

Part One: Introduction to Ethics & Ethical Reasoning

Introduction to Ethics

Last Revised 7/13/2005

I What is Ethics?

A. Morality and Ethics

1. Morality: the customs, precepts and practices that deal with matters of good/bad and wrong/right.
2. Descriptive morality: A description of an actual morality.
 - a. This simply states the characteristics of the morality in question.
 - b. This is done in the social sciences
3. Ethics: the entire realm of morality and moral philosophy.
4. Meta Ethics: The investigation of the creation and assessment of moral theories.
5. Normative Ethics: The creation and application of moral standards.
6. Applied Ethics: The application of moral standards to specific cases/situations.

B. Moral Philosophy/Ethics (as a branch of philosophy)

1. A rational and systematic attempt to understand moral terms, statements, principles, and theories.
2. Analysis of moral terms, concepts, principles and theories.
3. Creating and assessing moral principles and theories,
4. Applying principles and theories to moral problems.

C. Some classic moral problems

1. Objective/subjective dispute: the problem of determining whether ethics is objective or subjective.
2. The problem of the basis of morality: the problem of determining the foundation of morality.
3. The Euthyphro problem: Is something good because God says it is good, or does God say it is good because it is good?
 - a. First presented by Plato in a dialogue of the same name.
 - b. Originally a question about the nature of piety, but now presented as a problem for divine command theory.
 - c. This raises problems about the relationship between morality and religion.
4. The scope of morality: the problem of determining who and what counts morally.
5. Specific enduring moral problems: euthanasia, capital punishment, suicide, abortion, lying, stealing.

D. Some Moral Questions

1. What is good?
2. What is evil?
3. What is the correct life to live?
4. Is stem cell research morally acceptable?
5. What is the basis, if anything is, of morality?
6. Is morality objective or subjective?
7. Is it morally acceptable to use torture as a means of combating terrorism?
8. Is euthanasia morally acceptable?
9. Are there moral rights?
10. Is it morally acceptable to cheat in a serious relationship?
11. Is cloning morally acceptable?
12. Is there a moral obligation to test oneself for STDs?

II Ethical Assessment and Value

A. Focus of Ethical Assessment

1. Moral theories are often defined in terms of the main focus for moral assessment.
2. Actions: right/wrong, obligatory, optional, neutral, superogatory (not obligatory, but going beyond duty).
3. Consequences: good, bad, indifferent.
4. Character: virtuous, vicious, neutral.
5. Motives: good, evil, neutral.

B. Value

1. Value is a key part of moral theory.
2. Value: A measure of worth; includes both moral and non-moral worth.
3. Positive Value/Negative Value
4. Extrinsic value: Derives its value from something else.
 - a. A means to an end.
 - b. Something useful.

- c. Examples: money, medicine, education, work, etc.
- 5. Intrinsic value: Valuable in and of itself.
 - a. An end in itself.
 - b. Example: persons.

III Spectrum of Morality

A. Introduction

- 1. Moral views can be placed on a spectrum ranging from absolutism to nihilism.

B. Absolutism

- 1. There is one correct solution to every moral problem.
- 2. Morality is objective-moral statements are true or false independently of what people think or believe.
- 3. No moral principle can be overridden by another.
- 4. No exceptions are permitted.
- 5. Example: Assuming lying is wrong, it would be wrong to lie, even to save a life.

C. Objectivism

- 1. Morality is objective.
- 2. Moral principles can override each other.
- 3. Exceptions are permitted.
- 4. Example: Assuming that lying is generally wrong, lying to save a life could be permissible.

D. Relativism

- 1. Morality is relative to or depends on the culture.
- 2. The truth of a moral statement depends on the culture in which it is made.

E. Subjectivism

- 1. Morality depends on the individual.
- 2. Morality is subjective and the truth of a moral statement depends on who makes the statement.

F. Moral nihilism.

- 1. There is no morality.
- 2. Morality is a deception or illusion.
- 3. All moral statements are false.
- 4. Moral nihilists do not deny that people talk about morality etc.
- 5. Moral nihilists view morality as the atheist views religion.

G. Moral skepticism.

- 1. The truth of moral claims cannot be known.

IV Ethics and Other Normative Areas

A. Introduction

- 1. Ethics is a normative area-it deals with matters of norms (values).
- 2. There are other normative areas and these overlap with ethics.

A. Ethics

- 1. Assessment: Right/wrong, good/bad, virtue/vice
- 2. Basis: Varies-conscience, reason, self-interest, social agreement, nature, etc.
- 3. Punishments: Guilt, blame, bad reputation, non-legal punishment, suffering etc.
- 4. Rewards: Peace of mind, praise, good reputation, well-being etc.

B. Religion

- 1. Assessment: Righteous/sinful, holy/unholy, blasphemy.
- 2. Basis: religious authorities (such as priests) or divine being.
- 3. Punishment: Guilt, social punishment, punishment by divine agents (such as hell).
- 4. Rewards: Social rewards, divine reward (such as heaven).
- 5. Religion and ethics
 - a. Religion has often been used as the basis of morality.
 - b. Religion has often been assessed by moral standards.
 - c. Religion typical includes a moral aspect.
 - d. There is extensive overlap: religion raises many moral issues and morality raises many religious issues.

C. Law/Rules

- 1. Assessment: Legal/illegal
- 2. Basis: The authority of the lawmakers.
- 3. Punishment: Fines, prison terms, exile, death, torture, etc. inflicted by the enforcers of the law.
- 4. Rewards: Typically none.
- 5. Law and ethics
 - a. Laws can be immoral.

- b. Something that is moral can be illegal.
 - c. There is a tradition of basing many laws on morality.
 - d. Some immoral things are not illegal.
 - e. There is extensive overlap: law raises many moral issues and morality raise many legal issues.
- D. Etiquette
- 1. Assessment: Polite/impolite, proper/improper, rude.
 - 2. Basis: Social agreement, custom, etiquette authorities.
 - 3. Punishment: Social disapproval.
 - 4. Rewards: Social approval.
 - 5. Etiquette & Ethics
 - a. It can be immoral to ignore etiquette.
 - b. Things required by etiquette might be immoral.
 - c. There is a slight overlap.
- E. Aesthetics
- 1. Assessment: art/non-art, good/bad, beautiful/ugly
 - 2. Basis: Varies-reason, emotions, social agreement, etc.
 - 3. Punishment: Rejection, being ignored
 - 4. Reward: Acceptance, attention, possibly lucrative contracts and sales.
 - 5. Aesthetics & ethics
 - a. Things of beauty can be immoral.
 - b. There is some overlap: aesthetics raises some moral issues and morality sometimes involves aesthetic issues.
- F. Distinct
- 1. While these areas do overlap and interact, it is important to keep them distinct.
 - 2. Example: Law
 - a. Being illegal does not entail that something is automatically immoral.
 - b. Being immoral does not entail that something is automatically illegal.
 - c. Being moral does not entail that something is automatically legal.
 - d. Being legal does not entail that something is automatically moral.
 - 3. There are theories that do argue for such entailments.
 - a. Example: One form of divine command theory takes the will of God to define what is good.
 - b. Example: Legal positivism is the view that the law determines what is moral.

Ethical Reasoning

Revised 8/23/2005

Moral Issues

I Issues

- A. Issue
 - 1. An issue is a matter of dispute with two or more distinct sides.
 - 2. An issue is not a psychological issue, such as having an irresistible urge to dress up like a giant possum and whistle the theme song to Star Wars.
 - 3. Example: whether Bill should buy a laptop or not.
- B. Ethical Issue
 - 1. Defined: an issue that involves a moral component.
 - 2. Example: whether capital punishment is morally acceptable or not.
- C. Resolution
 - 1. The goal is to attempt to resolve the issue in a rational manner.
 - 2. People do try to resolve issues in other ways, including yelling, using explosives, or whacking others with baseball bats.
- D. Components of an ethical issue.
 - 1. Facts: The non-moral facts that are relevant to the issue.
 - a. If a fact is in dispute, this raises a factual issue which needs to be resolved.
 - 2. Concepts: The ideas, terms and definitions that are relevant to the issue.
 - a. If a concept is in dispute, this raises a conceptual issue that needs to be resolved.
 - 3. Morality: The normative or value aspect of the issue.

II. Facts

- A. Relevant Facts
 - 1. The facts relevant to the moral issue must be determined.
 - 2. Example: Censorship and the effect of violence.
 - 3. In some cases relevant facts will be in dispute and the factual issue will need to be resolved.

- a. Example: Capital punishment's deterrent value.
- b. Example: The damages sustained by the film industry from copying DVDs.
- 4. In some cases relevant facts will not be in dispute and there will be no factual issue to resolve.
 - a. Example: That even encrypted DVDs can be copied.
 - b. Example: That abortion involves killing.

B. Agreement and Disagreement

- 1. People can agree on the facts but disagree on the morality.
 - a. Example: Two people may agree that a person lied, but disagree about whether it was immoral or not,
- 2. People can agree in regards to morality but disagree about the facts.
 - a. Example: two people may agree that harmful things should be controlled, but disagree about the harm of violent art.

C. Resolution of factual issues

- 1. Empirical investigation: Direct investigation of the claims to determine their plausibility.
 - a. Example: Going to a computer store to see if software for copying DVDs is available.
- 2. Authority: utilizing experts and documentation to determine the facts.
 - a. Example: Citing a medical text that states a human embryo has brain activity.
- 3. Arguments: Presenting arguments for or against a claim being a fact.
 - a. Example: Arguing that the film industry is not being damaged by DVD copying by comparing revenues before and after DVD copying became available and factoring in other relevant factors.

III. Concepts

A. Relevant Concepts

- 1. What must be determined is the meaning and applicability of the concepts.
- 2. Examples: defining "lying", "person" or "legitimacy."
- 3. In some cases relevant concepts will be in dispute and will need to be resolved.
 - a. Example: When addressing abortion, the concept of personhood is often in dispute.
 - b. Example: When addressing copying movies, the concept of stealing is sometimes in dispute.
- 4. In some cases relevant concepts will not be in dispute.
 - a. Example: When addressing copying movies, the concept of copying is not in dispute.

B. Agreement and Disagreement

- 1. People can agree on concepts and disagree about morality and vice versa.
 - a. Example: two people might agree on a definition of "person" but disagree about the morality of abortion.
 - b. Example: two people might disagree about the definition of "lying" but agree that it is wrong.

C. Resolution Conceptual Issues

- 1. Conceptual issues are resolved primarily by argumentation.
- 2. Resolving a conceptual issue also involves presenting an adequate definition of the concept.
 - a. The standards for defining terms are discussed below in the Argument by Definition.

IV. Morality/Values

A. Morality

- 1. What must be determined is the morality of the action, person, etc. in question.

B. Resolution of the moral aspect of the issue.

- 1. The moral aspect of the dispute is resolved by using arguments based on moral principles, standards and theories.

Values & Facts

I Values & Facts

A. Value statements/matters of value

- 1. Normative-express a judgment of value.
- 2. Often contain a prescriptive element about what should be done.
- 3. Example: "Capital punishment is wrong."

B. Factual statements/matter of fact

- 1. Descriptive.
- 2. Are subject to testing-either actually or in theory.
- 3. A factual statement is not the same thing as a fact.
 - a. A fact is a claim that has been proven as true beyond reasonable doubt.
 - b. A factual claim is a claim that is true or false-so a factual claim could be false.
- 4. Example: "Mice are smaller than elephants."

II Objectivity & Subjectivity

A. Objective statement

1. A statement that is true or false regardless of what people believe.
 2. Is a matter of fact and hence testable.
 3. Example: "The earth is a sphere."
- B. Subjective statement
1. A statement that is neither objectively true nor false.
 2. Is not subject to resolution via testing.
 3. Example: "Rocky Road ice cream tastes better than vanilla ice cream."
- C. Objective-subjective dispute.
1. It is often believed that value claims are subjective.
 2. Value claims might be subjective but this is a matter of substantial dispute.
 - a. Ethical subjectivism and ethical relativism are both based on the view that morality is subjective.
 - b. Many other moral theories are based on the view that morality is objective.
 3. Assuming that value claims are subjective (or objective) would be to beg the question (to assume what is in need of proof).
 4. Even if value claims are subjective, there are still better or worse reasons that can be given in support of a value claim.
 - a. Example: To say that capital punishment is wrong because "capital" has the letter "c" in it is not a very good reason.
 5. It is possible to argue about both subjective and objective matters, so moral argumentation does not require that morality is objective.

Argument Basics

Revised 8/23/2005

I Argument Concepts

A. Defined

1. An argument is a set of claims, one of which is supposed to be supported by the others.
2. Conclusion: The claim that is supposed to be supported by the premises.
 - a. An argument has one and only one conclusion.
3. Premise: A claim given as evidence or a reason for accepting the conclusion.
 - a. An argument can have many premises.
4. Inductive Argument: An argument in which the premises are intended to provide some degree of support but less than complete support for the conclusion.
5. Deductive argument: An argument in which the premises are intended to provide complete support for the conclusion.
6. Fallacy: An argument in which the premises fail to provide adequate support for the conclusion.

B. General Assessment of Arguments: Reasoning

1. Do the premises logically support the conclusion?
2. If the argument is deductive, is it valid or invalid?
 - a. A valid argument is such that if the premises were true then the conclusion must be true.
 - b. An invalid argument is such that all the premises could be true and the conclusion false at the same time.
 - c. Validity is tested by formal means, such as truth tables, Venn diagrams and proofs.
 - d. A full discussion of deductive arguments is beyond the scope of this class.
3. If the argument is inductive, is it strong or weak?
 - a. A strong argument is such that if the premises were true, then the conclusion is likely to be true.
 - b. A weak argument is such that if the premises were true, then the conclusion is not likely to be true.
 - c. Inductive arguments are assessed primarily in terms of standards specific to the argument in question.

C. General Assessment of Arguments Are the premises true?

1. Are the premises true or at least plausible?
2. Testing premises for plausibility:
 - a. The premise is consistent with your own observations.
 - b. The premise is consistent with your background knowledge and experience.
 - c. The premise is consistent with credible sources, such as experts, standard references and text books.

Some Useful Valid Deductive Arguments

I Introduction to Deductive Arguments

A. Defined

1. An argument in which the premises are intended to provide complete support for the conclusion.
2. The premises are offered as evidence that the conclusion must be true.
3. The conclusion is not supposed to go beyond the premises.

B. Use

1. Deductive arguments are often used as a "logical frame" to present points established in other (typically inductive) arguments.

2. Example: After arguing that sexist art is harmful, one might build an argument using that claim and the claim “if sexist art is harmful, it should be censored” as premises.

C. Assessment

1. Analogy method-any argument with the same form as a valid argument is valid.
 - a. This method requires that you know the form already.
2. Informal method: assume the premises are all true and ask whether the conclusion could still be false.
 - a. This method is not completely reliable.
3. Formal methods: Truth tables, proofs, Venn diagrams.
 - a. These are definite and objective methods of testing validity.

D. Valid/Invalid, Sound/Unsound

1. Valid: an argument such that if all the premises are true, then the conclusion must be true.
2. Invalid: an argument such that even if all the premises are true, then the conclusion can still be false.
3. Sound: the argument is valid and has all true premises.
4. Unsound: the argument is invalid or has one or more false premises or both.

II Some common Valid Deductive Arguments

A. Modus Ponens (Affirming the Antecedent)

1. Form
 - a. If P, then Q.
 - b. P
 - c. Q
2. Example:
 - a. If killing in war is like murder, it is immoral.
 - b. Killing in war is like murder.
 - c. It is immoral.

B. Modus Tollens (Denying the Consequent)

1. Form
 - a. If P, then Q.
 - b. Not Q.
 - c. Not P.
2. Example:
 - a. If reality is just a dream, it should seem fairly incoherent.
 - b. Reality does not seem fairly incoherent.
 - c. Reality is not just a dream.

C. Hypothetical Syllogism

1. Form
 - a. If P, then Q.
 - b. If Q, then R.
 - c. If P, then R.
2. Example
 - a. If cheating is wrong, then cheating in a class is wrong.
 - b. If cheating in a class is wrong, cheating on this test is wrong.
 - c. If cheating is wrong, then cheating on this test is wrong.

D. Disjunctive Syllogism

1. Form
 - a. P V Q
 - b. Not P (or not Q)
 - c. Q (or P)
2. Example
 - a. Bill can lose weight through surgery or diet and exercise.
 - b. Bill decided not to diet or exercise.
 - c. Bill has decided to lose weight through surgery.
3. Note: this assumes that P and Q are the only two options.

E. Dilemma

1. Form 1
 - a. If P, then Q
 - b. If R, then S
 - c. P or R
 - d. Q or S
2. Form 2

- a. If P, then Q
 - b. If R, then S
 - c. Not Q or not S
 - d. Not P or not R.
3. Form 3
- a. If P, then Q.
 - b. If not P, then not Q.
 - c. P or not P.
 - d. Q or not Q.
4. Example
- a. If lying is wrong, then people should not lie.
 - b. If lying is not wrong, then it is okay for people to lie.
 - c. Lying is either wrong or it is not.
 - d. So people should not lie or it is acceptable.

III Reductio Ad Absurdum (Reducing to Absurdity)

A. Defined

1. An argument in which one proves that a claim is false by drawing an absurdity from the assumption that it is true.
2. A claim can also be proven to be true by assuming it is false and deriving an absurdity from this.

B. Form #1

1. Assume that a claim, P, is true.
2. Prove that this assumption leads to something false, absurd, or contradictory.
3. Conclude that the claim that P is true is itself false.
4. Conclude that P is false.

C. Form #2

1. Assume that a claim, P, is false.
2. Prove that this assumption leads to something false, absurd, or contradictory.
3. Conclude that the claim that P is false is itself false.
4. Conclude that P is true.

D. Example

1. Oppression is to best defined as the mistreatment of a minority by a majority.
2. In the case of sexism, a majority (women) is mistreated by a minority (men).
3. Therefore, sexism is not oppression.
4. This is absurd, so the definition is flawed.

Some Useful General Inductive Arguments

I Introduction to Inductive Arguments

A. Defined

1. An inductive argument is an argument in which the premises are intended to provide some degree of support, but less than complete support, for the conclusion.
2. The premises are offered as evidence that the conclusion is likely to be true.
3. The conclusion goes beyond the evidence presented in the premises-this is the inductive leap.

B. Assessment

1. They are assessed in terms of how strongly the premises support the conclusion.
2. They are also assessed by standards specific to the type of argument.
3. The standards are also used in assessing your own arguments when creating them.
4. Unlike deductive arguments, there are no perfectly objective and definite ways of assessing inductive argument.

C. Strong and Weak Arguments

1. Strong argument: An argument such that if the premises are true, then the conclusion is likely to be true.
2. Weak argument: an argument such that even if the premises are true, the conclusion is not likely to be true.
3. Unlike validity, strength is relative and not absolute.

Analogical Argument

I Introduction

A. Definition

1. An argument in which one concludes that two things are alike in a certain respect because they are alike in other respects.

B. Uses

1. Analogies are often used in cases in which X is understood and Y is not, to conclude something about Y.

- a. These are typically called explanatory comparisons/analogies.
2. Example:
 - a. Email is like mail sent to a post office box.
 - b. Just as mail is delivered to the PO box and you go to pick it up, email is delivered to your email in box and your software “goes” and picks it up.
3. Analogical arguments are often used in cases in which X is accepted/seen as plausible and Y is not, to get the audience to accept Y or see it as plausible.
4. Example:
 - a. If a person has the blood cut off to her brain for too long, she’ll suffer brain damage.
 - b. The education system is like the “brain” of society and money is the blood of this brain.
 - c. So, cutting off money to the education system will damage society.
5. Analogical arguments are commonly used in both law and medicine.

II Form

A. Informal

1. Most analogies are presented in an informal manner.

B. Strict Form

1. Premise 1: X has properties P,Q, and R.
2. Premise 2: Y has properties P,Q, and R.
3. Premise 3: X has property Z as well.
4. Conclusion: Y has property Z.

III Assessment

A. The strength of the analogy depends on

1. The number of properties X and Y have in common.
 - a. The more the better.
2. The relevance of the shared properties to property Z.
 - a. The more relevant, the stronger the argument.
 - b. Property P is relevant to property Z if the presence or absence of P affects the likelihood that Z will be present.
3. Whether X and Y have relevant dissimilarities as well as similarities.
 - a. The more dissimilarities and the more relevant they are, the weaker the argument.

B. War Example

1. Attacking your next-door neighbors, killing them and taking their property is immoral.
2. War involves going into a neighboring country, killing people and taking their property.
3. So, war is immoral.

C. Assessment of War example.

1. War and violent theft share many properties:
 - a. Intrusion.
 - b. Violence.
 - c. Killing.
 - d. Taking the property of others.
2. War and violent theft share relevant properties.
 - a. Violence and taking of property are relevant to moral assessment.
3. War and violent theft have some relevant dissimilarities.
 - a. War often takes place between mutual antagonists, unlike the case of violent theft.
 1. Analogy to boxing.
 - b. In some wars, one side is not fighting to take property.
 2. The Allies in WWII were fighting to liberate the conquered nations and defeat the axis powers, not to take property or kill people.

Argument from/by Example

I Introduction

A. Definition

1. Defined: An argument in which a claim is supported by providing examples.
2. Arguments from/by example are common in law.

II Form

A. Informal

1. Arguments from/by example are typically presented in an informal manner.

2. Example: A person might prove that someone else is a pizza mooch by presenting all the times they had pizza without contributing.

B. Form

1. Premise 1: Example 1 is an example that supports claim P.
2. Premise 2: Example 2 is an example that supports claim P.
3. Premise x: Example x is an example that supports claim P.
4. Conclusion: Claim P is true.

III Standards of Assessment

A. Standards

1. The more examples, the stronger the argument.
2. The examples must be relevant.
 - a. The more relevant the examples, the stronger the argument.
3. The examples must be specific and clearly identified.
4. Counter-examples must be considered.
 - a. Counter-example: an example that counts against the claim.
 - b. The more counter-examples and the more relevant they are, the weaker the argument.

B. Examples

1. Example #1
 - a. Premise 1: The painting Oath of the Horatii shows three brothers ready to take action, while the women are painted as passive observers.
 - b. Premise 2: In action films, such as typical Westerns, women are cast as victims that must be protected and saved by men.
 - c. Conclusion: Art reinforces gender stereotypes.
2. Assessment of Example #1
 - a. More examples should be used.
 - b. The examples are relevant.
 - c. Specific Westerns should be named and described.
 - d. There are counter-examples, especially in modern films and TV.
2. Example #2
 - a. Premise 1: The Egyptians believed in an afterlife as shown by their funeral preparations.
 - b. Premise 2: Plato's writings indicate that the ancient Greeks believed in an afterlife.
 - c. Premise 3: The Chinese practice of ancestor worship indicates they believed in an afterlife.
 - d. Conclusion: People of ancient cultures believed in an afterlife.
3. Assessment of Example #2
 - a. More examples should be used, but the mix of diverse cultures strengthens the argument.
 - b. The examples are relevant.
 - c. The examples could be more detailed but are reasonably specific.
 - d. There are some limited counterexamples, such as periods of doubt about the afterlife in ancient Egypt.

Argument from Authority

I Introduction

A. Defined

1. Defined: An argument in which the conclusion is supported by citing an authority.
2. The strength of the support depends on the quality of the authority.
3. It is a relatively weak form of argument.

B. Use

1. They are used when a person lacks the knowledge or expertise and needs to rely on an outside source.
2. They are also used to add extra weight to the author's position.
3. Arguments from authority are often used as part of a larger argument.

