



Tadeusz Czeżowski

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/RF.2025.049>

How to build the logic of goods? (2)

The ultimate premises of all evaluative judgements are individual assessments such as 'this is valuable' (beautiful, good, etc.). If, at the same time, it is stated that 'this is such and such', where 'such and such' is a descriptive predicate, then a basis is created for the generalisation 'such and such things are valuable'. The term 'such and such' becomes a criterion of value, and individual objects that satisfy the criterion of value fall within the scope of goods. Sentences that establish criteria of value, like all results of generalisations, are not certain and are subject to change with the growth of axiological experience.

Goods are the objects of human aspirations, and different people choose different goods as their goals. Thus, goods become relative, becoming good for someone. At the same time, the scope of goods is expanded by another type of relativisation, namely, things that are in various relationships to the goods that are the primary goals of aspiration become secondary goods for someone. As a result, double-relativised judgements of goods arise in the form of 'such and such a thing is good for someone for due to something'. The sentence 'x is good due to y for z' is written as $D(x, y, z)$, where 'D' is a symbol of a value-creating relationship between good x, parameter y and evaluating subject z. In expression $D(x, y, z)$, the parameter y becomes identical to the good x if it is valuable in the original sense of the word, that is, not because of something else, but for its own sake. Goods of this kind are called absolute goods for their subject.

We define the equality of two goods x_1 and x_2 for a given subject by the equivalence of value-creating relations $D_1(x_1, y, z)$ and $D_2(x_2, y, z)$

in the set of parameters y , namely 'good x_1 is equal to good x_2 due to y parameters for subject z ' is equivalent to 'for every y , always and only if x_1 is a good due to y for z , then x_2 is also a good due to the same y for z '. In a similar way, the majority or minority relationship between goods is defined by the implication relationship: 'good x_1 is greater than good x_2 , and x_2 is less than x_1 , due to parameters y for subject z ' is equivalent to 'for every y , if and only if x_1 is a good due to y for z , then x_2 is also due to the same y for z '. Similarly, the relationship between the greater and lesser goods is defined by the relationship of implication: 'Good x_1 is greater than good x_2 , and x_2 is less than x_1 due to parameters y for subject z ' is equivalent to 'for every y , if x_2 is good for z due to y , then x_1 is also good for z due to the same y , but not vice versa.' In every case, a greater good can replace a lesser good, but not vice versa; this kind of displacement of lesser goods by greater ones seems to be characteristic of goods, in contrast to quantity, where a similar substitution of greater for lesser cannot occur. It is an everyday phenomenon in the realm of goods, after all, the inferior is abandoned for the superior.

Two different absolute goods are not comparable in terms of magnitude, as it is impossible to create a set of parameters such that the expressions defining their value-creating relationships imply one direction or the other. If we sometimes make such a comparison, then such a judgment concerns not the goods themselves, but their significance within a cultural complex, since absolute goods can be related in another aspect to parameters by which it is possible to compare them with other goods.

Goods that are incomparable across a certain range of parameters become comparable when that range is narrowed. Depending on how this is done, one or the other good will be considered greater, or both will be assigned equal value. Amidst goods that are comparable in terms of a certain set of parameters, there is the greatest good, determined by the value-creating ratio implied by every other value-creating ratio determining any of the comparable goods, and the smallest good, whose value-creating ratio implies the others. The greatest good satisfies the maximum needs of the evaluating entity in terms of given parameters, while the least good is superseded by every other good. Two goods that exist alternatively form the sum of goods, determined by the alternative of their value-creating relationships; their combined existence is the product of goods, determined by the conjunction of value-creating relationships. According to the law of absorption, the sum of two goods, one of which is smaller than the other, is equal to the larger one, and their product is equal to the smaller one. If, in a given field, we are in possession of the greatest good, then according to the law of absorption,

no sum in which it is included is greater than it. Two goods whose sum is exhaustive and separable are complementary goods; a good that is complementary to the greatest good is an opposite good or an evil.

Each of the parameters against which individual goods are defined is also a good, defined in turn in relation to some other good. By creating relative products of value-creating relationships that define parameters as goods, a sequence can be created that leads to some absolute good common to all goods of a given parameter, thereby enabling the comparison of goods originally defined according to different parameters. The diversity of evaluating subjects is eliminated by generalisation: if x_1 is a good for subject z_1 and x_2 is a good for z_2 , then both x_1 and x_2 are goods for z_1 or z_2 , i.e. for one of the two subjects. Thus, by introducing an alternative combination of individual subjects, i.e. 'a subject in general', we obtain the possibility of understanding all goods as goods 'for anyone'.

Once the parameters and evaluating entities have been equalised, only value-creating relationships remain different in the definitions of goods. However, it is possible to reduce incomparable goods in a certain range of parameters to a limited comparison. On this basis, we can create a scale of goods that serves as a measure for comparing different types of goods. The symbol of the scale of goods in a broad area of social life is money, which represents a measure of goods in that it is used to exchange different types of goods, while not being identical to any of the goods for which it is used as a medium of exchange.

The set of goods produced by the actions of members of society constitutes its culture. Advancement in the field of culture, i.e. enlargement of the set of goods, is conditioned by two factors: axiological knowledge and work. Knowledge discovers and identifies goods, while work realises them, using existing goods as means or components for the production of new ones.