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Students have very definite but decidedly different ways of using their minds. These differences in thinking are also thought to be related to different learning preferences as well as how individuals approach decision making concerning ethical and international matters. This paper examines the possible linkages between students’ ethical and cultural values and Raudsepp’s problem solving styles model of information gathering and processing. The value systems considered are the four ethical systems identified by Hitt and the cultural value dimensions outlined by Hofstede. To better educate diverse groups of students, a broader, more balanced approach is recommended to general course design.

Introduction

This paper introduces and attempts to link a cognitive problem solving styles model and various ethical systems as a theoretical framework for higher education. A greater understanding of these issues and how they may be related is believed to be particularly important for teaching in a campus environment characterized by a multicultural student population or in an international setting. In both of these environments there is likely to be a diversity of students’ learning styles and cultural values.

In order for today’s students to function in a world increasingly characterized by information technology, global interactions, and rapidly changing environments, traditional approaches to education may no longer be adequate. School systems, from first grade through college, seem to fail to recognize these complexities and place too great an emphasis on solving routine problems. Yet a further complication is encountered if one considers non-routine issues such as ethical decision making.

There are a large number of ways of categorizing human behavior including cognitive styles, values, attitudes, and personality. One way to relate these items is to think of them as an onion, which is a model originally developed by management consultant Dennis Rohen. Personality represents the outer layer of the onion and is the layer most evident when one deals with an individual. However, personality can be changed, as indicated by the large number of self-help books devoted to this subject. If one removes this outermost layer, encountered are the individual’s attitudes, including management practices or management style. An attitude “is a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner” (Rokeach, 1972, 112). At yet a deeper level there are ethical values, which are believed to be deeply influenced by early family interactions, and thus relatively fixed aspects of our character.

Unlike attitudes, which specifically focus on objects or situations, values are “enduring belief(s)” that certain end results are “personally and socially preferable to alternative(s) . . .” (Id., 160). Values thus become a basis for “morally judging self and others” (Id.). Two kinds of values are ethical values and cultural values. These collectively can be called the “software of the mind,” which is taken from the subtitle of Hofstede (1991). Finally, at the deepest level is the core of a person’s onion, which can be thought of as the hardware of the mind. These hardware or core characteristics have been operationalized in a number of so-called whole brain models including a simplified version of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), Kolb’s Experiential Learning Model (ELM), and the Herrmann Brain Dominance Model (HBDM).
Each of these models attempts to characterize brain functions using two opposite dimensions resulting in four different styles to describe patterns of information gathering and processing.

The model used in this research is a problem solving styles model which determines preferences in four fundamentally different ways of gathering and processing information: A = analytical, B = procedural, C = collaborative, and D = conceptual (Raudsepp, 1992). To develop and appreciate all four quadrants, students need to be taught in a holistic way involving a variety of activities. Such a broader approach to education recognizes that all students are different and have different learning preferences. Teaching effectiveness is thought to be enhanced by using each student's preferred learning style, as inferred from their problem solving preference, at least a portion of the time. This leads to a broader range of activities that goes beyond the lecture and problem solving typical of most introductory classes, which in terms of the model is related to the cognitive style preferred by the quadrant B dominant style. Added activities can be, for example, writing and computer assignments (quadrant A), group projects and other collaborative learning activities (quadrant C), and Socratic discussions and case studies (quadrant D).

Applying this problem solving styles approach to the issue of ethics would indicate that quadrant B students are likely to have a preference for evaluating an action based on whether the rules were followed in a given situation. For example, using business students the quadrant B approach to ethical decision making could be based on whether or not a Code of Professional Ethics was followed. (More complete information on different ethical systems and how they might relate to the problem solving styles model is provided in the section entitled Ethics.)