II Form

A. Informal

1. Most arguments from authority are presented in an informal manner.

B. Form

1. Premise 1: Person A is an authority on subject S.
2. Premise 2: Person A makes claim C about subject S.
3. Premise 3: Therefore, C is true.

III Assessment

A. Standards

1. The person has sufficient expertise in the subject.
 2. The claim is within the expert's area of expertise.
 3. There is an adequate degree of agreement among experts.
 4. The expert is not significantly biased.
 5. The area of expertise is a legitimate area or discipline.
 6. The authority must be properly identified.
 - a. This typically requires citing a source.
- B. Examples
1. Example 1
 - a. Premise 1: If violent art has a harmful psychological effect on people, then it should be censored.
 - b. Premise 2: However, the study by Loeb and Wombat shows that violent art has little, if any psychological effect on people.
 - c. Conclusion: Hence, there is no need to censor violent art to protect people from harm.
 2. Assessment of Example 1
 - a. The source needs to be properly identified (applying many of the other standards requires this identification).
 - b. There is a great deal of disagreement among the experts within the field of psychology, especially over the matter of the effects of violent art.
 3. Example 2
 - a. Premise 1: According to medical science, there is no life after death.
 - b. Premise 2: Since medical science is well established, it is clear there is no life after death.
 4. Assessment of Example 2
 - a. More information is needed about medical science, such as the exact source of the claim.

Some Common Methods in Moral Argumentation

Revised 8/30/2005

Logical Consistency (General)

I Concepts & Method

- A. Logical Consistency & Inconsistency Defined
1. Two claims are consistent when both can be true at the same time.
 2. Two claims are inconsistent when both cannot be true at the same time (but both could be false).
- B. Inconsistency
1. If a person makes inconsistent claims, at least one claim must be false.
 2. If a person accepts principles that are inconsistent or entail inconsistent claims, then at least one of the principles must be flawed (assuming the principles have truth values).
 3. A theory must be internally consistent.
 - a. An inconsistent theory must contain at least one false claim.
 4. The inconsistency of two principles or claims does not show which one is false-just that they both cannot be true.
 5. It is irrational to accept inconsistent claims when their inconsistency is known
- C. Method
1. Show that two claims made by a person or principles held by a person are inconsistent.
 2. Conclude that both cannot be true/correct.
- D. Example
1. Person A accepts the principle that people should be treated equally, but A also accepts the principle that certain people should receive special treatment.
 2. These principles are inconsistent.
 - a. If people should be treated equally, then certain people should not receive special treatment.
 - b. If some people should receive special treatment, then all people should not be treated equally.
 3. Therefore, one of the principles must be incorrect.

II Responding to a Charge of Inconsistency

- A. Abandoning One Principle or Claim.
1. The inconsistency can be resolved by abandoning one of the inconsistent claims or principles.
 2. The least plausible claim or principle should be the one rejected.
 3. Example: Person A might abandon the principle that some people should receive special treatment.
- B. Dissolving the Inconsistency
1. The inconsistency can be "dissolved" by showing that the inconsistency is merely apparent.
 2. This is done by showing how the two claims/principles are actually consistent.
- D. Example of Dissolving
1. Treating people equally requires providing special treatment to certain groups or people.

2. For example, allowing equal access to public facilities requires provided some people with special treatment in the form of ramps and special parking.
3. Thus, the inconsistency has been dissolved.

III Relativism, Subjectivism and Nihilism

A. Introduction

1. Logical consistency requires that the claims in question be true or false (but not both at the same time).
2. If the claims are relative or subjective, then the charge of inconsistency can only be applied internally.

B. Ethical relativism-Cross Cultural Claims

1. Ethical relativism is the view that the truth of a moral statement depends on the culture.
2. Cultures with different moralities will present claims that are inconsistent with each other.
3. Since their truth depends on the culture, one claim can be true in one culture and false in another, hence this inconsistency is not a problem.

C. Ethical Relativism- The charge of inconsistency can be applied within the culture.

1. Example: Slavery & Equality in America
 - a. In the 1800s American social morality held that all men are equal, yet also held that slavery was morally acceptable.
 - b. Slavery and equality are inconsistent; hence one claim must be false within the culture.
2. However, a culture might accept as a moral principle that moral inconsistency is acceptable.

D. Ethical Subjectivism

1. Ethical subjectivism is the view that the truth of a moral statement depends on the individual
2. Individuals with different moralities will present claims that are inconsistent with each other.
3. Since their truth depends on the individual, one claim can be true for one person and false for another, hence this inconsistency is not a problem.

E. Ethical Subjectivism- The charge of inconsistency can be applied to an individual.

1. Even if subjectivism is true, a person can be charged with inconsistency in their principles and claims.
2. However, a person could accept that moral inconsistency is perfectly acceptable.

F. Moral Nihilism

1. If moral claims are neither true nor false, then there is no possibility of logical inconsistency.
2. For the nihilist, moral claims are meaningless and hence neither true nor false.
3. Hence, if moral nihilism is correct, then inconsistency in regard to moral claims and principles is impossible.

Consistent Application (Normative)

I Concepts, Assumptions and Method

A. Defined

1. Consistent application: The principle/standard is applied in the same way to similar beings in similar circumstances.
2. Inconsistent application is a problem because it violates three commonly accepted moral assumptions.

B. Grounding Assumptions

1. Equality: People are initially morally equal and hence must be treated as such.
2. Impartiality: Morality must be impartial and this requires consistent application of standards/principles.
 - a. Inconsistent application would be, by definition, non-impartial.
3. Relevant Difference: Different treatment must be justified by relevant differences.

C. Method

1. Show that a principle/standard has been applied differently in situations that are not adequately different.
2. Conclude that the principle has been applied inconsistently.
3. Optional: Require that the principle be applied consistently.
4. Applying this method often requires determining the principle the person/group is using.

D. Example: Gender Equality

1. Barbara claims that male-only country clubs are immoral and should be opened to women.
2. Barbara claims that women should be allowed to have women-only gyms so they can work out without being gawked at by men.
3. If Barbara's principle is that exclusion based on gender is immoral, then she is not applying the principle consistently.
4. It is applied one way to men, another way to women.

II Responding to a Charge of Inconsistent Application

A. Becoming consistent.

1. The person can stop applying the principle in an inconsistent manner.

B. Dissolving the Inconsistency

1. The person can show that the inconsistency is merely apparent.
2. This can be done by showing that there is a relevant difference in the situation.

3. Example:

- a. It can be claimed that country clubs are relevantly different from gyms.
- b. It could be claimed that men are relevantly different from women in this case.

C. Rejecting the Attributed Principle

1. The person can deny that the attributed principle is their actual principle.
2. Inequality Example: The person could claim that their principle justifies the difference in application.
 - b. Example Principle 1: Women should be treated equally except when it is to their advantage to be treated differently.
 - c. Example Principle 2: People should not be discriminated against except in cases in which the presence of one gender would create undue discomfort to the other gender.
3. The “new” principle is subject to evaluation.
4. Inequality Example:
 - a. Example Principle 1: This principle seems to violate the standards of equality, impartiality and relevant difference.
 - b. Example Principle 2: This principle could be supported by an argument based on the fact that each gender has its own restrooms, locker rooms, etc.

D. Undercutting the Method

1. One can argue against the grounding assumptions of this method—the principles of equality, impartiality, and relevant difference.
2. To the degree that these assumptions are undercut, the method is weakened.

Reversing the Situation (Ethics)

I Introduction

A. Introduction

1. A common method of moral assessment is imagining what it would be like to be on the receiving end.
 - a. “How would you feel if someone did that to you?”
2. The Golden Rule: “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.”
3. If a person is unwilling to abide by his own principles when the situation is reversed, then it is reasonable to question those principles.
4. This method is often most effective when interacting with a person and being able to ask them if they would be willing to be subject to their own actions, policies, etc.

B. Basis

1. This method is similar to consistent application and in this role it is based on the same assumptions: consistency, equality, and impartiality.
2. The primary basis of the method is fairness.
3. Something is fair when all those involved would find it acceptable to trade places under similar circumstances –provided that they viewed the situation objectively.

C. Method

1. An action, policy etc. is proposed or implemented with at least two parties: an agent and the target of the action, policy, etc.
2. Hypothetically, the situation is reversed with the agent and the target switching places.
3. If the hypothetical switch is not morally acceptable to both parties when they observe it from an objective standpoint, then the action, policy, etc. is morally questionable.

D. Example-caste system

1. Many Indians practice the caste system in India.
2. One caste is that of the Untouchables.
3. The other castes hold that the Untouchables are unclean and may be harmed or killed for stepping out of line (for example, insisting on their legal rights or swimming in a public pond).
4. If an upper caste person were forced to live as an Untouchable, she would no doubt find it unacceptable.
5. Therefore, the caste system is morally questionable.

II Considerations

A. Switching

1. In some cases, those involved could not really switch places.
2. In such cases, the method can be modified by having the action, principle, policy, etc applied to the agent.
3. Example: development
 - a. A developer wants to bulldoze a wilderness area and build a new student housing megaplex.
 - b. The plants and animals in the area will be harmed or killed.
 - c. Obviously, these creatures cannot be developers.
 - d. However, the developer would not want her house plowed under and her family scattered or killed.
 - e. Therefore the development is morally questionable.

B. The Impartial Observer

1. Because of the problem of bias, this method often involves an appeal to an impartial observer.
2. If, from the standpoint of the ideal impartial observer, it would be fair to apply the same action, etc. to the parties if they were switched, then the action, etc. would be morally acceptable.
3. If not, it would be morally questionable.
4. In such cases, the switch would involve a switch of the morally relevant properties as well.
5. In some cases, directly appealing to impartiality might be a better choice than using the Reversing the Situation method.

III Responding

A. Relevant Difference

1. Argue that there is a relevant difference between the two parties that justifies the action, etc. even if the agent would be unwilling to switch.
2. Fire Ant Example
 - a. People are willing to exterminate annoying fire ants.
 - b. People are not willing to be exterminated if they are annoying.
 - c. However, people have a greater moral status than fire ants so killing them for being annoying is acceptable.
3. For the argument to be effective, the relevant difference must be identified and adequately supported.

Argument by Definition (General)

I Method

A. Introduction

1. A common method of argumentation is to argue that some particular thing belongs to a particular class of things because it fits the definition for that class.
2. The goal is to show that the thing adequately meets the definition.
3. Definitions are often set within theories (see Apply Moral Theory, below).
4. This method is most often used as part of an extended argument.

B. Method

1. Present the definition
2. Describe the relevant qualities of X.
3. Show how X meets (or fails to meet) the definition
4. Conclude that X belongs within that class (or does not belong within that class).

C. Example

1. A person is defined as something that has A, B, C.
2. A human embryo has A,B,C (or a human embryo lacks A, B or C).
3. A human embryo is a person (or a human embryo is not a person).

D. Example

1. A work of horror is defined as a work which has as its goal to produce an emotion that goes beyond fear, namely that of horror, which is defined as....
2. The movie *Alien* meets this definition because...
3. Thus, *Alien* is a work of horror.

E. Dictionaries

1. An Argument from Definition based on a dictionary definition tends to be weak.
2. Dictionaries just provide the definition that the editors regard as the correct, acceptable, or the generally used definition.
3. Dictionaries generally do not back up their definitions with arguments.
4. Hence the dictionary generally cannot be used to settle substantial disputes.

II Assessing Definitions

A. A definition must be

1. Clear.
2. Plausible.
3. Internally consistent.
4. Either in correspondence with our intuitions or supported by arguments that show our intuitions are mistaken.

B. A definition must not be

1. Circular-the definition merely restates the term being defined.
 - a. Example: Goodness = the quality of being good.
 - b. Example: A work of art = A product of the fine arts.
2. Too narrow: A definition that excludes things that should be included.
 - a. Example: Person = A human being.
 - b. Example: Art =Paintings and sculpture.
 - c. Example: Stealing = Taking physical property away from another person.

3. Too broad: A definition that includes things that should not be included.
 - a. Example: Stealing = taking something you do not legally own.
 - b. a. Example: Art = Anything that creates or influences the emotions.
4. Definitions can be too narrow and too broad at the same time.
5. Too vague-not precise enough.
 - a. Vague definitions are typically also too broad.
 - b. Example: Person = a being with some kind of mental activity.

III Responding

A. Attacking the Definition

1. The definition can be attacked by showing how it fails to meet one or more of the standards given above.
2. If the definition is flawed, then the argument is flawed.
3. Example: A person defines a tragedy as a work that creates strong emotions.
 - a. This argument is flawed because the definition is too broad.
4. Example: A person defines stealing as taking something that one does not legally own.
 - a. This is too broad because a person catching a fish while adrift in the middle of the ocean does not legally own the fish, but this does not seem to be stealing.

B. Attacking X

1. It can be argued that X does not meet the definition.
2. If X does not meet the definition, then the argument would fail.
3. Example: A person argues that a particular song is a country song, but it is shown that the song lacks the alleged qualities.
4. Example: It is argued that dolphins are people, but it is shown that they lack the qualities needed to be persons.

C. Counter Definition

1. This argument can be countered by presenting an alternative definition.
 - a. This is actually using another argument of the same type against the original.
2. If the new definition is superior, then the old definition should be rejected and hence the argument would presumably fail.
 - a. The quality of the definitions is compared using the standards above.
 - b. This method of responding also involves an attack on the original definition.
3. Example: A person might present a definition of horror that is countered by a better definition.
4. Example: A person might present a definition of stealing that is countered by presenting a more adequate definition.

Appeal to Intuition (General)

I Method

A. Introduction

1. One problem in creating moral principles and theories is finding a starting point.
2. A related problem is finding a way to test the results of a principle/theory without creating another principle or theory.
 - a. This could create an infinite regress.
3. There is also the general problem of settling an issue.
4. A generally accepted method of addressing these problems is by appealing to our pre-philosophical intuitions.

B. Intuitions & Arguments

1. An intuition is typically a blend of how one thinks and feels about a matter prior to reflection.
 - a. Crudely put, it is sort of a “gut” reaction.
2. The goal of the argument is to “motivate” the reader’s intuitions so s/he accepts your position on the issue.
3. The argument is something of a blend between persuasion and argumentation.
 - a. The goal is to support a position through reason.
 - b. The goal is also to get the audience accept your view because you have presented something that appeals to their intuitions.

C. Basic Method

1. Show that X violates (or coincide with) our intuitions.
2. Conclude that X is incorrect/implausible/wrong (or correct/plausible/right).

D. Story Method (General)

1. Present a plausible and appealing story or scenario that aims at motivating the target’s intuitions towards your position on the issue.
2. Present a developed argument that shows the reader why the story or scenario rationally supports your position.
3. Conclude that your position is correct.

E. Weakness and Strength

1. A weak point of this method is that moral intuitions are intuitions and not the result of reflection and argument.
2. This method is strong and effective with people who share intuitions, but tends to be weak and ineffective with people who do not share the same intuitions.

F. Testing Theories and Principles

1. This method is a useful tool in philosophy and is regularly used to check theories, principles, etc.
2. If a theory, principle etc. violates our intuitions, the theory, etc. becomes less plausible unless an adequate reply can be given.
3. If a theory, principle, etc. matches our intuitions, the theory, principle, etc. is more plausible.

G. Example: Stoned children.

1. In the Bible, Deuteronomy 21:18-21 says that stubborn and disobedient children should be stoned to death in public.
2. However, this seems to violate our moral intuitions about just grounds for capital punishment.
3. Therefore, the stoning of disobedient children is not acceptable.

H. Example: Injustice.

1. Story of Sweet Poly and Bad Bill.
2. Developed argument showing how being unjust is more advantageous.
3. Conclusion that the life of justice is the better choice.

II Responding

A. Attacking the Intuition.

1. It can be argued that the intuition is flawed.
2. A way to do this is to present a counter-intuition: an argument by intuition that goes against the original argument.
3. The idea is to show that the opposing intuition is more appealing, thus undercutting the original argument.

4. Example: Stoned Children.

- a. While it is believed by some that children should not be stoned to death for being disobedient, my moral intuition tells me that one must obey the will of God.
- b. Through the Bible God makes it clear that he wills that disobedient children be stoned to death.
- c. Therefore the stoning is right and good.

5. Example: Injustice

- a. Story of Sweet Poly and Bad Bill, Take 2.
- b. Developed argument showing that being just is more advantageous.
- c. Conclusion that the life of justice is a better choice.

B. Responding-Overriding the Intuition

1. The goal is to show that the intuition is mistaken.
2. This is done by showing the case against the position the intuition supports is strong enough to reasonable lead us to abandon the intuition.
3. Example: Stoned Children.
 - a. While our intuition might lead us to believe that stoning disobedient children is wrong, the consequences of doing this shows that it is right.
 - b. Disobedient children are a great burden on their parents and an annoyance to the rest of society.
 - c. Disobedient children often turn to crime and some become career criminals.
 - d. Fear of stoning or actual stoning will drastically cut down the number of disobedient children, thus greatly benefiting society.
 - e. So, stoning disobedient children is morally acceptable.
4. Example: Injustice.
 - a. While our intuitions might lead us towards injustice, the consequences of doing this show that it is a mistake.
 - b. Unjust people do great harm to society and even to themselves.
 - c. Thus, the life of justice is better because it provides a better existence for everyone.

Applying Moral Principles (Ethics)

I Method

A. Introduction

1. One method of moral assessment is to apply a moral principle.
2. Appeals to Consequences, Rules, and Rights are specific examples of this general approach (see below).

B. Method

1. Present and argue for the moral principle.
2. Describe the relevant qualities of X.
3. Show how X meets or fails to meet the conditions set by the principle.
4. Draw the relevant moral conclusion in regards to X.

C. Example: An athlete's principle.

1. Principle: Cheating in competition is wrong.
2. A performance enhancing drug has the qualities that would make using it cheating.
3. Therefore using the drug would be wrong.

D. Assessing Moral Principles

1. A moral standard must be presented.
2. This standard must be supported by arguments.

- a. The arguments are subject to assessment.
3. The application of the principle must produce reasonable solutions to the moral problem.
4. The principle must be coherent.
5. The principle must be plausible.
6. The principle must correspond to our moral intuitions or provide adequate grounds for abandoning our intuitions.

II Responding

A. Attacking the Principle

1. The principle can be argued against.
2. If the principle is flawed or incorrect, then its use would also be flawed.
3. Example: An athlete's principle.
 - a. The athlete's agent might argue that cheating is morally acceptable.
 - b. The agent might argue that the flaw is that "cheating" is almost impossible to adequately define.

B. Attacking X

1. It can be argued that X lacks the relevant qualities.
2. If X lacks the relevant qualities, then it would not meet the conditions set by the principle.
3. Example: An athlete's principle.
 - a. The agent might argue that the drug does not have the qualities that would make using it cheating.
 - b. Many performance enhancing substances and methods are not considered cheating.

C. Counter Principle

1. It can be argued that X is better assessed by a different principle.
 - a. This is actually using another argument of the same type against the original.
2. If assessment by the new principle is a better assessment, the first assessment is undercut.
3. Example: An athlete's principle.
 - a. The agent might argue that a better principle is that it is morally acceptable for an athlete to use any means to enhance performance (and make more money).

Applying Moral Theories (Ethics)

I Method

A. Introduction

1. One method of moral assessment is to apply a moral theory
2. Moral theories also contain moral principles.
3. This method is primarily a larger scale version of Applying Moral Principles.

B. Method

1. Present and argue for the relevant aspects of the moral theory.
2. Describe the relevant qualities of X.
3. Show how X meets or fails to meet the conditions set by the theory.
4. Draw the relevant conclusion regarding the status of X.

C. Assessing Moral Theories

1. Moral standards and guides must be presented.
2. These standards and guides must be supported by arguments.
 - a. The arguments are subject to assessment.
3. The application of the theory must produce reasonable solutions to moral problems.
4. The theory must be internally consistent.
5. The theory must be coherent.
6. The theory must be plausible.
7. The theory must correspond to our moral intuitions or provide adequate grounds for abandoning our intuitions.

D. Examples of Theories

1. Divine command theory: what God commands is good; what God forbids is evil.
2. Utilitarianism: Actions are right as they promote happiness; actions are wrong as they promote unhappiness.

II Responding

A. Attacking the Theory

1. This method can be countered by attacking the theory being used.
2. If the theory is flawed or incorrect, then its use would also be flawed.
3. Attacking a theory can require an extensive amount of work.

B. Attacking X

1. It can be argued that X lacks the relevant qualities.
2. If X lacks the relevant qualities, then it would not meet the conditions set by the theory.

C. Counter Theory

1. It can be argued that X is better assessed by a different principle.
 - a. This is actually using another argument of the same type against the original.
2. If assessment by the new theory is a better assessment, the first assessment is undercut.

The “Playing God” Argument (Ethics)

I Method

A. Introduction

1. People often claim that certain decisions should not be made or certain actions should not be done because doing so would be “playing God.”
2. Simply making this assertion is not an argument-but it can be developed into one.

B. Literal Version

1. Taken literally, this method is based on these assumptions
 - a. God exists.
 - b. God wants or commands that certain decisions should not be made or that certain actions should not be done.
 - c. We should do what God wants/obey His commands.
2. This often, but not always, involves an acceptance of divine command theory.
 - a. What God commands is right and what He forbids is wrong.
 - b. The effectiveness of this method would rest on the acceptance of this theory.

C. Metaphorical Version

1. Taken metaphorically, this method is based on the assumption that people should not make decisions or take actions as if they were God.
2. What it means to make decisions or take actions as if one is God must be defined.
 - a. This is often defined in terms of arrogance or acting outside the limits of normal constraints.
3. Why this should not be done must also be defended.
4. There is often a tacit or hidden appeal to a moral theory other than divine command theory
 - a. For example, playing God might be seen as having terrible consequences; thus assuming a consequentialist position.
5. While this method has dramatic appeal, it is usually better to use the underlying moral theory rather than playing the “God card.”

D. Method

1. Argue that making the decision about X or doing Y would be playing God.
2. Argue that people should not play God.
3. Conclude that people should not make the decision about X or do Y.

E. Example: Euthanasia

1. Argue that making the decision to let someone die or actually pull the plug would be playing God.
2. Argue that people should not play God.
3. Therefore, people should not make the decision about euthanasia or actually pull the plug.

F. Example: Genetic Engineering

1. Argue that tampering with the genetic code of living things is tampering with God’s work.
2. Argue that people should not play God in this way.
3. So, people should not tamper with the genetic code of living things.

G. God

1. In its literal form, use of this argument rests on certain assumptions about God and what God wants.
2. The argument tends to be effective with people who share the same religious views.
3. But, it tends to be ineffective when used on people who do not share the same religious beliefs.

II Responding

A. Spelling Out

1. In a live discussion, require that the person spell out exactly how one is playing God and why this is wrong.
 - a. This is can also be a request for the person to explicitly state the underlying theory/principle.
 - b. This is not a counter-argument but can be used to expose the lack of an argument on the other person’s part
2. Show that the person has not spelled out how this is playing God and why this is wrong and conclude they did not make their case-they merely expressed their unsupported opinion.

B. Arguing that it is acceptable to “Play God” in similar situations.

1. This can be done by presenting an argument by analogy.
2. The analogy is drawn between the situation at hand and a similar situation in which making the decision or taking the action is regarded as morally acceptable.
3. Euthanasia example
 - a. In the legal system people make decisions to put people to death and this is not seen as playing God.
 - b. In war people make decisions of life and death and even kill people and this is not seen as playing God.
 - c. Thus, euthanasia is not playing God.

4. Genetic Engineering Example

- a. People have been altering animals through selective breeding for thousands of years without being accused of playing God.
- b. Genetic engineering is simply a more efficient method of achieving the ends of selective breeding.
- c. Therefore, genetic engineering is not playing God.

