiveness, universality and consistency. These principles are abstract and ethical; they are not concrete moral rules like the *Ten Commandments*. At heart, these are universal principles of *justice*, of the dignity of human beings as *individual persons*. And it is within this concept that the goal or principle of *ultimate care/caring* also emerges

Kohlberg's work surrounding the concept of stages implies the following characteristics:
Structured Wholes: **stages are *structured wholes* or *organized systems of thought*; individuals are *consistent* in level of moral judgment.**

Invariant Sequence: **stages form an *invariant sequence*, under all conditions except extreme trauma, movement is always forward, never backward; individuals never skip stages — movement is always up to the next stage;**

Hierarchical Integrations: **Stages are *hierarchical integrations*, thinking at a higher stage includes or comprehends within it lower-stage thinking; there is a tendency to function at or prefer the highest stage possible.**

The results indicated that more than 50% of an individual's thinking is always at one stage, with the remainder at the next adjacent stage (which he is leaving or which he is moving into). More recently this has been challenged by Lalonde's extensive review (2010) of my on-going research wherein she discovered a unique variation on the Webster story⁹ (relating to dealing with an immigrant worker) and a less significant but still striking variation on the Escaped Prisoner story¹⁰. Ms. Lalonde found significantly lower levels of reasoning, even on those who scored overall at a Stage Five [5], from which she posited a sense of *moral smugness* where people of higher reasoning when dealing in their own realms, shift to a more pre-conventional stage when outsiders are added to the dilemma.

Not IQ — Yet Structured

To better understand the applicability of moral stages to the decision-making process, it is useful to clarify the connection of logic or intelligence on the one hand and to moral behaviour on the other. Maturity of moral judgment is not highly correlated with IQ; rather it is cognitive development that is important. Since moral reasoning clearly is reasoning, advanced moral reasoning depends upon advanced logical reasoning. The moral stages are *structures of moral judgment or moral reasoning* and must be distinguished from the *content* of moral judgment. A moral choice involves choosing between two (or more) values as they *conflict* in concrete situations of choice: as a couple of my classes¹¹ have stated –

- *A moral dilemma is an internal conflict between two (2) equal choices/options that must be made but the consequence is painful.*
- *A conflict where an individual is forced to make a choice in which their reasoning is challenged and there is often a trade-off between the consequences to oneself & the consequences imposed on others.*
- *A situation where an individual's personal integrity & judgment is challenged AND a choice must be made even though it is painful + the situation is uncertain (least adverse effect).*

The stage or structure of a person's moral judgment defines:

- what he finds valuable in each of these moral issues
- why he finds it valuable

⁹ Story Five [5] in Rest's D.I.T.

¹⁰ Story Three [3] in Rest's D.I.T.

¹¹ In each of my undergraduate classes students go through a series of discussions until the entire class comes to consensus on what they define a moral dilemma to be. These are three [3] such examples.

Thinking ≠ Acting: Nevertheless, mature moral judgment is not a sufficient condition for mature moral action. One cannot follow moral principles if one does not understand (or believe in) moral principles. However, one can reason in terms of principles and not live up to these principles.

Now, if maturity of moral reasoning is only one factor in moral behaviour, why do I use the cognitive-developmental approach to focus so heavily upon moral reasoning? For the following reasons:

- **moral judgment, while only one factor in moral behaviour, is the single most important or influential factor yet discovered in moral behaviour**
- **while other factors influence moral behaviour, moral judgment is the only distinctively *moral* factor in moral behaviour**
- **more judgment change is long-range and irreversible: a higher stage is never lost; moral behaviour as such is largely situational and reversible or *loseable* in new situations.**

Other Approaches...

The approach being advocated in this paper is not to be confused with *character education* wherein moral values are preached or taught in terms of what may be called the *bag of virtues*. Oft-times it is easy to get superficial consensus on such a *bag of virtues*. Character education and other forms of *indoctrinative* moral education have aimed at teaching values; but the detailed definitions used are relative — often defined by the very teachers who are teaching them. This may lead to concrete moral action but it is not necessarily based on the individual's own belief system nor is it necessarily rational and therefore may not lead to any consistency in rationale and/or action.