To illustrate how differences in problem solving styles may be important in international settings, consider the following illustration. Research indicates that North American and East Asian managers may have a very different cultural values. Using the cultural dimensions defined by Hofstede (which are described more fully later), the most dramatic differences appear to be the highly individualistic cultural scores for the U.S. and Canada compared to the collectivistic patterns in China, Korea, and Japan. (More information on these differences is provided in the section entitled Cultural Values).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. First is a discussion of literature focusing on ethical decision making studies using multi-dimensional ethics measures, and studies which focus on cultural values. There also is a detailed discussion of the Raudsepp problem solving styles model. More detail is provided on this model because it is less well known than the multi-dimensional ethical decision making and cultural values models. This is followed by speculation on the anticipated linkages between problem solving styles and both ethical systems and cultural value dimensions. The paper concludes with the educational implications of such research.

**Literature Review**

**Ethical Values**

Most of the studies of ethics in this context have focused on the effects a person's level of cognitive moral development as inferred from the moral judgments taken by the person in a situation involving an ethical dilemma. One problem with this approach is that ethical decision making is impacted both by factors presented in the scenario being tested as well as the personal characteristics of the subjects being tested. This problem of separating personal characteristics and the framing of the decision problem was recognized long ago by researchers in social psychology (Hartshorne & May, 1928). A second problem is the
predominant use of a univariate measure of moral development. For example, Larry Ponemon
uses the Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Rest, 1986) which is based on six successive stages of
moral development. The DIT results in a univariate P (principled) score that measures the use
of principled moral considerations.

To effectively deal with a concept as complex as “ethical values,” there must be a
conceptual framework that disaggregates it into meaningful components. Two such multi-
dimensional systems have been used in the accounting arena. One is the Ethics Position
Questionnaire (EPQ) developed by Forsyth (1980). This instrument classifies individuals by
their personal moral philosophies (Forsyth, 1992, 461) as:

(a) situationists advocate striving for the best consequences possible irrespective of
moral maxims;

(b) subjectivists reject moral guidelines and base judgments on personal values and
practical concerns;

(c) absolutists assume that actions are moral, provided they yield positive consequences
and conform to moral rules; and

(d) exceptionists prefer to follow moral dictates but allow for exceptions for practical
reasons.

A second instrument called the multi-dimensional ethics scale (MES) was developed by
Reidenbach and Rubin (1990). In its original version this instrument used three dimensions:
this three dimensional scale to adapt it specifically for an accounting setting and ultimately
added a fourth item: utilitarianism.

In addition to determining where on a given multi-dimensional ethic scale an individual
fits, further analysis must be done to determine relevant situational factors. Thus it may be
necessary to not only determine an individual's ethical ideology, but also determine a match
between that individual's personal ethical ideology and professional career choices likely to
lead to ethical situations that place the greatest value on this ethical ideology.

Cultural Values

Not only must students be trained to interpret the meaning of information and be able to
deal with unstructured problems, but they also must develop an understanding of the
importance of global differences. For example, the U.S. has a long tradition of limiting
international accounting study to such items as foreign currency translation, foreign account-
ing standards, and accounting for multinational corporations. Only recently have scholars
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Problem Solving Styles

A cognitive model that can provide an inexpensive and readily accessible basis for measuring students thinking and learning styles for education research is the Raudsepp Problem Solving Styles Inventory (Raudsepp, 1992). Most other models used in such research, including the Kolb’s Learning Style Inventory, the simplified version of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, and the Herrmann Brain Dominance Model, mentioned in the Introduction, are expensive to administer and often require specialized training or a psychologist to administer and interpret. For this research the Raudsepp instrument was chosen because it is a simple exercise and requires no specialized training to administer and interpret.

The Raudsepp model begins with the now popular notion of complementary brain hemispheres, where the left hemisphere is characterized by a tendency to concentrate on facts and details and the right hemisphere seeks and constructs patterns and uses a “big picture” or holistic information gathering style. In addition to this left-right dichotomy, individuals are modeled as processing information using either a “new brain” thinking mode, by applying logic and a step-by-step approach, or by a “mature brain” experiential (experimental) mode, which is a more active approach where individuals attempt to solve problems using instinctual methods or prior experience. The foundation for this second processing dimension of the problem solving styles model is found in MacLean’s Triune Brain Model (MacLean, 1990) which shows that the neocortex (the uniquely human brain) evolved on top of a more primitive mammalian brain that still remains inside us.