The Unnatural Argument (Ethics)

I Method

A. Introduction

1. People often claim that certain things are wrong or that certain actions should not be done because doing so would be “unnatural”
2. This argument does not require a religious foundation.
3. This argument is often combined with the “playing God” argument.

B. Literal Version

1. Taken literally, the argument rests on the following assumptions:
 - a. There is a natural way things should be
 - b. We should act in accord with the natural way.
 - c. Unnatural things and actions are morally wrong.
2. Defining what is natural and what is not is a critical part of this method.
3. There are moral theories that are based on the concept of human nature or a natural way.
4. Some use this method based on the assumption that if X is not done in nature or does not exist in nature, then X is wrong.

C. Metaphorical Version

1. Taken metaphorically, this method is based on the assumption that people should not go beyond certain limits.
2. What it means to make decisions or take actions beyond these limits must be defined.
 - a. This is often defined in terms of arrogance or acting outside the limits of normal constraints.
3. Why this should not be done must also be defended.
4. There is often a tacit or hidden appeal to another moral theory.
 - a. For example, doing something unnatural might be seen as having terrible consequences; thus assuming a consequentialist position.
5. While this method has dramatic appeal, it is usually better to use the underlying moral theory rather than playing the “unnatural card.”

D. Form

1. Argue that X or doing X is unnatural
2. Argue that unnatural things or actions are wrong.
3. Conclude that X is wrong or X should not be done.

E. Example: Homosexuality

1. Argue that homosexuality is an unnatural lifestyle.
2. Argue that people should not live unnatural lifestyles.
3. Conclude that homosexuality is morally wrong.

F. Example: Genetic Engineering

1. Argue that creating new life forms with genetic engineering creates unnatural things.
2. Argue that people should not create unnatural things.
3. Conclude that the use of genetic engineering to create new life forms is morally wrong.

G. Natural

1. Defining what is natural is critical to this argument.
2. If natural is taken as being non-artificial, then all technology ranging from shoes to space shuttles would be immoral.
3. If natural is taken in terms of the way things should be, the method seems to be circular since the argument would be that people should not do things they should not do.
4. There are moral theories that based on a concept of nature.
 - a. Taoism.
 - b. Virtue theory.

II Responding

A. Spelling Out

1. In a live discussion, require that the person spell out exactly how X is unnatural and why X is wrong.
 - a. This is can also be a request for the person to explicitly state the underlying theory/principle.
 - b. This is not a counter-argument but can be used to expose the lack of an argument on the other person’s part
2. Show that the person has not spelled out how X is unnatural and why this is wrong and conclude they did not make their case—they merely expressed their unsupported opinion.

B. Showing that it is acceptable to be “unnatural” in similar situations.

1. This can be done by an argument by analogy.

- a. The analogy is drawn between the situation at hand and a similar situation in which making the decision or taking the action is acceptable.
- b. The challenge is finding an analogy that is acceptable.
- 2. Genetic Engineering Example
 - a. People have been altering animals through selective breeding for thousands of years without being accused of engaging in unnatural activities.
 - b. Genetic engineering is simply a more efficient method of achieving the ends of selective breeding.
 - c. Therefore, genetic engineering is not unnatural.
- C. Showing that the act or thing occurs in nature.
 - 1. Example: Homosexuality.
 - a. Homosexuality is common among animals.
 - b. So, it is not unnatural.
 - c. Therefore it is not morally unacceptable.

Appeals to Consequences (Normative)

I Method

- A. Introduction
 - 1. People commonly consider the consequences when assessing the morality of an action, policy, etc.
 - 2. It is generally accepted that harming people and things is morally bad and benefiting them is good.
 - 3. It is commonly accepted that if something creates more benefits than harms, then it is good or at least acceptable.
 - 4. This method involves weighing the benefits against the harms.
- B. Basis
 - 1. The theory behind this method is consequentialism—the view that actions are assessed in terms of their consequences.
 - 2. Though this method is generally accepted, there is philosophical debate over the underlying theory.
- C. Method
 - 1. Show that action, policy, etc. X creates Y harms and Z benefits.
 - 2. Weigh and assess Y and Z.
 - 3. Argue that moral assessment is based on the consequences of actions.
 - 3. If Y outweighs Z, then conclude that X is morally unacceptable.
 - 4. If Z outweighs Y, then conclude that X is morally acceptable.
- D. Example-violent media.
 - 1. It has been shown that violent media has a negative impact on people.
 - a. Most school shootings involved a direct connection to violent movies, such as the Matrix.
 - b. Studies have shown that people exposed to violent images are more likely to engage in violent behavior.
 - 2. While there are some benefits from violent media, such as large profits, one cannot weigh money more than human suffering and death.
 - 3. Therefore, violence in the media should be eliminated or at least curtailed.
- E. Moral versus Practical
 - 1. A common mistake when using this method is to simply weigh harms and benefits without including a moral element.
 - 2. Example: cheating in a relationship.
 - a. Potential harms would include disease, pregnancy, divorce, damage to one's reputation and physical injury.
 - b. Potential benefits would include pleasure and companionship.
 - c. Concluding that a person should not cheat because of the practical concerns (like avoiding a disease) would not be a moral argument.
 - 3. For the method to be used as a moral argument, the moral element needs to be included.
 - 4. Example: cheating in a relationship.
 - a. An argument from authority (Plato and Mill) can be used to argue that happiness is of value.
 - b. An argument from intuition can be used to argue that creating positive value is good and creating negative value is wrong.
 - c. It can be argued that the harms of cheating would create more unhappiness (negative value) than happiness (positive value).
 - d. It can be concluded that cheating would be morally wrong.

II Responding

- A. Another Assessment
 - 1. One counter is to present an alternative assessment.
 - a. One way is to argue for a different assessment of the harms and benefits.
 - b. Another way is to argue for a different assessment of their relative weight.
 - 2. Example: While violent media might produce such harms, it also produces benefits.
 - a. Violent films, shows and video games are very popular, generating large profits.
 - b. People also enjoy violent media.
 - c. Weighing the small number of deaths and injuries against the massive profits and enjoyment, it is

clear that the benefits of violent media outweighs the harms.

d. Therefore, violent media is morally acceptable.

B. Counter Method

1. It can be argued that some factor other than consequences should be used when assessing the situation.

2. This can be done by using another method, such as an appeal to rules, to offer a counter argument

3. Example-violent media.

a. Violence in the media might lead to harms.

b. But, people have a moral right to free expression.

c. This moral right overrides the consideration of harms.

d. Therefore, violence in the media should not be censored.

Appeal to Rules (Ethics)

I Method

A. Introduction

1. People often take the view that one must sometimes ignore the consequences of an action and simply assess the morality of the action itself.

2. It is generally accepted that some things are simply wrong even if they bring about good consequences.

3. It is also accepted that people should not do such things (“that’s just not right”).

4. It is generally accepted that some things are acceptable or right even if they have harmful consequences.

5. It is also accepted that people should do such things.

B. Basis

1. This method involves assessing the action, policy, etc. in terms of the nature of X itself as opposed to its effect(s).

2. The theoretical basis is deontology, the view that morality is based on determining and following the correct moral rules.

3. While such theories often have a great deal of appeal, they are also subject to debate.

4. It is important not to confuse moral rules with other rules, such as those of civil or criminal law.

a. There are theories that involve the claim that morality is determined by the law of the state.

b. Also see Mixing Norms, below.

C. Method #1

1. Argue that X violates (or does not) violate moral rule Y.

2. Conclude that X is morally unacceptable (or acceptable).

D. Method #2

1. Argue that X is required by moral rule Y.

2. Conclude that X is morally obligatory.

E. Example-Incurable diseases.

1. Putting people to death who are infected with incurable contagious diseases would protect everyone else.

2. Argue that morality should be based on rules.

3. Argue that the killing of innocent people violates the moral rules.

4. Therefore, we should not kill infected people.

F. Note

1. This method generally requires providing the audience with a reason (argument) that supports the rule.

2. In some cases this might involve using another method or moral theory.

II Responding

A. Attacking the rule.

1. The rule used in the method can be attacked.

2. If the rule is successfully attacked, then the argument is undercut.

3. The type of attack varies depending on the rule and the circumstances.

a. It can be argued that the rule is illegitimate.

b. It can be argued that a more important rule overrides the rule.

B. Counter Method

1. It can be argued that some factor other than moral rules should be used when assessing the situation.

2. This can be done by using another method, such as an appeal to consequences, to offer a counter argument

3. Example-incurable diseases.

a. While it is not a pleasant thing to contemplate or do, those with incurable contagious diseases should be mercifully put to sleep.

b. This would effectively reduce the spread of contagious diseases protecting everyone else from them.

c. And, of course, the good of the many must outweigh the needs of the few, especially when it comes to life and death.

Appeals to Rights (Ethics)

I Method

A. Introduction

1. Many people, especially those in Western democracies, believe in rights.
2. It is often accepted that people have rights that protect them and even entitle them to certain things.
3. It is generally accepted that such rights must be respected under most conditions.
2. This method involves assessing the action, policy, etc. in terms of whether it is in accord with such rights.

B. Basis

1. This method is based on rights theory-the view that people and perhaps other beings have moral rights.
2. While rights theories have a great deal of appeal, they are also subject to debate.
3. While they often overlap, it is important not to confuse moral rights with legal rights.
 - a. See Mixing Norms, below.

C. Method #1

1. Argue for right Y.
2. Argue that X violates (or does not violate) right Y.
3. Conclude that X is not morally acceptable (or is acceptable).

D. Method #2

1. Argue for right Y.
2. Argue that X is required by right Y.
3. Conclude that X is morally obligatory.

E. Example: Censorship

1. Censorship has often been proposed to protect people from the alleged harms of violent and sexually explicit media.
2. Argue that people have a right to freedom of expression.
3. Therefore, such censorship is not acceptable.

F. Considerations

1. This method generally requires providing the audience with a reason (argument) that supports the right.
2. In some cases this might involve using another method or a moral theory (see below).

II Responding

A. Attacking the right.

1. One counter is to argue against their being such a right or by arguing that the right is incorrectly applied.
2. If the right is successfully attacked, then the argument is undercut.
3. The type of attack varies depending on the right and the circumstances.
 - a. It might be argued that the right is not a legitimate right.
 - b. It might be argued that a more important right overrides the right.

B. Counter Method: The consequences override the right.

1. It can be argued that the consequences morally override the right.
2. This involves countering by using an Appeal to the Consequences.
3. Example: censorship.
 - a. While it is generally accepted that people have a right to free expression, it is also accepted that this right is not absolute-a person has no right to slander another.
 - b. While censorship would run against the right of free expression, the harms produced by certain works justify censoring them, just as it would be justified to quiet a person yelling "fire" in a crowded, but fire-free theatre.

C. Counter Method: a rule overrides the right.

1. It can be argued that a moral rule overrides the right in question.
2. This essentially involves applying the Appeals to Rules method.
3. For example, people are supposed to have a right to life and property, but they can be justly deprived of them by a rule of due punishment.

D. Counter Method: General

1. Other methods can be used to counter the argument by offering an alternative assessment of the situation.

Mixing Norms (Normative)

I Method

A. Introduction

1. People commonly make inferences from one normative area to another.
 - a. Law, religion, aesthetics, morality, and etiquette.
2. The inference is that status of X in one normative area automatically gives it the same status in another normative area.
3. Example: It is often assumed there is a moral right to be free of censorship because of the 1st Amendment, which guarantees a legal right to the freedom of press.
4. Such inferences can be made, but must be made carefully.

B. Flawed Method

1. Reasoning

- a. X has status S in normative area Y.
- b. Therefore X should have the comparable status to S in normative area Z.
2. This method is flawed, even fallacious, because the conclusion does not follow unless a proper link is made between Y and Z.
3. Examples:
 - a. Lying to a friend is immoral, so it should be illegal.
 - b. Capital punishment is legal, so it is morally acceptable.
 - c. Deuteronomy 21:18-21 says that children who do not obey their parents are to be stoned to death, so it is morally acceptable.
 - e. Depicting graphic violence and sexuality is morally wrong, therefore such works are also aesthetically unacceptable as well.
- C. Acceptable Method
 1. Reasoning
 - a. X has status S in normative area Y.
 - b. Premise or Argument connecting area Y and normative area Z.
 - c. Therefore X should have the comparable status to S in normative area Z.
 2. Provided that the connection between Y and Z is adequately made, the reasoning is acceptable.
 3. The first premise will most likely require support of its own.
 4. Example:
 - a. Argue that making backups of DVDs, software and CDs is morally acceptable.
 - b. Argue that things that are morally acceptable should be legal.
 - c. Making backups of DVDs, software and CDs should be legal.

II Making the Connection

A. Theory

1. The task is to show that the status of X in normative area Z should be inferred from its status in normative area Y.
2. There are theories that explicitly or implicitly connect two normative areas.
 - a. Example: Divine Command Theory is the view that morality is determined by religion, so the inference from religious norms to moral norms is justified.
 - b. Example: Legalism is the view that morality is determined by the laws of the state, so the inference from legal norms (the laws) to moral norms is justified.
3. One can state that the argument is being made in the context of the theory.
 - a. Weakness-only those who accept the theory will accept the inference.
 - b. Example:
 1. Given divine command theory, since the bible permits torture (2 Samuel 12:26-31) it follows that torture is morally acceptable.
 2. Given legalism, since the use of marijuana is illegal, it must also be evil.
4. One can also argue for the theory, which will typically require a great deal of work.
5. If there is an easier or more direct way to argue for the conclusion, this method can be overkill.

B. Argument

1. The task is to show that the status of X in normative area Z should be inferred from its status in normative area Y.
2. An argument can be provided that makes the connection.
3. The effectiveness of the method depends on the quality of the argument for the connection.
3. Example
 - a. The state exists to protect people from harm.
 - b. Thus, the laws of the state are designed to protect people from harm by making harmful things illegal.
 - c. Things that are immoral are harmful-at the very least they damage the person's moral character.
 - d. Thus, things that are immoral should also be made illegal by the state.
5. If there is an easier or more direct way to argue for the conclusion, this method can be overkill.

III Considerations

A. Considerations: Law

1. The great variation in laws limits inferences from law to other normative areas and can lead to problems such as contradictions.
 - a. Example: prostitution is legal in Nevada but not in Maine, so inferring from law to morality would entail that prostitution is both moral and immoral.
2. There are many different views of the foundation and purpose of law, so inferences to or from law can be problematic.
 - a. Example, the US has legal separation of Church and State, so inferring from religion to law would be problematic.

B. Considerations: Religion

1. Inferences to or from a religion will generally only be accepted by those of the same faith.
 - a. Example: Pork is forbidden to Jews, but Christians are unlikely to accept that that pork should be outlawed.
2. There is a great variety even within one religion and this makes inferences from religion problematic.
 - a. Example: the Koran calls for Jihad, but some interpret it in ways that justify terrorism and others do not.
3. Bringing in an entire religion and accompanying metaphysics to solve a problem is often overkill.

4. The religion and its assumptions are often far more controversial than the point being argued for.

C. Considerations: Aesthetics

1. Aesthetics is often regarded as being trumped by law, morality and religion.

a. This often makes inferences from aesthetics to other areas too difficult.

b. This often makes inferences from other areas to aesthetics too easy.

c. The areas where aesthetics and other areas overlap are typically regarded as belonging to those other areas.

d. Example: censorship is often regarded as primarily a legal or moral issue rather than an aesthetic issue.

2. There is a great deal of disagreement in aesthetics, which makes inferences from aesthetics problematic.

3. The concerns of aesthetics are seen as removed from those of other areas, thus making inferences from aesthetics more difficult.

a. Example: what implications does a theory of beauty have for law, religion or morality?

4. Aesthetics is regarded as being a realm of pure opinion thus making inferences from aesthetics more difficult.

D. Considerations: Morality

1. There is a great deal of disagreement about morality, which can make inferences to or from morality problematic.

2. There are moral theories based on other normative areas, which can make inferences too easy or too difficult.

a. Example: Divine command theory makes inferences from religion to morality automatic, but precludes inferences from morality to religion.

b. Example: Legalism makes inferences from law to morality automatic, but precludes inferences from morality to law.

3. This is dispute over the foundation and purpose of morality which can make such inferences problematic.

a. Example: Relativism is the view that morality is grounded in the culture, so making an inference from morality to international law would be problematic.

IV Responding

A. Responding-Attacking the First Premise

1. The normative status of X, as presented in the first premise of the method, can be challenged.

2. Challenging this status involves arguing that X does not have the alleged status.

3. If X does not have the required normative status, then the inference fails.

4. Alternatively, the inference can be made, but the normative status will be based on the "new" status.

a. Example:

1. Original argument: copying DVDs is immoral and hence should be illegal.

2. Response: Copying DVDs is moral, hence should be legal.

B. Attacking the Link

1. The argument depends on the link between the two normative areas-if the link fails, the argument fails.

2. The objective is to argue that the inference is not justified.

3. In some cases there are established ways to break the link.

a. Example: a way to counter an argument for basing a law on religion is to appeal to the separation of church and state.

4. The link can also be attacked by arguing that the norms of one area do not apply to the other or that one area overrides another, thus preventing the inference.

a. Example: Oscar Wilde claimed that morality does not apply to art.

b. Example: Morality is often seen as trumping law, so the inference from law to morality would not be justified.

Part Two: Moral Theory

Ethical/Moral Theories

Revised 9/12/2005

I Introduction

A. Moral Theory

1. A systematic development and justification of an account of the nature and foundation of good and evil.
2. Typical provide moral principles that can be applied in specific situations.
3. Moral theories tend to focus primarily on actions, consequences, motives, or character.
4. Provide a standard or standards for distinguishing between what is morally significant and what is not.
5. Contain arguments in support of the standard(s).

B. Assessment of Ethical Theories

1. Ethical standards and guides must be presented.
2. These standards and guides must be supported by arguments.
3. Some limits must be placed on allowed behavior.
4. The application of the theory must produce reasonable solutions to moral problems.
5. The theory must correspond to our moral intuitions or provide adequate grounds for abandoning our intuitions.
6. The theory must be internally consistent.
7. The theory must be coherent.
8. The theory must be plausible.

C. Moral Theories and Real People

1. Some moral theories attempt to codify and develop pre-existing moral views already held by people.
 - a. How well these theories capture these views is a matter of debate.
 - b. Whether or not moral theories should attempt to capture these views is also a matter of debate.
2. There is significant moral diversity among people, even those who identify themselves as part of a moral group, which makes moral theorizing difficult.
 - a. Example: Catholics disagree about specific ethical positions as well as on the basis of morality.
3. Most people are not aware of moral theories and do not knowingly base their moral judgments on such theories.
 - a. Most people do not have a systematic ethical system.
 - b. Most people make moral judgments on the basis of other factors-emotional, political, cultural influence, etc.
4. However, many moral judgments can be understood in terms of existing theories.

C. Use

1. Moral theories are created to provide an account of ethics.
 - a. Some are attempts to explain, describe and systematize existing moral behavior.
 - b. Others are attempts to provide an original account of ethics.
2. Moral theories are academically useful in enhancing our understanding of ethics.
3. Moral theories are often created to provide an ethical system that serves as a theoretical framework for moral principles.
 - a. This framework is useful for providing a context for resolving ethical issues.
4. Moral theories enable a more focused and systematic approach to ethical issues.
5. Moral theories are also used in moral argumentation-see Applying Moral Theories, above.

II Assumptions about Moral Principles/Theories

A. Introduction

1. Many thinkers accept these assumptions about morality but the acceptance is not universal.
2. A moral principle or theory containing a principle that violates these assumptions is defective-unless the violation can be justified.

B. Prescriptivity

1. Moral principles need to provide guides for action.
2. Some moral theories do not, because of their nature, make prescriptions.
 - a. Example: Moral nihilism is the view that there is no morality, hence it makes no moral prescriptions.

C. Universalizability

1. Moral principles must apply to all entities that occupy situations that are relevantly similar.
 - a. Example: Paying men differently from women simply because they are women would violate this assumption.
2. Moral judgments must be applied consistently: If X is judged to be good or bad, then anything adequately similar to X must also be judged in the same way.
 - a. Example: If someone claims that euthanasia is immoral because it takes a life, then they would need to accept that capital punishment is also wrong.

3. The assumptions grounding this are:
 - a. Moral equality: People are moral equals, at least initially.
 - b. Relevant difference: A difference in treatment between A and B must be justified by a difference in morally significant properties or circumstances of A and B.
4. The principles within a moral theory are supposed to be universalizable.
5. There are some moral theories that explicitly deny this assumption.
 - a. Examples: Relativism and subjectivism.

D. Overridingness

1. Moral principles are supposed to take precedence over other normative areas.
2. For example, moral concerns are supposed to override aesthetics, law, and etiquette.
3. This is a matter of extensive debate.
4. There are moral theories that involve the principle that morality depends on another normative area.
 - a. Legalism: morality is determined by what is illegal and legal, hence the law is overriding.
 - b. Divine command theory: morality is determined by God, hence religion is overriding.
5. Some argue that other areas should override ethics or at least be on par with ethics.
 - a. Example: Wilde argues that art is not subject to moral assessment.

E. Public

1. Moral principles must be public-otherwise they cannot provide guides to action.
2. Secret moral principles would, in general, be self-defeating.
3. Some moral theories do endorse secret moral principles, but justification is required for this.

F. Practicality

1. A moral principle or theory must be practical-an average individual must be able to abide by the principle.
2. A theory that fails to take into account the limitations of moral agents is defective because it presents unrealistic expectations.
3. This principle can be used to justify differences in the application of moral principles in different conditions.
 - a. Example: In times of plenty, more generosity can be reasonably expected.

Moral Theories: Detailed Accounts

Virtue Theory/Aretaic Ethics

Introduction

I Introduction

A. Defined

1. Focused primarily on the character of the agent.
2. A person should cultivate his/her character by developing both moral and non-moral virtues.
3. The objective is to achieve excellence.
4. Virtues are typically regarded as having intrinsic value.
3. The theory is based on human nature.

B. Aretaic Ethics

1. Virtues are taken as dominant.
2. Virtues have intrinsic value.
3. Moral principles and moral duties are derived from virtues.

C. Proponents

1. Aristotle
2. Confucius
3. Aquinas
4. Alasdair MacIntyre
5. Philippa Foot
6. Richard Taylor

D. Appeal

1. Practical: virtue theories tend to provide a clear guide about how to become a good person.
2. Intuitive appeal: people intuitively regard being virtuous as desirable and good.
3. Universal: the notion of being virtuous has universal acceptance across cultures and time and most virtues are common to all significant human societies.

Confucius

Created: 9/13/2005

I Background

A. Life

1. Born in 551 B.C. and died in 479 B.C.
2. Lived in the state of Lu.

3. It is believed that he was from an impoverished noble family.
4. He was self educated.
5. Had 3,000 students and 72 close followers.
6. He lived during a violent and chaotic time in the history of China.
7. He is credited with preserving and editing many of the early works of Chinese literature.

B. Rituals & Values

1. He sought a philosophical foundation for political and social stability.
2. He revived old rituals and values in the belief they would revive society.
3. He utilized the legends of the ancient sage kings, most especially the duke of Chou (died 1094 B.C.).
4. These sage kings ruled with wisdom and moral virtue rather than force and violence.

C. The Analects

1. A compilation of his teachings put together after his death by his students,
2. He held that humans are basically good.
3. Each person should develop this goodness to achieve *jen* (virtue).
4. The path to virtue is achieved by due attention to *li* (ritual and customs) and *chung* (inner nature).
5. Key virtues include reciprocity, righteousness, and filial piety.
6. A critical part of his view was the need for the rulers to be properly educated.
 - a. Virtuous rulers would rule with wisdom and virtue rather than with force and violence.