Likewise, while many may consider it to be a step forward, *values clarification* tends to stop at the point where awareness of values are elicited. The tendency is towards relativism where there is **no right answer**. There often is a concern over offending minority viewpoints or a desire to achieve consensus — a type of *feel good* notion about morality. Again, there may be some resultant positive moral action, but the situational nature of the approach can lead to very different results each time the individual faces moral choice due to the surrounding pressures for consensus.

In terms of moral discussion this paper supports, the important conditions appear to be:

- exposure to the next higher stage of reasoning;
- exposure to situations posing problems and contradictions for the individual's current moral structure, leading to dissatisfaction with the current level;
- an atmosphere of interchange and dialogue combining the first two conditions, in which conflicting moral views are compared in an open manner.

How Do We Become Better At Moral Decision-Making?

Moral discussion and curriculum constitute only one portion of the conditions stimulating moral growth. Analysing the broader life environment, consideration must be given to the *moral atmosphere* of the home, school, the workplace environment and larger society.

- The first [1st] basic dimension of social atmosphere is the role-taking opportunities it provides to better appreciate the point of view of others.
- The second [2nd] dimension of social atmosphere, more strictly moral, is the level of justice in the environment or institution.
- A third [3rd] aspect that can be brought to bear on the social atmosphere, in an ethical sense, is the degree to which the desire to care (or caring for) exists.

The Example of Jails & Remediation...

The justice structure of an institution refers to the perceived rules or principles for distributing rewards, punishments, responsibilities and privileges among institutional members. This structure may exist or be perceived at any of the moral stages.

- As an example, a study of a traditional prison revealed that inmates perceived it as Stage One (1), regardless of their own¹². Obedience to arbitrary command by power figures and punishment for disobedience were seen as the governing justice norms of the prison.
- A behaviour-modification prison using point rewards for conformity was perceived as a Stage Two (2) system of instrumental exchange. Inmates at Stage 3 or 4 perceived this institution as more fair than the traditional prison, but not in itself fair using their own moral perspectives as the evaluation instrument.

These and other studies suggest that a higher level of institutional justice is a condition for individual development of a higher sense of justice. Some attempts have been made to proactively set up prisons complete with voting on rules and the opportunity to resolve conflicts through discussions of fairness and democratic voting in a community meeting. The basic problem however rests in the preponderance of lower stage/level moral reasoners (especially Stage One [1] and Two [2]) who are found in prisons. Until their levels are enhanced/elevated, it is very difficult to have them participate effectively in Stage Five [5] or even Four [4] level planning and administration. If an individual believes s/he is only incarcerated because s/he got caught, all the democratic opportunities will be meaningless as the person is simply wanting out because it really wasn't fair that they got caught.¹³

¹² Kohlberg, Scharf & Hickey, *The Justice Structure of the Prison: A Theory and Intervention in The Prison Journal*

¹³ Based on a personal story related by Peter Scharf at a Moral Education class at the University of California, Irvine (June, 1976)

Other approaches have been centred in high schools where democratic decision-making was incorporated into dealing with real issues concerning drugs, stealing, disruptions and grading: the focus was on fairness. Oft-times the larger meetings were preceded by small-group moral discussion. Enhanced moral reasoning and improved moral development seemed to emerge and as it did, the decision-making became better with better results – overall school discipline improved and students took more individual responsibility for their actions.

The Opportunity is Here...

Subsequent research by the author¹⁴ combined with thirty-five [35] years of follow-up investigations, analyses and research suggests that short term exposure to these concepts may not always improve one's level of moral reasoning, but it definitely will increase one's sensitivity to the existence of the moral dilemma. Moreover, by providing the individual a deeper understanding of the **stages theory of moral/ethical development** it is possible to enhance the ability to deal/work with others involved in the same dilemma or more effectively manage the resolution of conflict among colleagues when their levels of moral reasoning are known.