Because this second dimension is less well known, a quick overview will be provided of the differences between the new and mature brains. Words describing new brain activities are: logic, objectivity, precision, analysis, and technology. Contrast this with mature brain activities which rely on skills such as: motivation, dealing with people, innovation, memory, and trying to understand the big picture. The new brain works much like a computer and is able to solve very complex problems, but like a computer it must be programmed (i.e., understand) all of the steps necessary to get to the solution. However, when something sidetracks the new brain, such as by introducing conflicting factors, or more generally by creating a situation requiring one to look at problems in new ways, one must be able to trigger a switch to the mature brain which possesses these skills.

The Raudsepp Problem Solving Styles Inventory (Raudsepp, 1992) combines these left/right and new/mature brain dimensions into one model which is graphically illustrated in Figure 1.
The model inferred from Raudsepp’s Problem Solving Styles Inventory, which was initially used for career counseling, has been adapted for education purposes by this author. No claim is made that the instrument correctly determines an individual’s actual information gathering or processing behavior. Raudsepp’s instrument is based on a self-report inventory resulting in a measure of an individual’s preferences along each of two bi-polar dimensions. The instrument gives results displayed as a brain-dominance profile, or mind map, with four scores marked on axes bisecting the four quadrants. These scores are connected by lines resulting in the profile. The circles in the profile indicate areas of preference (1), use (2), or avoidance (3). Scores are reported as a 1, 2, or 3 for each quadrant in A, B, C, and D order.

To help readers determine their own preferences, the Raudsepp Problem Solving Styles Inventory is included in the Appendix. When taking the test, consider the following questions:

1. Does it appear to measure what is described in the model?
2. How do you feel about your pattern?
3. Do the results let you see yourself in new ways?

In the Raudsepp model the preferred quadrant indicates a propensity to use a certain pattern rather than others. In this regard the preference is something like handedness. A right handed person has a preference for the right hand, but in the event of injury can learn to use the left. The most extreme opposite types in the model are along the diagonals, specifically A-C and B-D. To illustrate the A-C opposites, consider two characters from the original Star Trek TV series. Spock, who was analytical, logical, and quantitative, is an A dominant individual compared to Dr. McCoy, the ship’s medical doctor, whose empathy, caring, and nurturing were in many ways too “good” to be true of an actual person. Considering the B vs. D extremes, one can offer Sergeant Joe Friday from the Dragnet TV series who was a detail person, a list maker, methodical, practical, and well organized and wanted “just the facts,
Ma'am." Contrast this with Sherlock Holmes, who was intrigued by odd and seemingly unrelated facts and details of a case. He possessed a mental picture of what should, and more importantly, what shouldn't be present in a crime scene, so he noticed the importance of "the dog was not barking," meaning the crime was an inside job. This is something that would not be included on Joe Friday's list of facts.

**Ethics**

Most of the studies reviewed in the literature section use personal ethical measures to describe ethical decision makers. In this study a slightly broader approach was chosen. The full range of ethical systems that have been identified by philosophers is examined and an attempt is made to link these ethical systems with what is thought to be related cognitive problem solving styles. The ethical systems used in this analysis are taken from *Ethics and Leadership* by William Hitt (1990). The four ethical systems are briefly defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical System</th>
<th>Proponent</th>
<th>Definition: The moral rightness of an action is determined by . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End result</td>
<td>John Stuart Mill</td>
<td>Considering its consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule based</td>
<td>Immanuel Kant</td>
<td>Laws and standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contract</td>
<td>Jean Jacques Rousseau</td>
<td>Customs and norms of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Martin Buber</td>
<td>Your own conscience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For end result ethics the basic principle is to compare the sum total of the utilities produced by some proposed action to the sum total of utilities produced by any other action that could have been performed in its place. This ethical approach would be reframed by accountants as a cost/benefit analysis. A problem is that concepts such as pleasure and happiness are hard to quantify.

The basic principle of the rule ethics approach is to simply follow all rules. Rule ethics appeals to individuals who desire, and is appropriate for, situations that require certainty. It is also easy to evaluate one's behavior based on well established rules. The downfall of rule ethics is when we question whether the rules are right, what to do about conflicting rules, or should a rule be followed if its consequences could turn out bad?