D. Impact

1. Like many great thinkers, Confucius did not have significant impact in his own time.
2. His teachings eventually achieved dominance in Chinese thought.
3. His teachings were made orthodox during the Han period (206 B.C. – 220 A.D.).
4. His teachings became the basis of the Chinese civil service exams.
5. Confucianism only lost official status in 1911 when the communists took power.
6. Confucianism, along with Buddhism and Taoism, still has significant impact on Chinese culture and thought.

Analects of Confucius

Revised 9/13/2005

-Translated by Arthur Waley, 1939

I The Virtues

A. Respect for Authority

1. Those who behave well towards parents and elder brothers seldom resist the authority of superiors.
2. The gentleman works on the trunk of Goodness- proper behavior towards parents and elder brothers.

B. Master Tseng's Three Points of Examination

1. In acting on behalf of others, have I always been loyal to their interests?
2. Have I always been true to my word?
3. Have I failed to repeat the precepts?

C. A Young Man's Duty

1. To behave well to his parents at home and to his elders abroad.
2. To be cautious in giving promises and punctual in keeping them.
3. To have kindly feelings towards everyone.
4. To seek the intimacy of the Good.
5. If he has energy left, then study the polite arts.

D. Four virtues of the Way of the true gentleman.

1. In his private conduct he is courteous.
2. In serving his master he was punctilious.
3. In providing for the needs of the people he gave them more than their due.
4. In exacting service from the people, he was just.

E. How to act

1. Be faithful to your superiors.
2. Keep all promises.
3. Refuse the friendship of all who are not like you.
4. If you have made a mistake, do not be afraid of admitting the fact and amending your ways.
5. Behave when away from home as though you were in the presence of an important guest.
6. Deal with the common people as though officiating an important sacrifice.
7. Do not do to others what you would not like yourself.
8. Then there will be no feelings of opposition to you, whether in affairs of a State or a Family.
9. If a gentleman is frivolous, he will lose the respect of his inferiors and lack firm ground on which to build his education.

F. Nine Cares of the Gentleman

1. In seeing he is careful to see clearly.
2. In hearing he is careful to hear distinctly.
3. In his looks he is careful to be kindly.
4. In his manner to be respectful.
5. In his words to be loyal.
6. In his work to be diligent.
7. When in doubt he is careful to ask for information.
8. When angry he has a care for the consequences.
9. When he sees a chance of gain, he thinks carefully whether the pursuit of it would be consonant with the Right.

II Goodness

A. Good & Goodness

1. One who is free to choose, yet does not prefer to dwell among the Good-is not wise.
2. Without Goodness a man cannot long endure adversity nor long enjoy prosperity.
3. The merely wise pursue Goodness in the belief that it pays to do so.
4. Adage: "Only a Good Man knows how to like people, knows how to dislike them,"
5. Confucius: He whose heart is in the smallest degree set upon Goodness will dislike no one.

B. Wealth & Goodness

1. All desire Wealth and rank; but if they can only be retained to the detriment of the Way, he must relinquish them.
2. All detest Poverty and obscurity; but if they can only be avoided to the detriment of the Way, he must accept them.

C. Goodness & Wickedness

1. One who really cared for Goodness would never let any other consideration come first.
2. One who abhorred wickedness would be so constantly doing Good that wickedness would never have a chance to get at him.
3. No one has managed to do Good with his whole might for even a single day.
4. No one has given up the attempt because he lacked the strength to go on.

D. Goodness & Happiness

1. One who is Good can never be unhappy.
2. One who is wise can never be perplexed.
3. One who is brave is never afraid.

E. Moral Force

1. He who rules by moral force (te) is like the pole-star- remaining in place.
2. Govern people by regulations, keep order by chastisements, and they will flee and lose all self-respect.
3. Govern by moral force, keep order by ritual and they will keep their self-respect and come to you on their own.

Doctrine of the Mean in The Chinese Classics

Revised 9/13/2005

Translated by James Legge 1891

I Equilibrium & Harmony

A. Equilibrium

1. The mind is in Equilibrium when there are no stirrings of pleasure, anger, sorrow, or joy.
2. Harmony: When those feelings are stirred and act in due degree.
3. Equilibrium is the root from which grows all human actions.
4. Harmony is the universal path which all should pursue.

B. If equilibrium and harmony exist in perfection, then

1. A happy order will prevail through heaven and earth.
2. All things will be nourished and flourish.

II The Mean

A. Virtue

1. Virtue which is according to the Mean is perfect.
2. Those who can practice it are rare.

B. Why the path of the Mean is not walked

1. The knowing go beyond it.
2. The stupid do not come up to it.

C. Why path of the Mean is not understood.

1. The men of talents and virtue go beyond it.
2. The worthless do not come up to it.
3. Everyone eats and drinks, but few can distinguish flavors.

D. Shun's Wisdom

1. Shun loved to question others and study their words.
2. He concealed what was bad in them, and displayed what was good.
3. He took hold of their two extremes, determined the Mean, and employed it in his government of the people.

E. Hui

1. He made choice of the Mean.
2. Whenever he got hold of what was good, he clasped it firmly and did not lose it.

III Virtues

A. Virtues

1. Benevolence is the characteristic element of humanity, and the great exercise of it, is in loving relatives.
2. Righteousness is the accordance of actions with what is right, and the great exercise of it is in honoring the worthy.
3. The principle of propriety produces the decreasing measures of love due relatives, and the steps in the honor due the worthy.
4. When those in inferior situations lack the confidence of their superiors, they cannot retain the government of the people.

B. The Path

1. Only by perfect virtue can the perfect path, be made a fact.
2. When one fully cultivates the principles of his nature, and exercises them on the principle of reciprocity, he is near the path.
3. What you do not like when done to yourself, do not do to others.

IV Duties & Virtues

A. The Five duties of universal obligation.

1. Sovereign - minister.
2. Father - son.
3. Husband - wife.
4. Elder brother- younger brother.
5. Friend-friend.

B. The virtues by which the Five Duties are Practiced

1. Knowledge.
2. Magnanimity.
3. Energy.
4. Means by which the duties are put into practice is singleness.

C. Acquiring Knowledge of Duties

1. Some are born with the knowledge.
2. Some know them by study.
3. Some acquire the knowledge after a painful feeling of their ignorance.
4. Once acquired it is the same knowledge.
5. Some practice them
 - a. With a natural ease.
 - b. From a desire for their advantages.
 - c. By strenuous effort.
6. Once the achievement is made, it comes to the same thing.

V Sincerity

A. What is Sincerity?

1. Is what brings about self-completion.
2. Its way is that by which man must direct himself.
3. Is the end and beginning of things.
4. Without sincerity there would be nothing.
5. The superior man regards the attainment of sincerity as the most excellent thing.
6. Sincerity is the way of Heaven.
7. The attainment of sincerity is the way of men.

B. Attaining Sincerity Requires:

1. The extensive study of what is good.
2. Accurate inquiry.
3. Careful reflection.
4. Clear discrimination.
5. Earnest practice.

D. Intelligence & Sincerity

1. Intelligence resulting from sincerity is due to nature.
2. Sincerity resulting from intelligence is due to instruction.
3. Given sincerity there shall be intelligence.

4. Given intelligence there shall be sincerity.
- E. One who possesses Sincerity:
 1. Hits without effort what is right.
 2. Apprehends, without the exercise of thought.
 3. Is the sage who naturally and easily embodies the right way.
 4. Chooses what is good and holds it fast.
- F. Sincerity & Completion
 1. The possessor of sincerity does not merely accomplish his self-completion.
 2. He completes other men and things also.
 3. Completing himself shows his perfect virtue.
 4. Completing other men and things shows his knowledge.
 5. This is the way by which a union is effected of the external and internal.
 6. Whenever the entirely sincere man-employs them their action will be right.

IV The Superior Man

- A. The Superior Man and the Mean
 1. The superior man embodies the course of the Mean.
 2. The mean man acts contrary to the course of the Mean.
 3. The superior man's embodies the course of the Mean because he is a superior man, and so always maintains the Mean.
 4. The mean man's acting contrary to the course of the Mean is because he is a mean man, and has no caution.
- B. The Superior Man
 1. Honors his virtuous nature.
 2. Maintains constant inquiry and study.
 3. He cherishes his old knowledge, and is continually acquiring new.
 4. He exerts an honest, generous earnestness, in the esteem and practice of all propriety.
- C. Archer Analogy
 1. Archery is like the way of the superior man.
 2. When the archer misses the target's center he seeks for the cause of his failure in himself.
- D. Energy of the southern regions
 1. To show forbearance and gentleness in teaching others.
 2. Not to revenge unreasonable conduct.
 3. The good man makes it his study.
- E. Energy of the Northern Regions
 1. To lie under arms and meet death without regret.
 2. The forceful make it their study.
- F. The Superior Man
 1. Cultivates a friendly harmony, without being weak.
 2. Stands in the middle, without inclining to either side.
 3. When good principles prevail in his country, he does not change from what he was in retirement.
 4. When bad principles prevail, he maintains his course to death without changing.

Aristotle

Background

I History

- A. Athens & Macedonia
 1. Athens lost the Peloponnesian war to Sparta in 404 B.C.
 2. The Greek city states were conquered by Philip of Macedonia in 338 B.C.
- B. Aristotle
 1. Born 384 B.C. in Stagira, Macedonia.
 2. His father, Nichomachus, was the doctor of Amyntus II, the ruler of Macedonia.
 3. Studied at the academy when he was 18 until Plato's death in 348 B.C.
 4. The academy was taken over by Plato's nephew Speusippos.
 5. Aristotle left the academy, perhaps because of anti-Macedonian sentiments, and traveled the Greek islands investigating sea life.
 6. Philip called him back to Macedonia in 342 B.C. to serve as the tutor to his son Alexander.
 7. In 335 he returned to Athens to found the Lyceum, a rival school to the Academy.
 - a. Located near the temple of Apollo Lyceus.
 8. Alexander died in 323 B.C. releasing a surge in anti-Macedonian sentiment and Aristotle's flight from the city.
 - a. "lest the Athenians should sin twice against philosophy."

9. Died in 322 B.C.
 - a. His will reflected his generous and affectionate nature-he provided generously for his family and servants.
 - b. He requested that he be buried next to his first wife, Pythias, although he did express affection for Herpyllis, his second wife.

Aristotle's Ethics

I Introduction

A. *Nicomachean Ethics*

1. Named after both Aristotle's father and son.
2. He does not claim to offer an entirely new moral theory-it would be absurd to think no one had ever previously discovered what it is to be good.
3. His works have a commonsense approach to ethics that tends to match most peoples' intuitions.

B. Nature of Ethics

1. Ethics is a body of objective knowledge.
2. It is a science of conduct whose aim is to guide us to human excellence.
3. Morality is a matter of knowing and practicing principles.
4. A person can be mistaken in regards to morality.
5. Ethics is not an exact science.
6. When ethical principles are applied in specific situations, ambiguities and other difficulties arise.
7. Ethics is analogous to navigation and medicine in that exact and specific rules are not possible.

C. Intellectual Virtue & Moral Virtue

1. Intellectual virtue: excellence of intelligence.
2. Moral virtue: excellence of character.
3. Both are required to lead the good life and to be happy.

D. Intellectual Virtue

1. Philosophic wisdom: a theoretical understanding achieved by grasping the unchanging structure of reality.
2. Practical wisdom: the rational understanding of how to conduct one's life.
3. However, the inquiry is to become good and not just to know what virtue is-otherwise the inquiry would be useless.
4. More is needed beyond intellectual virtue, namely the ability to moderate one's emotions and desires.
5. But, one part of being virtuous is acting from knowledge.

Relevant Aspects of Aristotle's Metaphysics

I Causes & Teleology

A. The Four types of Causes

1. Material Cause: the matter that composes the thing.
 - a. Example: The stone that makes up a statue.
2. Efficient Cause: The origin of the process that produced the thing.
 - a. The cause that actualizes the thing's potential.
 - b. Example: The parents of a child.
3. Formal Cause: The essence of the thing.
 - a. The form that is actualized which makes the thing what it is.
 - b. Example: The form of a human causes the baby to become a human adult and not a squirrel.
4. Final Cause: The end, purpose or function of the thing.
 - a. Natural objects have purposes, ends and functions.
 - b. Example: The final cause of the acorn is becoming a tree that will create more acorns.

B. Teleology

1. From "telos" which means "end" or "goal."
2. Nature is regarded as a collection of processes that aim at fulfilling various ends.
3. There is not an assumption that the natural beings are consciously aiming towards the ends.
4. The essence of each substance includes the impetuous to achieve its end(s).
5. Entelechy: The final stage of a process.
6. Human beings also have an end or goal as humans.

Aristotle's Virtue Theory

I The Supreme Good

A. End

1. Every rational activity, art and action aims at some end or good.
2. Good is that at which all things aim.
3. There are many actions, arts and sciences, so their ends are many.
 - a. Medical science's end is health.
 - b. Military science's end is victory.

c. Economic science's end is wealth.

4. Our activities have some end which we want for its own sake, and for the sake of which we want all the other ends

B. Regress-Reductio Argument

1. We do not choose everything for the sake of something else
2. This would involve an infinite progression,
3. Making the aim pointless and ineffectual
4. The end must be the Good-the supreme good.

C. Knowledge of the Good

1. Knowledge of the Good is of great importance to us for the conduct of our lives.
2. We are more likely to achieve our aim if we have a target.

II Happiness & Lives

A. Happiness

1. The highest of all practical goods to people is happiness-living or doing well.
2. Opinions differ about happiness.
3. The many see it as obvious and familiar like pleasure or money or eminence.
 - a. When ill it is health,
 - b. When poor it is money.
4. Some claim that over and above these particular goods there is another good in itself and the cause the goodness in all others.

B. The three main types of life:

1. The life of pleasure.
2. The political.
3. The contemplative.

III Life of Pleasure

A The Life of Pleasure

1. The masses and most vulgar believe the Good or happiness is pleasure.
2. They ask for nothing better than the life of enjoyment.
3. The utter servility of the masses is from their preference for a bovine existence.
4. Their view is considered because many powerful people share the tastes of Sardanapalus.

B. Pleasure is not Happiness

1. To mistake pleasure for happiness is to prefer a "life suitable for beasts" instead of what is appropriate to humans.
2. To take pleasure/amusement to be happiness would be a mistake.
 - a. Happiness is the end, so that we chose all other things for its sake.
 - b. To exert oneself and work for the sake of amusement/pleasure "seems silly and childish."
3. While pleasure is not happiness, it is part of happiness.

IV Life of Honor

A. The Life of Honor

1. Cultured people identify the Good with honor, because it is the goal of political life.

B. Honor is not the Good

1. This is too superficial.
2. Honor depends more on those who confer it than on the receiver.
3. The Good is something proper to its possessor and not easily taken from him.
4. People seek honor to convince themselves of their own goodness, so goodness is superior to honor.

C. Goodness/justice rather than honor?

1. One might suppose that goodness/justice rather than honor is the end pursued in public life.
2. Goodness is deficient as an end.
3. The possession of goodness is compatible with being asleep and a life of inactivity.
4. It is also compatible with the most atrocious suffering and misfortune
 - a. None would call such a life happy-unless he was defending a paradox.

V What is the Good for Man?

A. Wealth and the Good

1. Wealth is not the good that is sought because it serves only as a means.

B. Inadequate

1. The earlier suggestions are more likely ends than wealth, because they are appreciated on their own account.
2. But they are inadequate, and many attacks on them have been published.

C. What is the Good for man?

1. It must be the ultimate end or object of human life: something that is in itself completely satisfying.
2. Happiness fits this description.

VI The Good

A. Second argument for The Good

1. The good appears to vary with the action, art, or sciences.
2. The good of each one is that for the sake of which everything else is done.
 - a. Medicine-health.
 - b. Strategy-victory;
 - c. Architecture-building
3. In every action and pursuit it is the end, since it is for the sake of this that everything else is done.
4. If there is one thing that is the end of all actions, it will be the practical good-or goods, if more than one.
5. Thus the argument has reached the same conclusion as before.

B. The Final End

1. There are more ends than one.
2. Some are chosen as means to something else, so not all of them are final ends
3. The supreme good is something final.
4. If there is one final end, it is the good we seek.
5. If there is more than one, it will be the most final.
6. An object pursued for its own sake is more final than one pursued because of something else.
7. What is always chosen for its own sake and never because of another is final without qualification.

C. Choice Argument for Happiness as the Final End

1. Happiness is such an end-we choose it for itself and never for any other reason.
2. Honor, pleasure, intelligence and other good qualities are chosen partly for themselves and for the sake of happiness.
3. No one chooses happiness for the sake of the good qualities or for any other reason.

D. Self Sufficiency Argument for Happiness as the Final End

1. The perfect good is self-sufficient.
2. Self sufficient is not what is sufficient for a solitary life.
 - a. Man is by nature a social being, so it includes parents, wife, children, friends and fellow-citizens.
 - a. A limit must be set: if it is extended to grandparents, grandchildren and friends of friends it will proceed to infinity.
3. A self-sufficient thing is one which by itself makes life desirable and in no way deficient.
4. Happiness is such a thing.

E. Most Desirable Argument for Happiness

1. It is the most desirable of all things, not seen as one among many.
2. If it was one among many, happiness would be made more desirable by the addition of even the least good.
 - a. Because addition makes the sum of goods greater.
 - b. The greater of two goods is always more desirable.
3. So, happiness is perfect and self-sufficient, being the end to which our actions are directed.

VI The Function of Man

A. Argument for Function

1. Happiness is a virtuous activity of the soul.
2. Taking happiness as the supreme good is a platitude, so an account is required.
3. This can be achieved by understanding man's function.
4. The goodness and proficiency of an artist-or any class having a specific function is in the performance of that function.
5. The same will be true of man, if man has a function.
6. Analogy 1: Is it likely that joiners and shoemakers have certain functions and man has been left by nature a functionless being?
7. Analogy 2: As the eye and hand and foot and other members have a function, a human being has a function over and above these particular functions.

B. Life is not Man's function.

1. Life is shared by plants.
2. We are looking for man's proper function.
3. So, we must exclude from our definition the life consisting in nutrition and growth.
4. Sentient life is shared by horses, cattle and other animals.
5. So, thus must be excluded as well.

C. The Function is found in the Rational Part

1. There remains a practical life of the rational part.
2. This has two aspects:
 - a. One amenable to reason.

- b. Another possessing it and initiating thought.
- 3. The life determined by activity is the life of man because it is the stricter sense.

D. Function and Good

- 1. The function of man is an activity of the soul in accord with or implying a rational principle.
- 2. The function of an individual and of a good individual is the same.
 - a. Example: The function of the harpist is to play the harp, but that of the good harpist is to play it well.
- 3. If the function of man is an activity of the soul, implying a rational principle.
- 4. If the function of a good man is to perform these well and rightly.
- 5. If every function is performed well when performed in accord with its proper excellence.
- 6. Then the good for man is an activity of soul in accordance with virtue.
 - a. If there is more than one kind of virtue, in accordance with the best and most perfect kind.
- 7. Further qualification: in a complete lifetime - one day or a brief space of time cannot make a man blessed and happy.

VII How is happiness acquired

A. How is happiness acquired?

- 1. Can it be learnt?
- 2. Can it be acquired by habitation or cultivated in some other way?
- 3. Does it come by a divine dispensation.
- 3. Does it come by chance?

B. Divine Dispensation

- 1. If anything is a gift of the gods, it is happiness.
- 2. Of all human possessions it is the best.
- 3. This point falls under another branch of study.

C. Study & Training

- 1. If happiness is not a divine gift, but acquired by moral goodness and study or training, it is one of our most divine possessions;
- 2. The end of goodness is the best: something divine and blissful.
- 3. Happiness will be widely shared as it can be acquired via study or application, by anyone who is not handicapped by an incapacity for goodness.

D. Teleological Argument against Chance

- 1. It is better to win happiness by study than by chance,
- 2. It is natural for nature's effects to be the finest possible,
- 3. Similarly for the effects of art and of any other cause, especially those of the best kind.
- 4. That the most important and finest thing of all should be left to chance would be a gross disharmony.

E. Happiness

- 1. Happiness is a kind of virtuous activity of soul.
- 2. All other goods are necessary pre-conditions of happiness or contribute to it and serve as its instruments.

F. Political Science and Virtue

- 1. The end of political science is the highest good.
- 2. The chief concern of this science is to imbue the citizens with virtue and the readiness to do fine deeds.

VIII Excellence & Virtue

A. Excellence

- 1. Any excellence enables its possessor to function, so this is true of human excellence, virtue.
- 2. Any excellence renders what it is the excellence of good, and makes it perform its function well
- 3. Examples
 - a. The excellence of the eye makes both the eye and its function good
 - b. The excellence of a horse makes him a fine horse.
- 4. Human excellence is the disposition that makes one good and causes him to perform his function well.

B. Virtue

- 1. By virtue is meant moral virtue since it is concerned with feelings and actions.
- 2. These involve excess, deficiency and a mean.
- 3. It is possible to feel fear, confidence, desire, anger, pity, and pleasure and pain too much or too little, and both are wrong.

C. The Mark of Virtue is to have these feelings

- 1. At the right times
- 2. On the right grounds
- 3. Towards the right people
- 4. For the right motive
- 5. In the right way
- 6. To an intermediate, the best, degree.

D. Actions

1. There are excess, deficiency and a mean in the case of actions.
2. It is in the field of actions and feelings that virtue operates.

E. The Mean

1. Excess and deficiency are failings.
2. The mean is praised and recognized as a success
3. Virtue is a mean condition, as much as it aims at hitting the mean.

IX The doctrine of the mean applied to particular virtues

A. Particulars

1. In Fear and Confidence the mean is Courage.
 - b. One with excessive confidence is rash.
 - d. One who has an excess of fear and a deficiency of confidence is a coward.
2. In pleasure and pain, the mean is temperance and the excess is licentiousness.
3. In giving/receiving money the mean is Liberality.
 - a. The excess and deficiency are Prodigality and Illiberality;
 1. The prodigal spends too much and gets too little.
 2. The illiberal man gets too much and spends too little.

B. More Particulars

1. Money

- a. Mean: Magnificence
- b. Excess :Tastelessness and Vulgarity,
- c. Deficiency: Pettiness.

2. Honor & Dishonor

- a. Mean: Magnanimity,
- b. Excess: Vanity,
- c. Deficiency: Pusillanimity.

3. Ambition

- a. Excess: ambitious
- b. Deficient: unambitious.

4. Anger

- a. The intermediate man is Patient and the mean Patience;
- b. The excessive one is Irascible and his vice Irascibility,
- c. The deficient one is Spiritless and has a Lack of Spirit.

5. Truth

- a. Mean: Truthfulness;
- b. Excess: boastfulness.
- c. Deficiency: Irony.

6. Social Pleasantness

- a. Mean: Wit.
- b. Excess: Buffoonery.
- c. Deficiency: Boorishness.

7. Pleasantness

- a. Mean: Friendliness;
- b. Excess without motive: Obsequious.
- c. Excess with a motive of self-interest: Flatterer.
- d. Deficient and unpleasant in all circumstances: Cantankerous and ill-tempered.

8. Modesty is not a virtue, but the modest are praised.

- a. Deficient: A Shy man who is overawed at anything.
- b. Excess: A shameless man feels too little or no shame.
- c. Mean: Modest.

3. Righteous Indignation is a mean between Envy and Spite.

X Summing up and three practical rules for good conduct.