Even more helpful is to take the Kohlbergian paradigm (which is basically an upward pointing pyramid) and turn it on its side – thus pictorially removing the impression that Stage Six [6] is always better than Stage Four [4], etc.! Our research suggests that if leaders at least are trained to recognize the various stages, they can begin to apply some of Kohlberg's insights to resolve or mediate potential ethical problems among staff by addressing the members in ethical language more akin to their levels of reasoning and thus, working from there bring them to a more compatible mutual understanding. At that point, in many instances (perhaps as many as 60%) the dilemma will evaporate; while in the remaining situations, the leader can then work directly to change the pending action(s) such that a moral meltdown is avoided. By such a re-deployment of the paradigm one can take a more objective stance by first learning to recognize the ethical dilemma and then determining the best stage(s)/level(s) at which to address it.

So, let's review these stages and reflect on how interaction most clearly occurs! Here, again, is each level of moral reasoning and how it contributes to resolving the ethical dilemma! The six stages are as follows:

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|--|
| (1) | <i>punishment and obedience</i> - | fear |
| (2) | <i>the attempt to make a deal</i> - | you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours! |
| (3) | <i>let's try to get along</i> - | nice person image |
| (4) | <i>law and order</i> - | show me the rules! |
| (5) | <i>social contract</i> - | I have an obligation to do to you what I would want you to do to me |
| (6) | <i>universal principles</i> - | I believe!! |

¹⁴ Sinclair, G.W. *The Development of A Program in Moral Reasoning for Educational Administrators*, University of Alberta (Educational Administration), 1978

Another way to explore this is to look at the stages in terms of the question of **the value of human life**. Here are examples of each stage of reasoning:

- Level 1 - *The value of human life is confused with the value of physical objects and is based on social status or physical attributes of the possessor.*
- Level 2 - *The value of human life is seen as instrumental to the satisfaction of the needs of its possessor, or of other persons.*
- Level 3 - *The value of human life is based on the empathy and affection of family members and others towards its possessor.*
- Level 4 - *Life is conceived as sacred in terms of its place in a categorical, moral, or religious order of rights and duties.*
- Level 5 - *Life is valuable in terms of its relation to community welfare and in terms of life being a universal right.*
- Level 6 - *Belief in the sacredness of human life as representing a universal human value of respect for the individual.*

Being comfortable with the various stages and more adept at determining the levels at which others predominately operate provides the foundation to adapt/adjust the level(s) being chosen when attempting to mediate or resolve a dilemma resulting from the behaviour of others or when one wishes to enhance one's own moral decision-making. Should you believe that your own behaviour and/or the thinking that supports it is inadequate or insufficient for the challenges/tasks at hand, then it is incumbent to refine your own level(s) of moral reasoning. In other words, if your present disposition is to use level three [3] reasoning, start to reformulate your arguments at a level four [4] and then try five [5].

In conclusion, I would recommend we should add to all our training & skill development programs in the field(s) of ethics &/or ethical leadership (as we do at University of Prince Edward Island [School of Business], Concordia University College of Alberta [Environmental & Public Health programs]) at least one (1) course that focusses on the cognitive developmental aspects of ethical reasoning. Moreover we need to enhance the potential for assisting leaders in both understanding their own levels of ethical reasoning & how they can work to enhance that plus recognizing the levels in their teams & how, by adopting different stages (of moral reasoning) on different occasions, they can more effectively resolve moral dilemmas and thus reduce the likelihood of moral meltdowns...

We may not change the behaviour (ethical action) immediately...

We may even take some time before leaders fully comprehend the various stages in themselves let alone in others...

But we do know that there is an on-going impact of studying the moment of critical choice on enhancing people's abilities to recognize moral dilemmas to begin with...

**AND MAYBE THAT IS THE MOST CRITICAL
FIRST (1st) STEP WE CAN TAKE**

**IN GETTING THE HORSE BEFORE THE CART
ONCE AGAIN...**