Social contract ethics moves away from rules and laws and holds that the standards of morality are to be set by the general will of the people. The problem, of course, is how to determine the general will of the people. A limitation is that since the common good or the general will decide what should and shouldn't happen in their community, those people who are independent thinkers may be ostracized for their different ways of thinking. It is, however, just such radical thoughts that create positive changes in a society.

Unlike the previous three approaches, which are based on considerations outside the individual, personalistic ethics looks inside a person to determine what is morally right. The obvious downfall to this type of ethical decision making when applied in a business setting, is that it is hard to objectively determine what a person "feels" is the right thing to do. This is not to say that personalistic ethics are a total waste of time, because it is personalistic ethics that provides the basis collectively used to come up with policies, rules, or laws in society. A possible way to introduce more objectivity would be for individuals to ask themselves if they would be proud to explain their behavior to their parents or children.
The linkages between these ethical systems, related decision making strategies identified by Hitt (1990, 179), and the more general problem solving styles (Raudsepp, 1992) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical System</th>
<th>Decision Making Strategy</th>
<th>Problem Solving Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End-result</td>
<td>Test for results</td>
<td>Analytical (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule based</td>
<td>Test for policies and procedures</td>
<td>Procedural (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-contract</td>
<td>Test for organizational values</td>
<td>Interpersonal (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Test for personal conviction</td>
<td>Conceptual (D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These proposed linkages appear reasonable, but would need to be verified by empirical testing. Such a proposed study would also provide data to examine whether there are any systematic differences in the Raudsepp problem solving styles data for upper division students who have chosen different areas of emphasis. The proposed research must also undertake an analysis of any systematic differences among individuals when characterized by their ethical system preferences. While ethical research has focused on individuals, the primary focus of this analysis will be on any group differences that there may be for individuals examining different ethical problems that are relevant to different majors.

**Cultural Values**

To effectively deal with a concept as complex as “cultural values,” one must come up with a conceptual framework that disaggregates it into meaningful components. One such system has been developed by Geert Hofstede (1980, 1991). In his original research there were four cultural dimensions defined as follows (Hofstede, 1980):

- **Individualism/Collectivism** - A measure of the degree to which cultures prefer autonomy or group affiliation.
- **Power Distance** - A measure of the degree to which cultures prefer a more autocratic structure. Countries scoring high on this dimension prefer a less participative style.
- **Uncertainty Avoidance** - A measure of the degree to which cultures feel uncomfortable with uncertainty.
- **Need for Achievement** - A measure of the degree to which cultures stress achievement, assertiveness, and material success.

Hofstede (1984) published data on the results of the these four dimensions for fifty countries.

The majority of the comparative literature concerning international management differences has focused on personality, managerial practices, and cultural values. Most often such research has dealt with the differences between the Japanese and the Americans. There appears to be a reasonable consensus that Americans prefer an individualistic, impersonal, and rational decision making style while the Japanese place more value on positive interpersonal feelings, collaboration, and group decision making. Some of these differences can be traced to philosophical differences in the respective cultures. As indicated by Taggart and Robey (1981, p. 191)

Western philosophy ... assumes the original condition of nature as one of chaos ... The human role is to impose order ... In contrast, Eastern philosophy takes the original condition of nature to be one order ... One returns to this original state by letting go and permitting natures inherent expression rather than by actively intervening.
Studies on negotiations indicate that Americans value time efficiency and focus on points of disagreement in an attempt to clarify issues and resolve differences, while the Japanese seek consensual decision making and feel the future will be governed by the foundation created from a smooth, harmonious relationship (Moran, 1987). One would expect the philosophical differences listed above to also be related to systematic differences in cognitive styles.

The linkage between Hofstede’s individualism-collectivism cultural value dimensions and Raudsepp’s A-C problem solving quadrants appears relatively straightforward. The search for a cultural value counterpart for the problem solving B-D dimension was not as simple. Specifically, one had to choose from the three remaining dimensions originally identified by Hofstede: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity.