A. Virtue

1. Moral virtue is a mean.
2. It is a mean between two vices, one of excess and the other of deficiency,
3. It aims at hitting the mean point in feelings and actions.

B. It is difficult to be good.

1. It is difficult to find the midpoint.
2. Analogy: Only one who knows can find the centre of a circle.
3. It is easy to get angry or to give and spend money;
4. To feel or act towards the right person to the right extent at the right time for the right reason in the right way is not easy and not everyone that can do it.
5. Hence to do these things well is a rare, laudable and fine achievement.

C. Practical Rule 1

1. Rule: Keep away from that extreme which is more contrary to the mean,
 - a. As Calypso advises: Far from this surf and surge keep thou thy ship.
2. One extreme is always more erroneous than the other;
3. As it is difficult to hit the mean, we must chose the next best course and the lesser evil.

D. Practical Rule 2

1. Rule: We must notice errors into which we are liable to fall and drag ourselves in the contrary direction;
2. We all have different natural tendencies.
3. We find ours from the pleasure and pain they give us.
4. We shall arrive at the mean by pressing well away from our failing.
 - a. Like one straightening a warped piece of wood.

E. Practical Rule 3

1. Rule: One must guard especially against pleasure and pleasant things, because we are not impartial judges of pleasure.
2. We should adopt the same attitude towards it as the Trojan elders did towards Helen, and repeat their pronouncement.
3. If this eliminates the attraction, we will be less likely to go wrong.

F. Hitting the Mean

1. By following these rules we shall have the best chance of hitting the mean.
2. This difficult, especially in particular cases.
 - a. It is not easy to determine what is the right way to be angry, with whom, on what grounds, and for how long.
 - b. Those showing deficiency are sometimes praised as patient and sometimes those who display temper are praised as manly.
3. One who deviates only a little from the right degree, in excess or deficiency, is not censured.
4. Only the one who goes too far is censured, because he is noticeable.

G. Rule

1. It is not easy to define by rule for how long, and how much, a man may go wrong before he incurs blame.
2. This is no easier than to define any other object of perception.
3. Such questions of degree occur in particular cases, and the decision lies with our perception.
4. In all our conduct it is the mean that is to be commended.
5. One should incline sometimes towards excess and sometimes towards deficiency
6. In this way we shall most easily hit upon the mean-the right course.

Problems with Virtue Theory

I Specifying Virtues

A. The Problem

1. Virtue theorists tend to be rather vague about the virtues.
2. Virtue theorists tend to not justify the acceptance of virtues.
3. Without such a justification, there would be no reason to accept virtue theory.

B. Reply

1. Almost everyone intuitively accepts that the virtues are, in fact, virtues.
2. This is taken as indicating that the virtues describe objectively desirable qualities.
3. Thus, there is no special need to provide such a justification.
4. Some virtue theorists provide arguments for accepting the virtues.

II Self Focus

A. Virtue ethics seems self-focused.

1. The emphasis is on developing one's own virtues.
2. This seems to make virtue theory a selfish theory.

B. Reply

1. Many virtues involve others.
2. Virtues such as generosity, kindness and loyalty are other regarding.
3. Selfishness is typically regarded as being a vice.

III Totalitarianism

- A. Virtue theory leads to totalitarianism.

1. With its emphasis on developing particular virtues, virtue theory would seem to be aimed at creating a uniform society with no diversity.
2. Some virtue theorists, such as Aristotle, even argue that the state should forcefully impose moral education on the citizens.
3. Diversity is regarded by some as a moral good and attempts to impose homogeneity would thus be morally wrong.
4. Diversity among people is a fact so to make a population virtuous would require dealing, perhaps forcible, with those who do not fit into the intended mold.

B. Reply

1. Developing virtue seems no more likely to lead to uniformity than developing athletic ability or musical ability would.
2. Totalitarianism is based on vice is contrary to virtue theory.
3. The development of virtue is consistent with diversity.

IV Conflicting Virtues

A. Problem

1. Virtues come into conflict with each other.
2. Example: the virtue of honesty would require telling the truth but this might conflict with the virtue of loyalty when the truth would harm a friend.
3. Virtue theory does not provide a way to resolve such conflicts.

H. Reply

1. Almost all moral theories face similar problems, so it is not telling against virtue theory in particular.
2. The conflict can be resolved by determining which virtue should take precedence.
3. Virtue theorists have addressed this problem and provide ways to resolve such conflicts.

V Guides

A. The theory fails to provide adequate guidelines for action.

1. Being told to act in a virtuous way does not tell us how to act in specific situations.
2. For example, knowing that bravery is a virtue does not tell a person how to act in a mugging.

B. Reply

1. There is no need to provide such specific guidelines.
2. In developing virtue, a person will learn how to act.
3. For example, a martial artist will not provide a guidebook on exactly when to use each technique, but a trained fighter will know this via her training.
4. This objection also seems to assume that there must be such definite guides, which can be seen as begging the question against virtue theory.

VI. Moral Luck

A. Virtue Requires Luck

1. The ethical life requires health, a relatively long life, and a healthy society that supports or permits the development of virtue.
2. These factors seem to be a matter of luck and mostly beyond the agent's control.
3. The ability to be a good person should be under the agent's control.
4. Being able to solve moral problems correctly requires being of good character, but if this is a matter of luck, solving such problems will be a matter of luck as well.

B. Reply

1. Luck balances out.
2. A person can develop virtue even in great adversity.
3. People do have an impact on society.

Religion & Ethics

I Basis of Morality

A. Introduction

1. One meta-ethical problem is determining the basis of morality.
2. Religion is often used as the foundation for morality.
3. One moral question is "Can there be ethics without God?"

II Ethics and God

A. Introduction

1. Even among theists, there is debate over whether morality is dependent on God or autonomous from God.

B. Divine Command Theory

1. Morality depends on God.
2. Morally good = commanded by God.
3. Morally evil = forbidden by God.
4. Morality is dependent on God's will and lacks any independent basis.

C. Autonomy Thesis

1. Morality does not depend on God and hence is independent.
2. Moral goodness and moral evil are not a matter of what God wills.
3. God is subject to moral assessment but is morally perfect.

D. Kant

1. According to Kant, we intuitively want moral goodness to be linked with happiness.
2. In experience, no necessary connection is found between virtue and happiness.
3. For this intuition to make sense there must be a transcendent cause bringing about a just future distribution of happiness.
4. Thus, "it is morally necessary to assume the existence of God."
5. Morality is rational and independent of God's will, yet morality naturally leads to religion.

E. Secular Ethics

1. Some secular theorists, such as Bertrand Russell and Kai Nelson, argue that morality does not require God in any role.

F. Antireligious Secular Ethics

1. Some, such as P.H. Nowell-Smith and James Rachels argue that religion is or leads to an inferior morality.

II Intellectualism & Voluntarism

A. Introduction

1. One debate in religious ethics is whether morality is based on God's will or His intellect.

B. Voluntarism

1. The will has priority over the intellect.
2. If God's intellect does not restrict his will, then he is free to choose what is and is not morally good.
3. Human reason cannot determine what is or is not good since God could make anything good or evil.
4. Moral obligation is not based on following the directions of reason but simply obeying God without question.
5. The moral theory based on this approach is Divine Command Theory.
6. This view is held by Duns Scotus.

C. Intellectualism

1. The intellect has priority over the will.
2. If God's intellect does restrict his will, then he is not free to arbitrarily choose what is and is not morally good.
3. God's intellect reveals what is good and then He wills that it be so.
4. Human reason can potentially discern what is or is not good.
5. Aquinas holds this view.

St. Thomas Aquinas

I Background

A. Early Life

1. Born in 1224 or 1225 into a noble Italian family.
2. A few months before he died, he had a mystic experience that caused him to stop writing.
 - a. "I can write no more, I have seen things which make all my writings like straw."
3. He died in 1274 en-route to the Council of Lyons.
4. Canonized in 1323 and in 1879 Pope Leo XIII recommended his philosophy as a model for Catholic thought.

B. The Ox

1. He was large and rotund, but gentle.
2. He was nicknamed "the dumb ox" because he was quiet in class and did not engage in the active discussions.
3. Cow Story
 - a. Other monks told him a cow was flying and he went to look, causing them to laugh and ask him if he thought cows could fly.
 - b. He replied that he would rather believe that a cow could fly than that another monk would lie.

C. Works

1. He wrote about 25 volumes and supposedly kept four secretaries busy transcribing different works.
2. The *Summa Theologica* is his major work and is longer than Aristotle's works.

Aquinas's Moral Philosophy

I Teleological Ethics

A. *Nicomachean Ethics*

1. His moral theory is a Christian modification of Aristotle's ethics.
2. Each event occurs because of an end towards which it directed.
3. Humans have ends and inclinations and are the only earthly beings that can consciously chose to act towards these ends and inclinations.
4. Ethics deals with determining which ends are worthy of human pursuit.
5. The moral good is a fulfillment of the natural end of humans.
6. Evil is a lack.

B. Actions

1. All genuine actions are good or bad-there are no morally neutral actions.
2. This is because all chosen actions always seek an end that will be either good or bad.
3. The intellect is primary in ethics: Only chosen, deliberate actions have moral qualities.
4. The will desires what is good but reason is needed to determine what is good and the means for achieving it.

C. Human Actions vs. Acts of Humans

1. Human actions are voluntary, consciously willed actions chosen because the individual's reason is seeking a specific end.
2. Human actions are good or bad.
3. Acts of humans are unconscious or involuntary behaviors.
4. Acts of humans are morally neutral.

C. Factors of Moral Assessment

1. The object of the action.
2. The circumstances of the action.
3. The end of the action.
4. Aquinas uses an example of the giving of alms.
 - a. The object is to give money to one who is in need.
 - b. The circumstances would include such things as the origin of the money, the needs of the recipient, etc.
 - c. The end is the goal of the action, such as to help one in need or to be praised for generosity, or to get a tax break.

D. Christian Modification

1. Aristotle's theory places humans in a special role as rational beings, but God does not play any role in his theory.
2. Aquinas held that Aristotle provided a natural ethical theory built on achieving imperfect and temporal happiness on earth.
3. Aquinas claims that humans long for the perfect good, which is not to be found in the imperfect realm of the natural world.
4. Aquinas claims that nature does not provide us with a means of satisfying one's spiritual nature.
5. The supreme good can only be found in God.
6. This supreme good is not acquired by merely having intellectual knowledge of God but by acquaintance with God.
7. This acquaintance is not possible in this life, thus our natural desire for ultimate happiness indicates that there must be an afterlife.

II Natural Law

A. Natural Law

1. Since humans were created by God to live a certain way, reflection on human nature can reveal guidelines for actualizing human potentialities.
2. As human nature remains the same across cultures and time, the rules of the natural law are universal and self-evident.
3. What is good is what is in accord with reason-this is conformity to the natural law.
4. He reasoned that by reflecting on human nature and natural inclinations, he could infer moral principles.

B. Natural Morality

1. All creatures naturally tend to preserve their own life, hence murder and suicide is wrong because "life is to be preserved."
2. All animals seek to preserve their species and protect their children.
 - a. For humans this includes helping the young develop their full potential.
3. Being above animals, humans are inclined to fully develop their rational, human potential.
 - a. This leads to the duty to seek truth and to follow the rules needed to live in society.

B. Disagreement

1. Given that natural law is both universal and self evident, disagreements arise because some are blinded by passions, bad habits, and ignorance.
2. People who do not see the natural law fail to do so because of limits and defects.
3. The conscience is the rational activity of applying moral knowledge to specific cases.
4. "Every will at variance with reason, whether right or erring, is always evil."
5. People are obligated to follow their informed conscience as well as possible.
6. If one is mistaken, one is still judged by how well they followed the moral light as they saw it.

III The Four Laws

A. Metaphysics

1. The moral law in our nature is an expression of God's eternal law.

2. The moral law is not an arbitrary creation of God's will but is the result of His reason which is grounded in His nature.
 - a. Since God is not arbitrary, neither is the moral law.
 3. There are four ways in which God's law is manifested.
- B. Eternal Law
1. The rational order God established for His created world.
 2. All things follow this law.
 3. Non-rational beings simply follow the law.
 4. Humans can choose to obey or disobey the moral aspects of the law.
- C. Natural Law
1. Law available to reason that regulates human moral behavior.
 2. This law guides humans insofar as they are natural and social beings.
 3. It leads humans to develop the Aristotelian model of virtue by developing the classic virtues of temperance, courage, and justice.
- D. Divine Law
1. Known by revelation.
 2. Goes beyond the natural law and guides humans towards eternal happiness.
 3. In following this law, the natural virtues are exceeded by the theological virtues of faith, hope and love.
 4. These virtues are only attained by God's grace.
- E. Human Law
1. Laws created by humans.
 2. "In temporal law there is nothing just and lawful but what man has drawn from the eternal law."

The Summa Theologica

-Thomas Aquinas

"Natural Law," *The Summa Theologica, Vol. II*, translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Wesminster, MD: Christian Classic, 1911), pp.90-108.

I Whether There is an Eternal Law?

A. Law

1. Law: A dictate of practical reason emanating from the ruler who governs a perfect community.
2. Granted that the world is ruled by Divine Providence, the whole community of the universe is governed by Divine Reason.
3. The very Idea of the government of things in God the Ruler of the universe has the nature of a law.

B. Eternal Law & Natural Law

1. The Divine Reasons conception of things is not subject to time but is eternal (Prov. viii. 23), so this kind of law is eternal
2. All things partake of the eternal law to the degree they derive their inclinations to their proper acts and ends from it being imprinted on them.
3. The rational creature is subject to Divine providence in the most excellent way as far as it partakes of a share of providence.
4. The rational creature has a share of Eternal Reason whereby it has a natural inclination to its proper act and end.
5. This participation of the eternal law in the rational creature is the natural law.
6. The light of natural reason, whereby we discern good and evil, which is the function of the natural law, is an imprint on us of the Divine light.
7. So, it is evident the natural law is the rational creature's participation of the eternal law.

II Whether an Effect of Law Is to Make Men Good?

A. Law and Virtue

1. A law is a dictate of reason in the ruler by whom his subjects are governed.
2. The virtue of any subordinate thing consists in its being well subordinated to what regulates it.
 - a. The virtue of the irascible faculties consists in their being obedient to reason.
3. The virtue of every subject consists in his being well subjected to his ruler.
 - a. As Aristotle says (*Polit. i*).
4. Every law aims at being obeyed by those who are subject to it.
5. So, the proper effect of law is to lead its subjects to their proper virtue.
6. Since virtue is that which makes its subject good, the proper effect of law is to make those to whom it is given good.

B. Goodness & the State

1. The goodness of any part is considered in comparison with the whole.
2. So, Augustine says that unseemly is the part that harmonizes not with the whole.
3. Since every man is a part of the state, to be good he must be well proportionate to the common good.
4. The whole cannot be well consistent unless its parts are proportionate to it.
5. So the common good of the state cannot flourish unless the citizens, at least those governing, are virtuous.
6. It is enough for the community's good that the other citizens be virtuous enough to obey the commands of their rulers.

C. Tyrannical Law

1. A tyrannical law, through not being according to reason, is not a law but a perversion of law.
2. Yet, as far as it is something in the nature of a law, it aims at the citizens' being good.
3. All it has in the nature of a law consists in its
 - a. Being an ordinance made by a superior to his subjects.
 - b. Aiming at being obeyed by them.
 - c. Aim to make them good with respect to that particular government.

III Whether the Natural Law Contains Several Precepts, or One Only?

A. Natural Law as Self Evident

1. Precepts of the natural law are to practical reason what first principles of demonstrations are to speculative reason-both are self-evident principles.
 - a. The proposition *Man is a rational being* is self-evident, since who says *man*, says *a rational being*.
2. Some propositions are self-evident only to the wise who understand the meaning of the terms.
 - a. To one who understands an angel is not a body, it is self-evident an angel is not in a place.
 - b. Because the unlearned cannot grasp it, this is not evident to them.

B. Principles of Practical Reason

1. The first principle in practical reason is founded on the notion that *good is that which all things seek after*.
3. The first precept of law: *good is to be done and pursued, and evil is to be avoided*.
4. All other precepts of the natural law are based on this:
 - a. Whatever the practical reason naturally apprehends as man's good (or evil) belongs to the precepts of the natural law as something to be done or avoided.

C. Good & Evil

1. Good has the nature of an end and evil the nature of a contrary.
2. All things man has a natural inclination to are naturally taken by reason as good and so as objects of pursuit and their contraries as evil and objects of avoidance.
3. The order of the precepts of the natural law is according to the order of natural inclinations.

D. Inclination to Good

1. Man has an inclination to good in accordance with the nature he has in common with all substances.
 - a. Every substance seeks the preservation of its own being.
2. By reason of this inclination all means of preserving human life and warding off its obstacles belongs to the natural law.
3. Man has an inclination to good according to the nature of his reason which is proper to him.
4. So man has a natural inclination to know the truth about God and to live in society.
5. Whatever pertains to this inclination belongs to the natural law.
 - a. To shun ignorance.
 - b. To avoid offending those among whom one has to live.
 - c. Other such things regarding the above inclination.

IV Whether the Natural Law Is the Same in All Men?

A. Same

1. The natural law, as to general principles, is the same for all both in rectitude and knowledge.
2. In certain matters of detail, conclusions of the general principles, it is the same for all in the majority of cases both in rectitude and knowledge.
3. In some few cases it may fail in rectitude and knowledge.
 - a. In rectitude because of certain obstacles.
 - b. In knowledge, since in some reason is perverted by passion, evil habit, or an evil disposition of nature.

Divine Command Theory

Revised: 9/18/2005

Introduction

I Definition

A. Defined

1. Moral principles are defined and justified in terms of divine will.
2. People should be moral because the divine commands them to be moral.
3. What God commands people to do is good.
4. What God forbids is evil.

B. Characteristics

1. God is regarded as perfectly good, so what He commands must be good.
2. God's commands are universal, impartial and overriding.

3. Morality is enforced by divine agents as well as divine reward and divine punishment.
4. Is typically also a form of deontology in that morality is presented in terms of rule and a duty to obey God.

C. Appeal

1. It provides a definite foundation for ethics.
2. It seems to be required by God's sovereignty and omnipotence.
3. It seems implausible to think that there could be anything above or even equal to God.
4. It answers the question "why be moral" because a reward for goodness is guaranteed and the punishment for evil is certain.
5. It provides an objective, certain basis for morality.

John Dun Scotus (1266-1308)

Background

I Background

A. Life

1. Born around 1266 in Scotland and died in 1308.
2. Was in the Franciscan order.
3. Studied at Oxford and Paris.
4. Lectured and wrote at Oxford, Paris and Cologne.

B. Dunsmen

1. He had many followers called "Dunsmen" or "dunces."
2. They and their Scholasticism were regarded as barriers to intellectual enlightenment and progress by the Renaissance humanists.
3. Thus, "dunce" has come to mean "a dull, ignorant person."

Moral Philosophy

I Will, Intellect and Morality

A. The Will & Intellect

1. Aquinas regarded the intellect as the higher and nobler aspect of the soul.
2. Scotus regarded the will as the higher and nobler aspect of the soul.

B. Scotus' Arguments for the will

1. Knowledge is an instrument of the will.
 - a. The intellect provides the will with information and alternatives.
 - b. The will chooses between them.
2. The will can move the intellect: we can choose what we will think about.
3. The will is free and cannot be determined by anything, even the intellect.
 - a. Aquinas held the Greek view that we necessarily will what we regard as the highest good.
 - b. Scotus claims the will is not determined by knowledge of the good, but chooses the good only as the result of a free decision.
4. The intellect is determined by the object of knowledge while the will can accept or reject what is before it.
5. "The total cause of willing is in the will itself."

C. Voluntarism & Morality

1. Aquinas held that morality was based on a natural inclination to seek happiness.
2. Scotus held that morality might require actions that interfere with one's own happiness.
3. Moral obligations depend only on God's commands and not on human happiness.
4. Aquinas held that the moral law could be found by the study of human nature.
5. Scotus held that there was no natural way to determine the moral truths.

D. Voluntarism & God

1. God's actions are determined by His will and not His reason.
2. This is because He is free and omnipotent.
3. Reason cannot know His purposes or infer His actions via a priori means.
4. As everything is contingent on God's will there is no rational necessity to the world and it could have been otherwise.

E. Argument for Voluntarism

1. If God's choices were logically necessary, the details of the world could be determined by reason like a geometric proof.
2. We cannot do this.
3. So, God was free in His act of creation and the created world is contingent.

F. Love of God

1. The command to love God is the only moral law concerned with intrinsic good.
2. All other actions are good because they are commanded by God.

G. The Ten Commandments

1. The first set of commands in the Ten Commandments are rationally necessary moral truths.

- a. Have no other gods than the one true God.
 - b. Not make any graven images.
 - c. Not take the Lord's name in vain.
 - d. Keep the Sabbath holy.
2. These commands follow from God's love of Himself and it would be self-contradictory for him to not make these commands.
 3. If there is a natural law, it is found in those four commandments.
 4. The other six commandments are the result of His will and are not rationally necessary.
 5. They are to be obeyed because God commands them and God could have commanded their opposite.

Example of Divine Command Theory: The Bible

I Morality

A. The Ten Commandments

1. YOU shall not have other gods besides me.
2. YOU shall not carve idols for yourselves in the shape of anything in the sky above or on the earth below or in the waters beneath the earth; You shall not bow down before them or worship them.
 - a. God is a jealous God.
 - b. He inflicts punishment for the fathers' wickedness on the children to the third and fourth generation;
 - c. He bestows mercy to the thousandth generation on the children of those who love him and keep his commandments.
3. You shall not take the name of the LORD, your God, in vain.
 - a. God punishes those who take his name in vain.
4. Remember to keep holy the sabbath day.
 - a. Six days you may labor but the seventh day is the sabbath.
 - b. No work may be done by you, your son, daughter, slaves, beast, or alien who lives with you.
 - c. In six days the LORD made the heavens, earth, and sea; but on the seventh day he rested.
 - d. Hence the LORD blessed the sabbath day and made it holy.
5. Honor your father and your mother, that you may have a long life in the land which the LORD, your God, is giving you.
6. You shall not kill.
7. You shall not commit adultery.
8. You shall not steal.
9. You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor.
10. You shall not covet your neighbor's house, wife, slave, ox, ass, nor anything else that belongs to him.

B. Killing

1. One who kills a man must be put to death.
2. If a man caused a death by act of God, he may flee to a place which God set apart for this purpose.
3. When a man kills another after maliciously scheming, you must take him even from the altar and kill him.
4. Whoever strikes his father or mother shall be put to death.
5. A kidnaper shall be put to death.
6. Whoever curses his father or mother shall be put to death.

C. Injury

1. If a man injures another enough to put him in bed, the striker shall be acquitted, if the other can walk with the help of his staff.
2. He must compensate him for his enforced idleness and provide for his complete cure.
3. If a man kills his slave he shall be punished-unless the slave survives 1-2 days, since the slave is his property.

D. Loans, Thefts, and Losses

1. If a man gives another something for safekeeping and it is stolen the thief, if caught, must make twofold restitution.
2. If the thief is not caught, the keeper shall be brought to God, to swear that he did not steal.
3. In every question of dishonest appropriation where another claims the thing is his, both shall present their case before God.
 - a. The one God convicts must make twofold restitution to the other.
4. If a man gives an animal to another for safekeeping, if it dies, is maimed or snatched away, without witness, the custodian shall swear by the LORD that he did not lay hands on his neighbor's property.
 - a. The owner must accept the oath, and no restitution is to be made.
5. If the custodian is guilty of theft, he must make restitution to the owner.
6. If it has been killed by a wild beast, let him bring it as evidence, and he need not make restitution for the mangled animal.
7. If a man borrows an animal, if it is maimed or dies while the owner is not present, the man must make restitution.
 - a. If the owner is present, he need not make restitution.
 - b. If it was hired, this was covered by the price of its hire.

E. Virgins

1. If a man seduces a virgin who is not betrothed, and lies with her, he shall pay her marriage price and marry her.
2. If her father refuses to give her to him, he must pay him the customary marriage price for virgins.

F. More Death

1. You shall not let a sorceress live.

2. Anyone who lies with an animal shall be put to death.
3. Whoever sacrifices to any god, except to the LORD alone, shall be doomed.

G. Treatment of aliens, orphans & widows

1. You shall not molest or oppress an alien, for you were once aliens yourselves in the land of Egypt.
2. You shall not wrong any widow or orphan.
 - a. If ever you wrong them and they cry out to me, I will hear their cry.
 - b. My wrath will flare up, and I will kill you with the sword;
 - c. Then your wives will be widows, and your children orphans.

Problems with Divine Command Theory

I Problems

A. Problem: Euthyphro Problem

1. Is X good because God commands it or does God command X because it is good?
2. If X is good because God commands it, then X's goodness is arbitrary.
3. If God commands X because X is good, then X is good independent of God and DCT is false.

B. Problem: Different Religions, Texts and Interpretations

1. There are many different religions-which one is correct?
2. There are different texts and sects even within one religious tradition-which is correct?
3. The same text is interpreted differently-which is correct?
4. How do you know what God really wants?

C. Problem: Metaphysics

1. Basing morality on religion is to ground morality in metaphysics.
2. Thus, moral argumentation ultimately requires metaphysical argumentation.
3. This makes moral argumentation much more difficult.
 - a. Metaphysics is a difficult and controversial area.
 - b. People disagree widely about metaphysical entities.
 - c. It takes morality far beyond the realm of everyday human experience.

D. Problem: God's Goodness

1. God is said to be perfectly good.
2. Under DCT this says "God is perfectly commanded by God."
3. This is either absurd or circular.
4. If God is good in a meaningful sense, then divine command theory is false.

E. Arbitrariness

1. Since God's will determines morality, He can, in theory, will anything to be good and anything to be evil.
2. This makes morality arbitrary.
3. While God is said to make promises in scripture, there is no reason to think that
 - a. These are not lies because there is no reason why God cannot decide that lying is good.
 - b. God has not changed his mind since making those promises.

F. Problem: Reason is useless in morality.

1. What God commands is good and God can command anything since He determines morality.
2. Reason cannot provide any guide to determining what is good or not-one must know what God has, in fact, commanded.

II Concerns about Divine Command Theory

A. Concern: Moral Intuitions & Actual Moral Practices

1. Most religious texts forbid things that are generally accepted as moral and permit things that are widely accepted as immoral.
2. Examples
 - a. Men are to submit to women- Timothy 2:11-14
 - b. Use of birth control is punishable by death- Genesis 38:6-10
 - c. Torture is acceptable-2 Samuel 12:26-31
 - d. Murder of children is endorsed- Numbers 31:1-18, Deuteronomy 21:18-2, many more.
 - e. Genocide is endorsed- Deuteronomy 32:21-25, Joshua 6:21, many more.
 - f. Slavery is endorsed- Leviticus 25:42,25:44-46
 - g. God killing people- Genesis 6:5-9, Samuel 6:19, Numbers 25:1-9, many more.
 - h. Rape is endorsed- Judges 19:24
3. Thus, divine command theory seems to violate common moral intuitions.
4. Thus, divine command theory seems to go against actual moral practices.

B. Reply

1. Accepting God as the basis of morality does not require accepting all moral claims that are attributed to God as being from God.
2. For thinkers like Aquinas, reason can be used to distinguish between correct and incorrect moral claims.

3. On such a view our moral intuitions could be correct and the texts could be mistaken.
4. This concern is still relevant because many people do accept text and interpretations without any critical assessment.

C. Concern: Selective Approach

1. People tend to selectively ignore parts of religious texts.
2. This is generally not done in a consistent or principled manner.
3. People often seem to pick and chose based on their prejudices and political agendas.
4. Ironically, a religious person's morality often determines which aspects of religious morality they will accept, rather than the religion determining the morality.
5. Divine command theory is not consistent with this approach to ethics-God determines morality and people do not get to pick which to accept and which to reject.

D. Reply

1. It can be argued that the moral claims and principles that are being rejected are not actually commanded by God.
2. This reply is only available to those who are willing to accept that religious texts an authorities are subject to critical assessment.

E. Concern: Religious people have done evil things.

1. Religious people have done terrible things and have often done so in the name of God.
2. Therefore religion based on ethics is flawed.

F. Reply

1. To infer the truth or falsity of a belief based on the actions of those who profess the belief is a fallacy.
2. Thus, the behavior of those who have done terrible things while professing faith does not disprove the claim that ethics is based on God.

The Euthyphro Problem

From *The Euthyphro*

By Plato

Translation by Benjamin Jowett

I The Problem

A. The Question

1. Whether the pious or holy is beloved by the gods because it is holy or holy because it is beloved of the gods.

B. Socrates Discussion

1. In all the following cases there is a difference:
 - a. Carrying and being carried.
 - b. Leading and being led.
 - c. Seeing and being seen.
2. The beloved is distinct from that which loves.
3. The same is true of what is led and of what is seen.
4. A thing is not seen because it is visible, but visible because it is seen.
5. Nor is a thing led because it is in the state of being led.
6. Nor carried because it is in the state of being carried, but the converse of this.

C. Socrates' Meaning

1. Any state of action or passion implies previous action or passion.
2. It does not become because it is becoming, but it is in a state of becoming because it becomes.
3. Neither does it suffer because it is in a state of suffering, but it is in a state of suffering because it suffers.
3. That which is loved is in some state either of becoming or suffering.
4. The same holds as in the previous instances; the state of being loved follows the act of being loved, and not the act the state.

D. Piety

1. Piety is, according to Euthyphro's definition, loved by all the gods.
2. It is loved because it is holy, not holy because it is loved.
3. That which is dear to the gods is loved by them, and is in a state to be loved of them because it is loved of them.

E. Socrates gets Euthyphro to accept that:

1. That which is dear to the gods is not holy, nor is that which is holy loved of God; but they are two different things.
2. The holy is loved by God because it is holy, not holy because it is loved.
3. That which is dear to the gods is dear to them because it is loved by them, not loved by them because it is dear to them.

F. Socrates Presents the Problem

1. If that which is holy is the same as that which is dear to God, and is loved because it is holy, then that which is dear to God would have been loved as being dear to God.
2. But if that which is dear to God is dear to him because loved by him, then that which is holy would have been holy because loved by him.
3. But the reverse is the case, and that they are quite different from one another.

- a. One (theophiles) is of a kind to be loved cause it is loved.
 - b. The other (osion) is loved because it is of a kind to be loved.
- G. Unresolved
1. Thus, when asked what the essence of holiness is, Euthyphro offers an attribute only, and not the essence.
 - a. The attribute of being loved by all the gods.
 2. Euthyphro does not explain the nature of holiness.
 3. Socrates asks him to explain what piety really is, whether dear to the gods or not; and what is impiety.
 4. Euthyphro does not know how to express what he means.

Consequentialism

I. Introduction

A. Defined

1. The value of an action is assessed in terms of its consequences for the relevant beings.
2. Actions have extrinsic value.
3. A consequentialist theory or principle need not be moral.
 - a. Example: Businesses aim at maximizing profit.
4. The preferable action is generally taken as the one that maximizes what is of value for the relevant beings.
5. This is a general category which contains a variety of moral theories such as ethical egoism and utilitarianism.
6. This is a teleological approach because value is assessed in terms of outcomes.
 - a. From the Greek “telos”: “having reached one’s end” or “goal directed.”

B. Value

1. The value to be maximized need to be defined.
2. Examples: Profit, pleasure, happiness.

C. Relevant Beings

1. The relevant beings must be determined.
2. Relevant beings: the beings to be taken into account when assessing the consequences of an action.
3. This ranges from a very narrow scope (the individual) to incredibly broad (all beings)

D. Appeal

1. People seem naturally inclined to maximize what they consider valuable.
2. People seem naturally inclined to weigh the consequences of actions when making decisions.
3. People seem naturally inclined to consider some beings relevant and some not.

Ethical Egoism

I Introduction

A. Ethical Egoism

1. The view that people should act to maximize their self interest.
2. A consequentialist theory that assesses value relative to the individual.

B. Altruism & Egoism

1. Altruism: the theory that we should not always act in our own self interest but should also act in the interest of others.
2. Egoism and altruism conflict as theories-egoism advocates acting exclusively in one’s self interest while altruism advocates acting for the interests of others.

C. Appeal of Egoism

1. People seem to be naturally inclined to act in accord with their self interest.
2. There is evidence that humans are psychological egoists.
3. The question of why be moral is easily answered: morality and self interest are one.

II Varieties of Egoism

A. Psychological egoism

1. The descriptive theory that people are only motivated by what they regard as promoting their self interest.
2. This is not a prescriptive theory.
3. Often used as a foundation for ethical egoism-if people are only motivated by self interest, then ethical egoism seems to be the only viable moral theory.

B. Personal egoism

1. A personal egoist chooses to act in accord with his/her own self-interest without concern for others.
2. This is a state of chosen selfishness and is not an ethical theory.

C. Egotism

1. An egotist is a person who has extreme self-regard.
2. This is a psychological state and not a moral theory.

D. Ethical egoism

1. A prescriptive theory that each individual should maximize the satisfaction of their self-interest even when doing so conflicts with the interests of others.
2. A right action for person P is one that maximizes what is of value for P.
3. A wrong action for person P is one that generates negative value for P.

III Standard Arguments for Ethical Egoism

A. Adam Smith Style argument

1. Individuals acting in their self interest in a competitive marketplace produce an optimal state for society.
2. Self interested competition leads each to produce a better product at a lower price.
3. Self interest leads, via the invisible hand, to the best for all.
4. Smith was not arguing for ethical egoism but for utilitarianism-self interest is to serve the good of all.
5. His view was that ethical egoism would motivate the individual but would lead, via the invisible hand, to social utility.
6. However, the style of laissez-faire capitalism he endorsed seems to lead to social disutility-such as the Great Depression.

B. Ayn Rand's argument in *The Virtue of Selfishness*

1. The highest goal of a human being is to perfect one's abilities in a state of happiness.
2. We are morally obligated to achieve this goal.
3. Altruism, as an ethical theory, enjoins us to sacrifice our own interests and even of lives for the benefit of others.
4. Because of this, altruism is incompatible with the goal.
5. Ethical egoism enjoins that we exclusively seek our own happiness.
6. Thus, ethical egoism is correct and altruism is incorrect.
7. People should be ethical egoists.

C. Response to Rand

1. Rand is presenting a false dilemma: ethical egoism and extreme altruism are not the only options.
2. More plausible forms of altruism permit people to act to benefit others while also acting in their own self interest.

D. The Hobbesian Argument

1. Hobbes presents the most plausible argument for ethical egoism.

Thomas Hobbes

Background

I Background

A. Personal Information

1. English
2. 1588-1679
3. Educated in scholasticism at Oxford, but was critical of it and the universities.
4. Worked as a tutor for the wealthy Cavendish family.
5. Knew Francis Bacon, Galileo and perhaps even Descartes.
6. Wrote a series of objections to Descartes' Meditations which were published by Descartes along with his replies.

B. Influence: English Civil War

1. Began in 1642.
2. The main dispute was over the divine right of kings.
3. The war was fought between the monarchy and parliament.

C. Published *The Leviathan* in 1651.

1. This led him to be dubbed "the father of atheists."

II Physics

A. Goal & Method

1. He set out to revamp the study of the physical world, human nature and society.
2. He utilized one scientific method in his approach because he regarded economy as critical to science.
3. His goal was to reduce complex phenomena to the simplest laws and most basic components.
4. He adopted Galileo's reduction of nature to matter in motion as his model.

B. Empiricism

1. He held that all knowledge comes via the senses.
2. This served as his epistemology.

C. Metaphysical Materialism

1. The world can be fully explained in terms of matter in motion.
2. The sole science is physics.

D. God

1. Nature suggests the existence of an ultimate cause.
2. Since the notion of a nonphysical substance is meaningless, a spirit would have to be a fine and transparent physical substance.
3. While we may be able to claim that God exists, his empiricism entails that we cannot know what God is-he is

not accessible via the sense.

4. Hence, God is not a subject for philosophy or science and can be left to the theologians.

E. Ontology

1. There are natural bodies such as rocks, water and living things.

2. There are political bodies which are artificial bodies.

3. The goal of philosophy is to find the causal laws for natural and artificial bodies.

III Ethics

A. Morality and Materialism

1. He explains morality in the same manner as the Epicureans-in terms of human psychology.

2. "Good" refers to objects of desire-pleasure.

3. "Evil" refers to objects of aversion-pain.

4. Since good and evil rest on pleasure and pain and people vary in what they regard as pleasurable and painful, then good and evil are subjective.

5. People are egoistic hedonists-they are guided by their pursuit of pleasure.

6. Hobbes is a psychological hedonist-he claims that people always seek to gain pleasure and avoid pain.

7. On his view, good is what yields pleasure and evil is what yields pain-to the individual.

8. Given his view, there is no sense in asking whether people ought to act this way or not.

Except From Leviathan

-Thomas Hobbes

Chapter 13

Revised: 9/8/2005

I Of the Natural Condition of Mankind as Concerning Their Felicity and Misery

A. Equality

1. Nature has made men so equal in body and mind that the differences are not enough for one to claim benefits another cannot.

2. From the equality of ability arises an equality of hope in attaining our ends.

3. So, if two desire the same thing and cannot both enjoy it, they become enemies.

4. Each is in the way of the other's end which is principally their conservation and sometimes their enjoyment.

5. Hence, they endeavor to destroy, or subdue one another.

B. Value

1. Men have only grief in keeping company where there is no power able to over-awe them all.

2. Every man thinks others should value him at the same rate he sets upon himself.

3. On all signs of contempt or undervaluing each naturally endeavors, as far as dared, to extort a greater value from his contemnors by damage and from others by the example.

C. Three Causes of Quarrel

1. Competition-makes men invade for gain.

a. Violence is used to become master of other men's persons, wives, children, and cattle.

2. Diffidence-makes men invade for safety.

a. Violence is used to defend.

3. Glory-makes men invade for reputation.

a. Violence is used for trifles- a word, a smile, a different opinion, and any other sign of undervalue.

D. War

1. Men without a common power to keep them in awe are in a war of every man against every man.

2. In this state there is no

a. Industry, culture of the earth, navigation, use of the commodities that may be imported by sea.

b. Commodious building; instruments of moving and removing, such things as require much force.

c. Knowledge of the face of the earth, account of time, arts, letters, society.

3. In this state there is continual fear and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.

E. War & Justice

1. In such a war nothing is unjust.

2. The notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice have no place there.

3. Where there is no common power, there is no law and where there is no law there is no injustice.

F. The passions that incline men to peace.

1. Fear of death.

2. Desire of such things as are necessary to commodious living.

3. A hope by their industry to obtain them.

G. Articles of Peace

1. Reason suggests convenient articles of peace on which men may be drawn to agreement.

2. These articles are called the Laws of Nature.

II Chapter 14 Of the First and Second Natural Laws, and of Contracts

A. The Right of Nature (jus naturale).

1. The liberty each man has to use his power as he will for the preservation of his own life.
2. The liberty of doing any thing which he judges as the aptest means.
3. Liberty is the absence of external impediments.

B. Law of Nature (lex naturalis)

1. A precept or general rule, found by reason, that forbids a man to do what is destructive of his life or takes away the means of preserving it and to omit that by which he thinks it may be best preserved

D. Right & Law

1. Others confuse jus and lex (right and law)-but they ought to be distinguished.
2. Right consists in liberty to do or to forbear.
3. Law determines and binds.
4. Law and right differ as much as obligation and liberty-which in one and the same matter are inconsistent.

E. Fundamental Law of Nature

1. Naturally every man has right to every thing.
2. The fundamental law of nature: a precept/general rule of reason that every man ought to endeavor peace as far as he has hope of obtaining it and when he cannot he may seek and use all advantages of war.
3. The first branch contains the first and fundamental law of nature: to seek peace, and follow it.
4. The second contains the sum of the right of nature: to defend ourselves by all means we can.

F. The second law of nature.

1. From the command to seek peace is derived the second law.
2. A man is willing, when others are, to lay down the right to all things as far he thinks necessary for peace and self-defense and be content with a much liberty against others as he would allow others against himself.
3. As long as every man holds this right of doing any thing he likes people remain in the condition of war.
4. If other men will not lay down their right, then there is no reason for any to divest his own.
 - a. That would expose him to prey, which no man is bound to, rather than give him peace.

III Chapter 15 Of Other Laws of Nature

A. The third law of nature: justice.

1. Men perform their covenants made.
2. Without this covenants are in vain and but empty words- the right of all to all things remains, leaving the condition of war.

B. Justice and injustice.

1. In this law of nature is the fountain and origin of justice.
2. Where no covenant exists, no right has been transferred and every man has right to every thing, then no action can be unjust.
3. When a covenant is made, then to break it is unjust.
4. Injustice: the not performance of covenant.
5. What is not unjust is just.
6. Justice and propriety begin with the constitution of commonwealth.

IV Moral Philosophy

A. Moral Philosophy

1. The science of these laws is the true moral philosophy.
2. The science of them is the true and only moral philosophy.
3. Moral philosophy is the science of what is good and evil in the conversation and society of mankind.

B. Good & Evil

1. Good and evil are names signifying our appetites and aversions in different tempers, customs, and doctrines of men, are different.
2. Men differ in their judgment, on the senses of what is pleasant and unpleasant to the taste, smell, hearing, touch, and sight.
3. Men differ on what is conformable or disagreeable to reason in the actions of common life.
4. The same man, in different times, differs from himself .
 - a. At one time he praises, calls good, what another time he dispraiseth and calls evil.
5. From this arises disputes, controversies, and at last war.
6. So long as a man is in the condition of nature, a condition of war, private appetite is the measure of good and evil.
7. Consequently all men agree that peace is good and so also the means of peace.
8. Justice, gratitude, modesty, equity, mercy, and the rest of the laws of nature are good-moral virtues and their contrary vices, evil.

C. Moral Philosophy

1. The science of virtue and vice is moral philosophy.

2. Therefore the true doctrine of the laws of nature, is the true moral philosophy.
3. Writers of moral philosophy acknowledge the same virtues and vices but don't see
 - a. Wherein consisted their goodness.
 - b. They are praised as the means of peaceable, sociable, and comfortable living.
4. The writers mistakenly place them in a mediocrity of passions as if not the cause but
 - a. The degree of daring made fortitude.
 - b. The quantity of a gift made liberality.
5. These dictates of reason, men improperly call laws for they are but conclusions about what is conducive to their conservation and defense.

Problems with Ethical Egoism

I Inconsistency

- A. The argument (Variation of Brian Medlin's argument)
 1. Universal ethical egoism prescribes that each person act to maximize the satisfaction of their self interest.
 2. If I endorse ethical egoism, I endorse the claim that other people should act to maximize the satisfaction of their self interest.
 3. The activities of others will conflict with my maximizing the satisfaction of my self-interest.
 4. I do not think that they should take such actions, although the theory I accept says that they should.
 4. So, I cannot consistently endorse ethical egoism.
- B. Reply (based on Jesse Kalin's reply to Medlin)
 1. A person can distinguish between their belief about the correct moral theory and their own desires.
 2. An analogy can be drawn to sports-an athlete holds that people should compete to win, while at the same time they want to win and want the other people to lose.

II The Ironic Argument

- A. Argument
 1. Ethical egoists publish works that advocate and defend egoism.
 2. Ironically, an ethical egoist is better off with as few other ethical egoists and as many altruists as possible.
 3. This is because ethical egoists would be competing with him and altruists would be aiding him.
 4. Informing others of his view/advocating it would not be in his best interest-he would be exposed and could create competition.
 5. Thus, an intelligent ethical egoist would never argue for ethical egoism or reveal his view.
 6. A true ethical egoist would argue for altruistic ethics and present the illusion that he accepted such an ethical view.
 7. This would be a secret morality, thus violating the publicity assumption.
- B. Response
 1. While this does provide an interesting perspective on those who have advocated egoism, it does not disprove the theory.
 2. The publicity assumption can be argued against.

III The Paradox Argument

- A. The Argument
 1. Ethical egoism is the view that a person should act as to maximize for themselves what is of value.
 2. Happiness is regarded as being of the highest value.
 3. True happiness requires having friends, loved ones and living in a just and caring society.
 4. Having good friends, loved ones and living a just and caring society requires that a person be disposed to act as friend, to love others, to be just and care about others.
 5. But, this requires a person to develop a disposition that directly opposes ethical egoism.
 6. Thus egoism is inconsistent with achieving its own stated goal.
- B. Responses
 1. Not all varieties of ethical egoism hold happiness as the highest value and the highest values endorsed by these views can be consistent with egoism.
 2. It can be argued that happiness does not require these conditions and that happiness can be achieved by the egoist.
 3. It can be argued that that a person can fake the attributes in question and enjoy the benefits of her true egoism and her false altruism.
 - a. Glaucon argues for this in the Ring of Gyges.

Utilitarianism

I. Introduction

- A. Defined
 1. An action is morally right when it maximizes utility for the morally relevant beings.
 2. An action is morally wrong when it fails to maximize utility for the morally relevant beings.

3. This is a teleological and consequentialist approach to ethics because it is focused on the outcomes of actions.

B. Utility

1. Utility must be defined.

2. Utility, in general, is what is accepted as valuable or the end of action by the theory.

3. Examples of what has been considered to be of utility include: Pleasure, happiness, desires, and interests

C. Relevant Beings

1. The morally relevant beings must be determined.

2. Morally Relevant Beings: The beings to be taken into account when calculating utility.

a. Mill: All mankind and, as far as the nature of things permits, all of sentient creation.

D. Act and Rule Utilitarianism

1. Act Utilitarianism: The theory that an action is right if and only if it generates as much utility for the morally relevant beings as any alternative.

2. Rule Utilitarianism: The theory that an action is right if and only if the action is required by a rule that is within a set of rules that, if accepted, would maximize utility for the morally relevant beings.

E. Proponents

1. Jeremy Bentham

2. J.S. Mill

3. Henry Sidgwick

II Appeal

A. Costs and Benefits

1. Outside of morality, people seem naturally inclined to make decisions based on weighing utility.

2. In business, companies aim at maximizing profit and make decisions based on calculating costs and benefits.

3. In democratic governments, policies are supposed to weigh costs and benefits so as to maximize utility for the citizens.

4. The appeal of this approach extends to utilitarianism.

B. Democracy

1. The notion of aiming for the greatest good for the greatest number matches the democratic ideal.

2. The notion of majority rule is part of the democratic ideal.

2. Thus, democracy lends its appeal to utilitarianism.

C. Moral Intuitions

1. In many cases the notion that we should act to create the greatest utility has great intuitive appeal.

2. Doctor example

a. A plane crash in a remote location injures six people.

b. The only doctor available knows she can either save five people and let the most injured die or save the most injured person and let 3-4 of the others die.

c. Most peoples' moral intuitions lead them to believe the doctor should save the five over the one.

3. Collision Example

a. A truck driver rounds a corner and sees a motorcycle coming towards him.

b. He can swerve to avoid the motorcycle but in doing so, he will run over a group of children crossing the road.

c. Most peoples' moral intuitions lead them to believe that the truck driver should avoid the children and risk hitting the motorcycle.