Quadrant B in Raudsepp’s problem solving styles model represents the tendency to follow the rules, rely on past experience, and use structured procedures compared to quadrant D’s less structured and more imaginative approaches that allow one to “think outside the box.” The PD (power distance) at home and school discussion in Hofstede (1991) indicates a very authoritarian approach in high PD societies with teacher-centered learning being the preferred approach compared to more student-centered learning that tends to predominant in low PD societies. This suggests that authoritarian teacher-centered approaches will be a more comfortable environment for students with a quadrant B preference, while in a student-centered environment there is a greater propensity for quadrant D patterns to emerge.

Based on these speculations and the foregoing discussion of Japanese and American differences, a preliminary empirical analysis was undertaken to develop and test formal hypotheses for the linkages between Raudsepp’s problem solving styles and cultural values. The first is that the individualism/collectivism dimension on Hofstede’s cultural values model will be found to be most similar to the Analytical vs. Collaborative (A vs. C) quadrants of the Raudsepp Problem Solving Styles Model. Specifically, Americans will score higher on both Hofstede’s Individualism and Raudsepp’s Analytical components, while the Japanese will score higher on both Hofstede’s Collectivism and Raudsepp’s Collaborative components. The second is that the Power Distance dimension in Hofstede’s cultural values model will be found to be most similar to the Procedural vs. Conceptual (B vs. D) quadrants of the Raudsepp Problem Solving Styles Model. Specifically, Americans will score lower on Power Distance and higher on Conceptualism, while the Japanese will score higher on Power Distance and Procedural components.

Conclusion

In a world increasingly characterized by global interactions and change, students are no longer being adequately prepared by a narrowly framed education emphasizing memorization and solving routine problems. Professors need to change teaching objectives to emphasize creative problem solving involving complex unstructured problems. To achieve this goal there needs to be a broadening of the activities in courses to embrace all four quadrants of the problem solving styles model. One benefit of such an approach is courses that appeal to a more diverse group of students leading to a more balanced course and recognition of the many and varied contributions students can make. More important however is the possible results of empirical testing to verify the proposed links between the problem solving styles model and ethical systems and cultural value dimensions. If these linkages are supported then we as educators will have identified an easy to administer and understand cognitive model that can help us to more effectively understand the more illusive issues of ethics and cultural values.
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Appendix

Raudsepp Problem Solving Styles Inventory*

Directions

For each of the items below, examine the four statements and rank them 4-3-2-1 in order of your preference, with four being your most preferred response and one your least preferred response. Rank all four of the statements for each item.

1. I would like to be involved in work situations that deal with:
   b. Setting realistic and practical goals, then helping to achieve them.
   c. Helping the people I work with to grow and progress.
   d. Coming up with innovative ideas which will improve the organization.

2. When I wish to persuade another person about the soundness of my suggestion or idea, I:
   a. Demonstrate in a step-by-step fashion how the details and principles would work out in reality.
   b. Construct a logical rationale that would be difficult to refute.
   c. Picture the benefits and personal satisfaction the adoption of my idea would bring to that person.
   d. Emphasize the unique features of my idea which would open up new opportunities.

3. The most exciting times for me occur when:
   a. I can communicate with someone with whom I have had past difficulties.
   b. I discover a unique break-through solution for a chronic, long-standing problem.
   c. I put together a step-by-step procedure for implementing an important plan.
   d. I can quantify and therefore truly understand difficult choices.

4. During the first five years in a new job I would like to:
   a. Launch new, innovative ventures.
   b. Help improve the quality of people’s working lives.
   c. Plan for and manage a task force responsible for improving an organization’s performance and profits.
   d. Be a resource person and technical consultant for solving day-to-day problems.

5. If I were to be tested or examined for a job, I would prefer:
   a. Developing methods to apply in concrete situations.
   b. A discussion or debate with other candidates for the position.
   c. Objective, problem-oriented questions on how to solve a particular problem.
   d. An opportunity to make a visual-oral presentation of my knowledge on the subject.
6. I am most likely to believe something if it:
   a. Fits in with the other things I believe.
   b. Makes sense and is logical.
   c. Gives me a new insight into something I took for granted.
   d. Has been shown to have worked in practice.