John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)

I Background

A. Background

1. Born May 20, 1806 in Pentonville, London, England

2. Died May 8, 1873 in Avignon, France

B. Education

1. Educated by his father, Jeremy Bentham and Francis Place.

2. Had an extremely rigorous upbringing and was not allowed to associate with boys his own age.

3. His father, a follower of Bentham intended to create a genius to further the cause of utilitarianism.

4. At three he learned the Greek alphabet and Greek words.

5. By eight he had read Aesop's Fables, Xenophon's Anabasis, Herodotus, Lucian, Diogenes Laërtius, Isocrates, six Platonic dialogues, history in English and had learned arithmetic.

6. At twelve he studied scholastic logic and Aristotle's logical treatises in Greek.

7. At thirteen he studied Adam Smith and David Ricardo.

8. At 21 he had a nervous breakdown.

C. Life

1. Worked for the British East India Company.

2. A Liberal member of Parliament.

3. In 1851 he married Harriet Taylor.

D. Works

1. (1843) *A System of Logic*
2. (1844) *Essays on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy*
3. (1848) *Principles of Political Economy*
4. (1859) *On Liberty*
5. (1861) *Utilitarianism*
6. (1861) *Considerations on Representative Government*
7. (1869) *The Subjection of Women*
8. (1873) *Autobiography*

Utilitarianism

-John Stuart Mill

Revised: 7/26/2005

I What Utilitarianism Is

A. Foundation of morals: "utility" or "the greatest happiness principle."

1. Actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness; wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness.
2. Happiness: pleasure and the absence of pain.
3. Unhappiness: pain and the privation of pleasure.

B. Ends

1. Pleasure and freedom from pain are the only things desirable as ends.
2. All desirable things are desirable for their inherent pleasure or as means to promoting pleasure and preventing pain.

II The "Pig" Objection

A. The Objection

1. Supposing life has no higher end than pleasure is mean, groveling and a doctrine worthy only of swine.
2. This charge was originally made against the Epicureans.
3. Epicurean Reply: The accusers show human nature in a degrading light since the accusation supposes humans capable of only swinish pleasures.

B. Mill's Reply

1. If humans and pigs had the same pleasures the same rule of life would be good for both.
2. The comparison is degrading because a beast's pleasures don't satisfy a human's conceptions of happiness.
3. Humans have faculties above animal appetites and, if aware of them, don't see as happiness anything leaving out their gratification.

C. Differences of Quality in Pleasures

1. Mental pleasures are superior to the bodily due to circumstantial advantages and not intrinsically.
2. The principle of utility is compatible with some pleasures being more valuable.
3. In other cases quality and quantity are considered, so it would be absurd for pleasure's assessment to depend only on quantity.

D. Basis of the difference of quality in pleasures.

1. The more desirable pleasure is one which all/almost all who experience both prefer regardless of any moral obligation.
2. One pleasure has superior quality if those competently acquainted with both, prefer it to any quantity of the other even if accompanied by greater discontent.

E. Preference

1. Those acquainted with and capable of appreciating both prefer a life using higher faculties.
2. Few humans would consent to be changed to a lower animal for its fullest pleasures.
3. They wouldn't give up their greater qualities for the complete satisfaction of all desires they have in common.
4. If they thought they would, it would only be because of such unhappiness they would accept any escape.

F. Higher Faculties

1. A being of higher faculties requires more to make him happy and is capable of more acute suffering.
2. Despite these liabilities, he can't wish to sink into a lower existence.
3. Why: pride, love of liberty and personal independence, love of power or excitement, dignity.

G. Happiness & Contentment

1. Supposing the superior, in equal circumstances, is less happy than the inferior confuses happiness and contentment.
2. It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied;
3. Better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied.
4. If the fool or pig thinks otherwise it is because they only know their side while the other party knows both.

H. Objection

1. Many capable of higher pleasures are tempted to postpone them to the lower.

2. This is compatible with the intrinsic superiority of the higher.
3. Men, from weakness, often chose the nearer though lesser good.
4. They pursue pleasures injurious to health, though aware health is the greater good.
5. People addict themselves to inferior pleasures, not from deliberate preference, but because they are the only ones they have access to or the only ones they can now enjoy.

I. Competent Judges

1. The better of two pleasures is determined by the judgment of the majority of those who have knowledge of both.
2. This is the sole tribunal on quality and quantity.
3. When judgment declares the pleasures of the higher faculties preferable to the animal they are entitled to the same regard.

III Stand, End and Scope

A. Standard

1. That standard is not the agent's own greatest happiness, but the greatest amount of happiness altogether.

B. End and Scope

1. Ultimate end: an existence exempt as exempt from pain and as rich in enjoyments as possible, both in quantity and quality.
2. Being the end of human action, it is necessarily the standard of morality.
3. Scope: To the greatest extent possible, secure to all mankind and so far as the nature of things admits, to the whole sentient creation.

IV Of What Sort of Proof the Principle of Utility Is Susceptible

A. Questions of ultimate ends cannot be proven in the ordinary sense.

1. No first principles of knowledge or conduct can be proven by reasoning.
2. Principles of knowledge, as matters of fact, are subject to a direct appeal to faculties judging fact- senses and consciousness.
3. Questions about ends are questions about what is desirable.
4. Utilitarian doctrine: happiness is the only thing desirable as an end; all others are desirable as means to that end.

B. The Analogy

1. The only possible proof that an object is visible is that people see it.
2. The only proof that a sound is audible is that people hear it; and so of the other sources of experience.
3. By analogy, the sole evidence that anything is desirable is that people desire it.
4. No reason can be given why the general happiness is desirable, except that each person desires his own happiness.

C. All possible proof and all that is required:

1. Happiness is a good.
2. Each person's happiness is a good to that person,
3. The general happiness, therefore, is a good to the aggregate of all persons.
4. Happiness is thus one of the ends of conduct and, consequently, one of the criteria of morality.

V Objection & Reply

A. Objection-People desire things other than happiness.

1. Happiness has not been shown to be the sole criterion.
2. It must be shown that people desire happiness and nothing else.
3. People do desire things which are distinguished from happiness, such as virtue and the absence of vice.
4. So opponents infer there are other ends besides happiness, and happiness is not the standard of morality.

B. Virtue & Happiness

1. People desire virtue and it is to be desired disinterestedly, for itself.
2. The ingredients of happiness are various, and each is desirable in itself, and not just as adding to an aggregate.
3. The principle of utility does not mean any pleasure or exemption from pain is a means to happiness and thus to be desired.
4. They are desirable in and of themselves-besides being means they are part of the end.
5. Virtue is not naturally and originally part of the end, but can become so.
6. In the virtuous virtue is desired not as a means but as a part of their happiness.

C. Love of Money

1. There is nothing originally more desirable about money than about glittering pebbles.
2. Its worth lies solely in the desires for other things
3. From being a means it can become a principle ingredient of a person's conception of happiness.

D. Love of Power and Fame

1. What is true of the love of money is true of the great objects of human life such as power or fame.
2. The strongest attraction of power and fame is the immense aid they give to attaining our other wishes.
3. The means can become part of the end, and a more important part than what they are means to.
4. Happiness is not an abstract idea but a concrete whole; and these are some of its parts.
5. The utilitarian standard sanctions and approves their being so.

F. Virtue contrasted with the Love of Money, Power or Fame

1. Virtues differs from the love of money, power, or fame.
2. These loves might render an individual noxious to others.
3. Love of virtue makes a person a blessing.
4. Utilitarians accept other desires unless they become more injurious to the general happiness than promoting.
5. Utilitarianism holds the cultivation of the love of virtue as most important to the general happiness.

G. Happiness

1. Nothing is desired except happiness.
2. Whatever is desired as a means to happiness, is desired as a part of happiness, and not desired for itself until it has become so.
3. Those who desire virtue for its own sake desire it because it is a pleasure or being without it is a pain.

H. Proof of the principle of utility.

1. If human nature is such it desires only what is part of or a means to happiness there is no other proof or any other needed that these are the only things desirable.
2. If so, happiness is the sole end of human action, and its promotion the test to judge all human conduct.
3. It necessarily follows that it must be the criterion of morality, since a part is included in the whole.

Problems with Utilitarianism

I Internal Problems

A. Formulation

1. Utilitarianism aims at maximizing value for the morally relevant beings.
2. Does this mean that the most value should be created for the existing relevant beings or that more of them should be created?
3. Should value be maximized in terms of the total, an average or per individual?
4. How is value to be measured and compared between individuals?
5. Utilitarian theorists need to address these formulation problems and can reply to these problems by doing just that.

B. Consequences

1. The consequences of an action can extend indefinitely making moral assessment seemingly impossible except for someone who is omniscient.
2. This makes moral assessment problematic because an action that initial seems right (or wrong) could have terrible (or great) consequences.
 - a. Example: American medics save Ho Chi Min's life, but he goes on to lead Vietnam into communism.
 - b. Example: During a mugging, a criminal kills unknowingly kills a terrorist mastermind thus averting an event that would have killed and injured dozens or even hundreds of innocent people.

C. Response

1. C.I. Lewis argues that consequences can be divided into three types.
2. The actual consequences of an action: an action is absolutely right if it produces the best maximization of value.
 - a. Example: If Hitler had been killed as a child by a kidnapper.
3. Reasonably foreseeable consequences of an action: an action is objectively right if it is reasonable to belief that it would normally maximize what is of value.
 - a. Example: The medics treating Ho Chi Min who was an ally at the time.
4. Intended Consequences: an action is subjectively right if the agent sincerely intended to maximize what is of value.
 - a. Example: A doctor gives a patient a shot that has been mislabeled thus injuring her, though he intended to cure her.

II External Problems

A. Problem: Unreasonable Expectations

1. Moral theories need to place reasonable expectations on moral agents.
2. For the utilitarian, the action that is right is the one that maximizes utility.
3. Most of the time a person could be taking an action that would create more utility than what they are doing at that moment.
 - a. Example: instead of playing a computer game, a person could be helping the poor.
4. Most of the resources expended by most people could be better expended to maximize utility.
 - a. Example: instead of buying fancy rims for his car, a person could donate the money to a homeless shelter.
5. However, these expectations would place an unreasonable burden on moral agents.
6. Given that the theory requires too much, it is an unreasonable moral theory.

B. Reply: Rules

1. The rule utilitarian can reply that these act utilitarian requirements would lead to overall disutility.
2. Thus, on rule utilitarian grounds people should be held to realistic expectations because this set of rules would maximize utility.

C. Problem: The rights of minorities

1. Utilitarianism seems to justify the violation of the rights of minorities provided that such violations create more utility than disutility.

2. Example: Turning an innocent person over to a crowd to prevent a riot that could kill many people.
3. Example: Permitting the economic exploitation of the minority to benefit the majority.
4. Example: "Those who walk away from Omelas"
5. Example: Framing an innocent person to allay public fears about a dangerous criminal.
6. Example: Killing an innocent person to use his/her organs to save other people.

D. Reply: Rules

1. Rule utilitarians claim that what should be assessed is the consequences if the rule of the action were adopted as a general rule.
2. They claim that the violation of the rights of minorities and permitting terrible things would create more disutility than utility when considered as general practices.
3. Example: If people knew it was a rule that innocent people could be sacrificed to appease mobs or framed, then people would be afraid and would distrust the authority.
4. We should adopt the set of rules that are most likely to bring about the most utility most of the time.
5. In cases of conflicts between the rules, then the acts are to be assessed using act utilitarianism.
 - a. Example: lying is usually wrong, but if there is a choice between saving a life and telling a lie, one should lie.
6. Opponents argue that rule utilitarianism collapses back to act utilitarianism, because the basis of assessment is still the principle of utility.

E. Problem: Nothing is Forbidden

1. The theory seems to permit terrible things provided the utility outweighs the disutility.
2. Aside from disutility, there is nothing that is intrinsically wrong.
 - a. Murder, rape, genocide, torture, etc. could all be good under the right circumstances.

F. Reply: Happiness and human nature

1. Utilitarians like Mill claim that human happiness requires acting and being a certain way, including being virtuous.
2. Human beings cannot be happier when they are committing rape, murder, genocide and so forth.
3. Opponents argue that these terrible things do seem to make some people happy and that even if they do not make everyone happy now, it is easy to imagine a vicious species or a change in humanity.
4. This makes morality arbitrarily dependent on what the majority happens to be.

G. Problem: Absurd Implications

1. Developed by William D. Ross
2. If two actions create the same utility, then they are of equal value.
3. Yet, telling a lie could have the same utility as telling the truth.
4. But this seems absurd since the truth seems to be intrinsically good.

H. Reply

1. It can be argued that the consequences only seem absurd because of a cultural bias towards truth.
2. If lying promoted utility as well as truth, then their equal value would need to be accepted.
3. It can also be argued that our moral intuitions already incline us towards accepting lies in some cases.

I. Problem: Integrity

1. Developed by Bernard Williams.
2. A tourist is given a choice:
 - a. If he kills one native, the army will let the others live.
 - b. If he refuses, the soldiers will kill all the natives.
3. On utilitarian ground, he should kill the one native.
4. Williams argues that utilitarianism would lead to alienation, so it is flawed.

J. Reply

1. It can be contended that some alienation is a necessary and unavoidable aspect of morality.
2. The utilitarian can take this into account when calculating utility.
3. Moral decisions often require choosing among evils.

Deontology

I Introduction

A. Defined

1. Derived from "deon", which is Greek for "duty."
2. The position that certain features of an action are wrong or right.
3. This contrasts with the consequentialist position.

II Rule-Deontological Theories

A. Defined

1. A rule following position.
2. An action is wrong if it violates the correct moral rules.
3. An action is right if it conforms to the correct moral rules.

4. An action is neutral if it is neither prohibited nor endorsed.
5. Actions have intrinsic value.

B. Rules

1. The deontologist needs to provide the correct rules.
2. A list, as in the Ten Commandments.
3. Or a rule for generating rules, as in Kant's theory.
4. Ross held that the rules would be found via intuitions-those of the "thoughtful and well-educated people."
5. Kant held that the rules are to be found via reason.
4. Ross held that the rules are objective, but can be overridden.
5. Kant argues that the rules are objective but are absolute-there are no exceptions to a correct rule.

C. Proponents

1. Kant
2. Ross
3. Rawls

D. Appeal

1. The theory provides clear and definite answers without gray areas.
2. The theory provides guides for action in the form of rules.
3. People are accustomed to following rules.
4. There is a correspondence with law.
5. The theory matches our moral intuition that some actions are right and others are wrong, regardless of the consequences.
 - a. Example: Scrapping a person for organs in order to save other people.
 - b. Example: Exterminating people with incurable and transmittable diseases.

Kantian Ethics: Introduction

I Introduction

A. Theoretical Reason

1. Theoretical reason is reason that yields knowledge of the world of experience.
2. This deals with "the starry heavens" and the physical nature.
3. Physical bodies are governed by scientific laws.
4. Kant claims that we encounter both physical objects and persons.
5. We experience bodies from the outside, but experience personhood from outside and inside (our own personhood).

B. Practical Reason

1. Kant claims that people feel the draw of "the moral law within."
2. This law is a governing principle but differs from the laws governing natural objects.
3. While he divides reason, he claims that "in the final analysis there can be but one and the same reason which must be different only in application."

C. Ethical Works

1. 1785: *The Foundation of the Metaphysics of Morals*.
2. 1787: *The Critique of Practical Reason*.

D. Emphasis

1. He places an emphasis on duties, motives, the dignity and moral worth of persons, plus an unchanging and absolute moral law.
2. He does not use God as the basis for his ethics.
3. He claims that our ability to identify God with the greatest good and to regard historical religious figures as good requires a pre-existing a priori concept of moral perfection.

E. Rationalism

1. Morality cannot be derived from empirical facts about humans.
2. Like Hume, he agrees that we cannot go from an "is" to an "ought."
3. He solves this problem by his "Copernican revolution."
4. If moral principles cannot be derived from what is experienced, then the mind must apply its own rational principles of morality to said experience.
5. So, for Kant acting morally is acting rationally and immorality is a form of irrationality.

Kantian Ethics: Good Will, Duty and the Categorical Imperative

Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals

I The Good Will

A. The Good Will and Qualities

1. Only the good will is good without qualification.
2. Intelligence, wit, judgment, courage, resolution, and perseverance are good but may become bad without a good will.

3. Power, riches, honor, health, and happiness, inspire pride and presumption without a good will to correct their influence.

B. Worthiness of Happiness

1. Seeing one without a good will enjoying prosperity cannot please an impartial rational spectator.

2. So, a good will is necessary to being worthy of happiness.

C. Virtues

1. Some qualities serve the good will but lack intrinsic unconditional value-they presuppose a good will.

2. Moderation, self-control, and calm deliberation are good and seem to be part of the intrinsic worth of a person.

3. They are not good without qualification, though the ancients thought so.

4. Without the principles of a good will, they may become bad.

a. The coolness of a villain makes him more dangerous and abominable.

D. The Goodness of the Good Will

1. A good will is good in itself-not because of what it does or its ability to obtain an end.

2. It is to be esteemed much higher than all it can bring about.

3. If it couldn't achieve its purpose and only it remained-not a wish, but a summoning of all one's power, like a jewel, it would shine by its own light, having its whole value in itself.

4. Its usefulness or fruitlessness cannot add nor take away from this value.

III Moral Worth, Maxim & Universal Law

A. Moral Worth

1. The moral worth of an action is not in its expected effect nor a principle of action motivated by its expected effect.

2. All positive effects and promotion of the happiness of others could have been caused other ways.

3. So there would have been no need of the will of a rational being.

B. The Good

1. The supreme and unconditional good is only in the good will.

2. The pre-eminent good consists only in the conception of law-as far as it, and not the expected effect, determines the will.

3. This is possible only in a rational being.

4. This good is already present in the person and there is no need to wait for it to appear in the result.

C. Law

1. The universal conformity of the will's actions to law in general alone serves the will as a principle.

2. I am never to act otherwise than so that I could also will that my maxim should become a universal law.

3. Proof: The common reason of men perfectly coincides with this.

D. Example

1. May I when in distress make a promise with the intention not to keep it?

2. Two questions:

a. Is it prudent?

b. Is it right?

3. It is different to be truthful from duty and to be truthful from fear of injurious consequences.

a. To deviate from the principle of duty is wicked.

b. Ignoring my maxim of prudence may be advantageous, although abiding by it is safer.

4. The shortest and unerring way to determine if a lying promise is consistent with duty is to ask:

a. Should I accept that my maxim be a universal law for myself and others?

b. Should I be able to say: "Everyone may make a deceitful promise when he finds himself in a difficulty from which he cannot otherwise extricate himself"?

5. I cannot will that lying be a universal law-there would be no promises since none would believe promises.

6. Hence my maxim as a universal law would necessarily destroy itself.

E. Determining the Good

1. To determine what must be done to have a good will ask "Canst thou also will that thy maxim should be a universal law?"

3. If not, it must be rejected, not because of a disadvantage, but because it cannot be a principle of possible universal legislation.

F. Duty

1. Duty is the necessity of acting from pure respect for the practical law.

2. Every other motive must yield to this because it is the condition of a good will and its worth is above everything.

IV The Categorical Imperative

A. Law & Will

1. Everything in nature works according to laws.

2. Only rational beings have a will-the faculty of acting according to the conception of laws or principles.

B. Imperatives

1. All imperatives command either hypothetically or categorically.

2. Hypothetical: If the action is good only as a means to something else.

3. Categorical: it is conceived as good in itself and is necessarily the principle of a will which conforms to reason.
4. The categorical imperative: Act only on that maxim whereby thou canst at the same time will that it should become a universal law.
5. The imperative of duty: Act as if the maxim of thy action were to become by thy will a universal law of nature.

IV Examples

A. Case #1: Suicide

1. The situation: A man reduced to despair by a series of misfortunes is weary of life.
 - a. He asks if it would be against his duty to himself to commit suicide.
2. Maxim: From self-love, I will end my life when its continuation is likely to bring more evil than satisfaction.
3. Test: Can this principle become a universal law of nature?
 - a. A system of nature including a law to destroy life by means of what is to impel its improvement contradicts itself.
 - b. Thus, it could not exist as a system of nature.
 - c. Hence the maxim cannot exist as a universal law of nature and is inconsistent with the supreme principle of all duty.

B. Case #2: Lying Promises

1. The situation: A person is forced to borrow money.
 - a. He knows he cannot repay it, but knows he will not get it unless he promises to repay it.
 - b. He wants to promise, but asks: Is it not unlawful and inconsistent with duty to get out of a difficulty in this way?
2. Maxim: when I need money, I will borrow it and promise to repay it, though I know I cannot.
3. Test: The maxim may be consistent with one's future welfare, but is it right?
 - a. It could never be a universal law of nature, but would necessarily contradict itself.
 - b. If it were a universal law that everyone could lie to get out of difficulty:
 1. The promise and intended end would be impossible.
 2. Promises would not be believed and ridiculed as vain pretences.

C. Case #3.

1. Situation: A person has a talent that, if developed, might make him useful in many respects.
 - a. Being in comfortable circumstances, he prefers to indulge in pleasure rather than take pains to improve his natural capacities.
2. Test: Can his maxim of neglect, agreeing with his inclination to indulgence, agree with duty?
 - a. Such a system of nature could subsist though men allow their talents to rest, and devote themselves to enjoyment.
 - b. He cannot will this to be a universal law of nature.
 - d. As a rational being, he necessarily wills his faculties be developed, since they serve him, and were given for many purposes.

D. Case #4.

1. The situation: One in prosperity sees others in wretchedness and though he could help, he sees it as no concern of his.
 - a. Everyone can be as happy as Heaven pleases, or as he can make himself.
 - b. He will take nothing from or envy him, but does not wish to assist him.
2. Test:
 - a. If this were a universal law, the human race might be better than when
 1. Everyone talks of sympathy and goodwill, or occasionally practices it.
 2. But cheats and betrays or violates the rights of men.
 - b. But, it is impossible to will that such a principle have the universal validity of a law of nature.
 - c. Such a will would contradict itself:
 1. He might need the love and sympathy of others.
 2. But by such a law of nature he would deprive himself of all hope of aid.

V Ends

A. Rational Beings

1. Man and all rational being exist as an end in himself, not merely as a means to be arbitrarily used.
2. In all his actions, whether concerning himself or other rational beings, they must be regarded as an end.

B. Objects of the inclination

1. Objects of the inclinations have only a conditional worth.
2. If the inclinations founded on them did not exist, they would be without value.
3. The worth of any object to be acquired by our action is always conditional.
4. Beings whose existence depends on nature's will have only a relative value as means, and are hence things.

C. Rational Beings

1. Rational beings are persons, because their nature shows them as ends in themselves, which must not be used only as means.
2. These are not merely subjective ends whose existence has a worth for us as an effect of our action.
3. They are objective ends, whose existence is an end in itself.
4. If all worth were contingent, there would be no supreme practical principle of reason whatever.

D. Supreme practical principle (Second Formulation of the CI)

1. If there is a Supreme practical principle it must be drawn from what is necessarily an end for everyone.

2. The foundation of this principle is: rational nature exists as an end in itself
3. A man necessarily conceives his own existence as such, making it a subjective principle of human action.
4. Every other rational being sees its existence similarly, on the same rational principle
5. So it is an objective principle, from which as a supreme practical law and all laws can be deduced.
6. The practical imperative: So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end withal, never as means only.

E. Kingdom of Ends

1. Kingdom: the union of different rational beings in a system by common laws.
2. It is by laws that the universal validity of ends is determined.
3. If we abstract from the personal differences of rational beings and from their private ends, we can conceive all ends combined in a systematic whole.
4. This includes rational beings as ends in themselves, and the special ends each may propose to himself.
5. Thus, we can conceive a kingdom of ends.