7. When I have to make an important decision, I rely mostly on:
   a. Orderly sequencing the pros and cons.
   b. My past experience.
   c. My feelings of rightness or wrongness.
   d. My hunch or intuition.

8. I consider information to be good if it provides:
   a. Usefulness.
   b. Facts.
   c. Meaning.
   d. Hidden possibilities.

9. When it comes to problem solving, I prefer to:
   a. Discuss the problem with others in order to get different feelings and opinions about the situation.
   b. Come up with a number of innovative solutions to the problem.
   c. Implement and agreed-upon solution.
   d. Research the facts and/or figures in order to define the problem.

10. I find a theory to be useful if it:
    a. Shows me a new way to think about something.
    b. Serves to clarify my own feelings about something.
    c. Leads to a practical and concrete application.
    d. Can systematically shed light on a number of situations.

11. When starting to work on a group project, I would first like to:
    a. Determine how to organize and implement it.
    b. Understand how to organize and implement it.
    c. Determine exactly how the group should be doing the project.
    d. Understand what further opportunities it might open up for the future.

12. The magazine articles I prefer to read in my leisure time are:
    a. Descriptions of how someone resolved a personal or interpersonal problem.
    b. Accounts of technical or scientific research.
    c. Descriptions of historical events.
    d. Humorous depictions of events or humorous people.
13. I prefer dealing with people who know how to:
   a. Plan and successfully implement each step necessary to get a job done.
   b. Make decisions and set priorities.
   c. Get support from others.
   d. Generate new ideas and alternative solutions.

14. People who know me well would describe me as:
   a. A person who implements and follows through on plans.
   b. A person who uses sound logic in arriving at decisions.
   c. A good listener able to empathize with other people’s feelings.
   d. An imaginative person who sees new possibilities.

15. If I strongly disagree with another person, I would:
   a. Seek the most agreeable compromise with the least fuss.
   b. Outline the unique features and ideas of my position.
   c. Argue out the differences in value, principle, or policy.
   d. Show in a logical fashion how I arrived at my position.

16. I experience great difficulties communicating with people who:
   a. Do not seem to grasp what I am trying to say.
   b. Are insensitive to the feelings I am trying to express.
   c. Constantly jump from one subject to another.
   d. Do not make much sense and are illogical.

17. My major source of enjoyment during leisure time comes from:
   a. Competing with other people in a challenging situation and moving ahead.
   b. Doing things with close friends and family that make me feel good.
   c. Working on complex puzzles and problems that require careful thought.
   d. Expressing myself and my personal values in some imaginative way.

18. I am especially good at:
   a. Motivating others.
   b. Strategic planning.
   c. Creative problem solving.
   d. Organizing projects.

19. I would rather be considered:
   a. Reliable.
   b. Practical.
   c. Cooperative.
   d. Resourceful.
20. I feel it is a worse fault to be considered:
   a. Unreasonable.
   b. Illogical.
   c. Unsympathetic.
   d. Unimaginative.

21. Which of the following statements applies mostly to you:
   a. I prefer doing things with others rather than alone.
   b. I like to come up with new ideas.
   c. I enjoy supervising and directing others.
   d. I like to work according to a well-thought-out plan.

22. After reading a book of fiction, I best remember:
   a. The further possibilities or alternatives the author could have used.
   b. The feelings and emotions the story evoked in me.
   c. Portions of the book I liked and/or did not like.
   d. The development of the story line.

23. I prefer to spend my time in surroundings that:
   a. Are neat and orderly.
   b. Provide warm and friendly conversations with other people.
   c. Are appropriate to the task at hand.
   d. Stimulate and excite my imagination.

24. People whose abilities I admire the most are:
   a. Teachers and doctors.
   b. Engineers and economists.
   c. Artists, writers, and philosophers.
   d. Business and government leaders.

25. The quote that provides me with most comfort and guidance is:
   a. Learn from the mistakes of others since you cannot live long enough to make them all yourself.
   b. Balloonists have an unsurpassed view of the scenery, but there is always the possibility that it may collide with them.
   c. The wealth of a soul is measured by how much it feels, its poverty by how little.
   d. I will not listen to reason since reason always means what someone else has to say.