F. Rational Beings as Legislators (Third formulation of the Categorical Imperative).

1. Kant focuses on “the idea of the will of every rational being as making universal law.”
2. Known as the principle of autonomy.
3. For Kant, the autonomy of the will is based on freedom.
4. When one’s moral principles are based on external authority or one’s own inclinations, the will is not free.
5. The moral law is not something that is imposed from outside-it is an expression of one’s own rational nature.
6. As moral agents, rational beings are bound by moral law.
7. Rational beings are autonomous legislators of moral law.
8. In the kingdom of Ends everyone is autonomous, yet follows the same moral laws.

Kantian Ethics: Three Postulates of Morality

I Three Postulates

A. Introduction

1. There are three ideas that are unprovable and cannot be the objects of knowledge, but are irresistible because they are the foundation of all morality.
2. They are: freedom, immortality and God.

B. Freedom

1. Human freedom must be accepted for morality to make sense.
2. Freedom cannot be observed scientifically-for Kant, the scientific view is that all events are determined by natural causes and human behavior is analyzable in psychological and physiological terms.
3. In inner moral experience it is found that the moral law command unconditional obedience.
4. If X is what I ought to do, this implies that X is something that I can do.
5. Hence, only free agents can meet the requirements of morality.
6. Thus, there is a noumenal self beyond the empirical self which is the basis of moral actions.
7. This freedom is unprovable, but is a practical necessity for morality.
8. Human life would be meaningless without morality, hence humans must regard themselves as free.

C. Immortality

1. For Kant, the moral law is strict-we are obligated to make our will conform perfectly with duty.
2. No one can meet this requirement during life.
3. Thus, immortality is a practical necessity-endless time is required to achieve the perfect conformity.
4. “This infinite progress is possible, however only the presupposition of an infinitely enduring existence and personality of the same rational being; this is called the immortality of the soul.”

D. God

1. The hope for eternal life cannot be the motive for doing right.
2. If one is motivated by this, then one is not doing good out of duty but based on a calculation of interest.
3. According to Kant, we intuitively want moral goodness to be linked with happiness.
4. In experience, no necessary connection is found between virtue and happiness.
5. For this intuition to make sense there must be a transcendent cause bringing about a just future distribution of happiness.
6. Thus, “it is morally necessary to assume the existence of God.”
7. Morality is rational and independent of God’s will, yet morality naturally leads to religion.

Problem with Deontology & Kant’s Theory

I Problems

A. Problem: Duty

1. Duty is regarded by some as inadequate as a basis for morality.

2. One is inclined to ask “a duty to do what and why?”
 3. Determining the answer to “why” often seems to result in an abstract answer that is not well connected to normal life.
- B. Reply
1. Deontologists attempt to answer these questions within their theories.
 2. Also, it seems to beg the question to assume that morality must be grounded in normal life.
- C. Problem: Inflexibility
1. The absolutist’s moral rules permit neither exception nor allow us to take into account the consequences of an action.
 2. Our moral intuitions seem to favor allowing exceptions in certain circumstances.
 - a. Example: Lying is generally wrong, except to save a life, etc.
 3. Our moral intuitions also seem to favor the view that we should sometimes take the consequences of actions into account.
 - a. Example: A doctor at an accident scene.
- D. Reply
1. Suitable construction of the rules can allow for the apparent exceptions and concern about consequences to be adequately handled.
 2. One can simply “bite the bullet” and argue that there are no exceptions and the consequences are irrelevant.
- E. Problem: Rationality (Kant)
1. Critics of Kant are quick to point out that his theory gives non-rational beings no intrinsic moral weight while giving rational beings absolute worth.
 2. Those who think non-rational beings have value see this as a flaw.
 3. Why should rationality alone have intrinsic value?
- F. Reply
1. Why think that non-rational beings have worth?
- G. Problem: Terrible Maxims seem to pass Kant’s test.
1. Suppose George hates the French and wants them all dead.
 2. His maxim: “I give myself permission to kill the French.”
 2. The universal “Everyone has permission to kill the French.”
 3. There is no contradiction, so killing the French would be acceptable.
 4. The same can be done with other cases.
- H. Reply
1. Such maxims seem to involve defects in a being’s rationality.
 2. Such maxims also seem to violate the other formulations of Kant’s categorical imperative.
- I. Problem: Kingdom of Ends
1. Kant’s view that rational beings must be treated as ends has limited use.
 2. It does tell us we should not enslave or exploit others, but does not tell us how to resolve many moral conflicts or what it means, in the concrete, to treat beings as ends.
- J. Reply
1. It can be argued that careful reflection on this will provide concrete applications.

Ethical Relativism and Subjectivism

I Introduction

A. Defined

1. Ethics is not objective.
2. Ethical relativism: The validity of moral claims depends on cultural acceptance.
3. Subjectivism: The validity of moral claims depends on the acceptance of the individual.

B. Proponents

1. Herodotus
2. Harmon

C. Pojman’s reconstruction of the argument for relativism.

1. Diversity Thesis: What is considered morally right and wrong varies from society to society, so that there are no moral principles accepted by all societies.
 - a. An anthropological hypothesis.
2. Dependency Thesis: All moral principles derive their validity from cultural acceptance.
 - a. A philosophical hypothesis.
3. Conclusion: Therefore, there are no universally valid moral principles, objective standards which apply to all people everywhere and at all times-relativism is true.

D. Subjectivism

1. The validity of moral principles depends on the individual’s acceptance.

II Appeal

A. Appeal

1. Many people accept relativism in general.
2. The diversity thesis seems to be a fact.
3. Ethical relativism seems to avoid ethnocentrism.
 - a. An uncritical belief in the inherent superiority of one's own culture.
4. It seems to justify tolerance.

B. Anthropologist Melville Herskovits' Tolerance argument

1. If Morality is relative to its culture, then there is no independent basis for criticizing the morality of any other culture but one's own.
2. If there is no independent way of criticizing any other culture, we ought to be tolerant of the moralities of other cultures.
3. Morality is relative to its culture.
4. Therefore we ought to be tolerant of the moralities of other cultures.

HERODOTUS

I Background

A. Life

1. 484 BC - c. 425 BC.
2. Best known for his descriptions of places and people he met on his journeys.

B. Works

1. The Histories of Herodotus—a history of the 5th century invasion of Greece by Persia,

C. Contribution

1. Regarded as the father of history.
2. Prior to him there had been chronicles and epics that recorded the past
3. But, his contribution was to regard the past as subject to philosophical investigation and research that would yield information about human behavior.

II Relativism

A. The Best

1. Anyone given the opportunity to choose from all the nations in the world the set of beliefs which he thought best, he would inevitably, after careful consideration, choose his own.
2. Everyone believes his own customs and religion to be the best.
3. It is unlikely that anyone but a madman would mock at such things.

B. An anecdote of Darius.

1. When he was king of Persia, he summoned Greeks and asked what they would take to eat the dead bodies of their fathers.
 - a. They replied that they would not do it for any money.
2. Later, in the presence of the Greeks he asked some Indians, of the Callatiae tribe, who eat their parents' dead bodies, what they would take to burn them.
 - a. They uttered a cry of horror and forbade him to mention such a dreadful thing.
3. One can see by this what custom can do, and Pindar, in my opinion, was right when he called it "king of all."

Problems with Ethical Relativism (Pojman)

I Problems

A. Relativism Refutes the Tolerance Argument

1. If morality simply is relative to each culture then cultures that lack a principle of tolerance have no obligation to be tolerant.
2. Relativists provide no basis for criticizing those who are intolerant, and cannot rationally criticize anyone advocating what they regard as a heinous principle.

B. Relativism Precludes Cross Cultural Criticism

1. If valid criticism supposes an objective or impartial standard, relativists cannot morally criticize anyone outside their own culture.
2. Racism, genocide, oppression, and slavery, are as equally moral as their opposites.

C. Problem: Disturbing Consequences

1. Relativism entail that reformers are always morally wrong since they go against cultural standards.
2. The majority is always morally right and the minority is always morally wrong.

D. Problem: Defining Culture

1. The notion of a culture or society is n difficult to define.
2. When one is a member of societies with conflicting moralities one must be judged both wrong and not-wrong whatever he does.

- a. Example: a catholic-American and abortion.
 - b. Example: An American college student who is in a racist organization.
 3. There is no ground for deciding what the right thing to do might be.
- E. Problem: Relativism Collapses into Subjectivism
1. There seems to be no principled way of defining a culture, so anyone could form a culture of one.
 2. This collapses relativism into subjectivism.
- F. Problem: Subjectivism Seems to Collapse into Moral Nihilism
1. Morality is reduced to a matter of taste.
 2. There is no basis for resolving disputes since there will be no common ground.
 3. This contradicts the notion that morality's purpose is to assist in the proper resolution of human conflicts.
 4. This theory seems incoherent.

II. Criticism of the Argument

A. Diversity Thesis

1. While cultures do vary, many moral principles are shared.
2. Cultures with radically different morals are inevitably tiny, often failing cultures.

B. Dependency Thesis

1. Dependency can be explained.
2. Cultures seem to vary in their application of shared core of morality.
 - a. Example: The Greeks and Callatiae both treat their dead with what they regard as respect.
3. Such dependency is consistent with moral objectivism.

Part Three: Goodness & Equality

Being and Becoming Good

Why Be Good?

I Introduction

A. Why be good?

1. A classic moral question is “why be good?”
2. This question seems to involve the assumption that evil is more appealing than good, hence a reason must be given to chose good.
3. A critical part of answering the question involves determining what is good.
4. Most moral theorists attempt to answer the question.
 - a. Confucius & Aristotle: being virtuous makes you happy.
 - b. Hobbes: keeping your covenants avoids punishment.
 - c. Ethical Egoism: What is right is what is in your self-interest.
 - d. Kant: Being evil is irrational.

B. Other People

1. Almost all people do not want others to do bad things to them and they want others to do good for them.
2. So, people attempt, out of their own self-interest, to encourage others to be good.
3. While self-interest gives a person a reason to want others to be good, the question still remains: “Why should I be good?”

C. Practical Answer

1. Behavior that is regarded as immoral is typically punished in some manner.
2. Behavior that is regarded as moral is sometimes rewarded in some manner.
3. Most people prefer to be rewarded and to avoid being punished.
4. Thus, one practical reason to be good (or appear good) is to avoid being punished and to receive rewards.

II Goodness for its Own Sake

A. Reformulations of the Question

1. Why be good when you can avoid punishment?
2. Why be good if you can get the rewards of goodness without being good?
3. Why chose goodness for its own sake?

B. Another Practical Answer

1. People can sometimes avoid punishment for their misdeeds and there are often no rewards for being good.
2. If people do wrong when they can avoid punishment (or think they can), then it is likely that society will be harmed in some manner.
3. This harm might well affect the person who did the wrong.
4. Thus, the reason to be good is to avoid an indirect harm.
5. Of course, if a person can avoid (or thinks he can avoid) these harms, then he seems to have no reason to be good.

C. A Religious Answer

1. Many religions answer this question by placing a divine entity (such as God) or force (such as karma) as the enforcer of morality.
2. Misdeeds are ultimately punished and good deeds ultimately rewarded by this enforcer.
3. However, this still makes the motivation to be good merely a matter of the desire to avoid punishment and the hope of a reward.
4. There is also the question of the existence of such an enforcer.

D. Goodness for its Own Sake

1. Thinkers have often argued that people should choose goodness for its own sake and not for fear of external punishment or a hope of external reward.
2. A standard approach is to argue that goodness has intrinsic benefits and evil has intrinsic harms.
 - a. These benefits and harms provide a motivation to be good that does not depend on outside forces.
 - b. A person accrues the benefits or suffers the harms merely by being good or by being bad.

E. Analogies

1. One way to understand the desire to have people chose goodness for its own sake it to consider analogous situations.
2. God: God is supposedly to be loved/worshipped not for the sake of benefits and the fear of punishment but simply because God is supposed to be inherently worthy/deserving of such love/worship.
3. Love: True love is supposed to be the love of the person him/herself and not a ‘love’ of the person’s appearance, money, possessions, or other such factors.

Socrates (470-399 B.C.)**I Background****A. Life and Death**

1. 470-399 B.C.
2. The son of a sculptor and a midwife.
3. Eccentric in appearance and manner.
 - a. His clothes were rumpled.
 - b. Walked like a pelican.
 - c. Ugly, yet robust.
4. Served in the military.

B. Wisdom

1. A friend was told by the oracle and Delphi that Socrates was the wisest of men.
2. Socrates set out to prove the gods wrong by trying to find a wiser man.
3. He exposed the politicians, poets and craftsmen as all being less wise than they claimed.
4. Because of this he was eventually brought to trial.

C. Will the Real Socrates Please Stand Up

1. Socrates held that philosophy for a matter for conversation and not for books, hence he left behind no writings.
2. It is claimed that the early Platonic dialogues are accurate transcriptions of his conversations and that the later dialogues have Socrates serving as a mouthpiece for Plato's views.
3. However, the truth is not known and this remains a matter of debates.

II Ethical Theory**A. Virtue**

1. The most important goal is not merely living, but living well (virtuously/justly).
2. To understand how to live justly, one must understand the standard of excellence (arête).
3. Arête: good at a specific task, having excellence or fulfilling its function well.
4. Socrates was concerned with what it meant to be a virtuous human being-having arête.
5. By speaking in terms of arête, Socrates indicates that he is taking morality to be based in non-moral, naturalistic factors.
6. Morality involves being a successful human.

B. Why be moral?

1. Being virtuous is being successful at fulfilling human nature.
2. Thus virtue is the only thing that will lead to happiness.
3. Happiness was accepted by Greek thinkers as an end that needed no argument
4. Socrates' conception of happiness differed from those of earlier thinkers.
5. For Socrates one's real interests lie in being moral and not in being selfish.
6. People can be mistaken about their best interests and act unjustly or give in to bodily desires.
7. Injustice corrupts the soul and leads to unhappiness.

C. Ethical Intellectualism

1. Ethical Intellectualism: knowledge and virtue are one.
2. Without knowledge, the other virtues are either ineffective or actually harmful.
3. Unity of the Virtues: Having only some of the virtues can create a harmful person.

D. Knowledge and Goodness, Ignorance and Evil

1. Each person pursues his/her good by nature.
2. Our good is being virtuous.
3. To know the good is to do the good.
4. No one chooses to do evil knowingly, only out of ignorance.
5. For Socrates knowledge is more than having factual information-true knowledge is wisdom.
6. This view was criticized in Socrates' own time.
 - a. The playwright Euripides claimed that people did wrong from sloth or due to preferring pleasure.
 - b. Aristotle claimed that Socrates' view "plainly contradicted the observed facts."

III Socrates' Contributions**A. Plato**

1. He had a significant and great impact of Plato.

B. Ethical Theory

1. Megarians.
2. Cyrenaics.
3. Cynics.

C. Personality

1. Socrates' main influence was via the person he was, as oppose to the doctrines he espoused.

2. The philosophic life-the desire to know, the belief in the supreme importance of wisdom, and the conviction to follow questions.
3. "Know thyself"-inscription at the temple of Apollo at Delphi.
4. "An unexamined life is not worth living."-Socrates

Plato

Background

I Background

A. The Death of Socrates

1. Socrates was Plato's mentor.
2. Phaedo: "Such was the end...of our friend, who was, I think, of all the men of our time, the best, the wisest and the most just."
3. Plato wondered why society could not tolerate the existence of Socrates and what sort of society would be needed to permit Wisdom to prevail.

B. Life

1. Born 428 or 427 B.C. into an aristocratic family.
2. Trained to be a political leader.
3. Traveled, perhaps even to Egypt, and went to Syracuse, Italy in 388.
4. He founded the Academy located in a grove sacred to the hero Academus.
5. In 368 and 361 he attempted to educate the ruler of Syracuse, Dionysius the Younger.
 - a. He failed and barely escaped with his life in 361.
6. he died in 348 or 347 B.C.

C. Comprehensive Philosophy

1. Plato was concerned with ethical theory.
2. The fate of Socrates, an ethical person, convinced him of the importance of political philosophy.
3. He held that the answers to the ethical and political problems were to be found in metaphysics.
4. He realized that to make progress in these areas of philosophy required a theory of knowledge.

The Ring of Gyges

-Plato

I The Challenge

- ##### A. Glaucon wants to hear a defense of justice.
1. He wants to hear a defense that justice is better than injustice.
 2. He wants to hear justice praised for itself.
 3. He is going to speak at length in praise of the unjust life.

II Injustice and Justice

A. The nature and origin of justice.

1. They say that to do wrong is naturally good, to be wronged is bad.
2. The suffering of injury so far exceeds in badness the good of inflicting it.
3. So, when men have done wrong and suffered it, those who are unable to avoid the latter and practice the former decide it is profitable to come to an agreement with each other to not inflict injury nor suffer it.
4. As a result, they make laws and covenants and the law's commands they call lawful and just.

B. The origin and essence of justice.

1. It stands between the best and the worst.
2. The best is to do wrong without paying the penalty and the worst is to be wronged without power of revenge.
3. The just is a mean between two extremes.

C. Justice and Power

1. It is welcomed and honored because of men's lack of the power to do wrong.
2. The man who has that power would not make a compact with anyone not to inflict injury or suffer it.
3. For him this would be madness.

D. Why people are just.

1. Those who practice justice do so against their will because they lack the power to do wrong.

III The Ring of Gyges

A. The thought experiment.

1. We would realize this if we imagined ourselves granting to both the just and the unjust the freedom to do whatever they like.
2. We could then follow them both and observe where their desire leads them.
3. We would see just man traveling the same road as the unjust.

4. The reason is the desire for undue gain that every organism by nature pursues as a good, but the law forcibly sidetracks him to honor equality.

B. The story

1. Gyges was a shepherd in service to the king of Lydia.
2. He found a ring inside a mysterious bronze horse, after a rainstorm and earthquake exposed it.
3. He found that the ring enabled him to become invisible.
4. He used the ring to murder the king, and with the help of the king's wife, take over the kingdom.

C. The point.

1. If a just man and an unjust man each had a ring, then they would act the same way.
 - a. This proves no one is just willingly, but only under compulsion.
 - b. Justice is not one's private good, since wherever either thought he could do wrong with impunity he would do so.
2. Everyone believes injustice is more profitable than justice.
3. The man who did not wish to do wrong with that opportunity would be thought to be foolish and miserable.
4. But, they would praise him in public for fear of being wronged.

IV Choice Between lives.

A. The most just man and the most unjust man must be put face to face.

1. The unjust man must be perfect in his injustice.
2. The unjust man will act as a clever craftsman.
 - a. He will know what he can and cannot do and will only attempt what he can do.
 - b. When he slips, he can set things right.
4. His correct attempts at wrongdoing must remain secret, for one who is caught is a poor performer.
5. He must have the reputation for justice and to preserve this he must have:
 - a. The ability to persuade and use force.
 - b. Courage, strength, friends, wealth.

B. The Just man.

1. Simple and noble.
2. His reputation for justice must be taken away.
 - a. This is because the reputation for justice would bring rewards and it would not be clear whether he is just for the sake of justice or the rewards and honors.
3. He must be stripped of everything but justice and be the opposite of the perfectly unjust man.
4. Though he does no wrong, he must have the greatest reputation for wrongdoing.
 - a. This is so he might be tested for justice by not weakening under the ill repute and the consequences.

C. Judgment

1. The two men must be judged as to which is the happier.

Moral Education

I Introduction

A. Moral education typical involves

1. Conveying information about morality.
2. Instilling values, rules, precepts, guidelines and practices.
3. Training in right behavior.

B. Controversy

1. Moral education is a matter of controversy.
2. All the key matters relating to moral education have been extensively debated and are still in dispute.

C. Practical Matters

1. To persist as a culture or society a culture or society must pass on its values-including moral values.
 - a. However, moral values and practices tend to change with time.
 - b. The question of whether the specific values are correct or not still remains.
 - c. The question of whether certain cultures/cultural values should survive is also a matter of debate.
2. A society must educate its members in acceptable behavior in order for the society to exist as an organized entity.
 - a. It seems likely that a society without any standards would collapse into chaos.
 - b. Whether or not such standards are actually necessary is a matter of debate.
3. Thus, from a practical standpoint, moral education seems necessary for the survival of societies and cultures.

II Nature, Possibility & Desirability

A. Human Nature?

1. Do humans have a nature? If so, what is it?

2. Human nature is relevant both to the methods and the difficulty of moral education.
3. If humans are good by nature, then moral education would most likely be relatively easy and it would mainly involve refinement and guidance.
4. If humans are naturally inclined towards goodness, then moral education would probably not be very difficult and would mainly involve keeping people on the right track towards goodness.
5. If humans are naturally neutral and inclined neither to good nor evil, then moral education would probably be somewhat challenging and would involve directing people towards goodness.
6. If humans are naturally inclined towards evil, moral education would be challenging and would require methods that pushed people away from evil and towards goodness.
7. If humans are naturally evil, then moral education would be very difficult and would require powerful methods that forced people away from evil and towards goodness.

B. Possible?

1. Is moral education possible?
2. It is generally accepted that it is.
3. The evidence is that past generations have passed on moral teachings to following generations.
4. The possibility of moral education is linked to human nature as well as the nature of ethics.

C. Desirable?

1. Should morality be taught?
2. This can be taken as a moral question-is it ethical to teach morality?
3. Some thinkers have opposed certain methods of moral education because these methods are regarded as coercive.
4. Most thinkers regard moral education as desirable.
5. Most people regard it as desirable on practical grounds-moral education tends to make people behave better.

III Who, Why, What?

A. Purpose?

1. What is the purpose of moral education?
2. There are various answers to this question.
3. It should have the practical aim of making people good.
4. It should aim at theoretical aim of informing people about moral views.
5. It should help clarify the student's values.
6. It should provide the student with various alternatives and allow them to choose while also encouraging tolerance.

B. Educators?

1. Who should be the moral educator?
2. Those chosen should presumably be the best able to educate others in morality.
3. These are the people that would be accountable for failures in moral education.
4. Standard answers include: family (parents), religious institutions (churches), educational institutions (schools), and the state.
5. Some thinkers focus on one educator while others propose a mixture of educators.
6. There is considerable debate over who should be responsible for moral education.
 - a. Example: In the US, the schools are often blamed for the moral failings of the youth while others argue that parents are to blame.

C. One Morality?

1. Some argue that moral education should convey a single morality.
2. One argument for this is based on the fact that it would be problematic to teach different moralities.
 - a. Different moralities can be inconsistent or even contradictory.
 - b. Teaching different moralities would be confusing to the student.
 - c. Thus, one morality should be taught.
3. Those who think moral education should make people good tend to believe that one morality should be taught.

D. Several Moralities?

1. Some argue for diversity in moral education.
2. The following reasons are often given for this diversity.
 - a. Exposure to different morality leads to tolerance.
 - b. It is unlikely that one morality has gotten everything right.
 - c. Imposing one morality on people seems authoritarian.
 - d. Imposing one morality seems to violate rights.

E. Content?

1. One main point of contention is the content of the morality that is to be taught.
2. Examples of disputes in public moral

F. Methods?

1. How should morality be taught?

2. Discourse-moral lectures and discussions.
3. Models-presenting role models.
4. Habituation-training by repeated activity.
5. Other.

Habit and Virtue

-Aristotle

Revised 10/18/2005

I The origin and nature of virtue.

A. Human Nature

1. Moral virtues are developed neither by nor contrary to nature.
2. It is natural to receive virtue.
3. Full development of virtues is due to habit.

B. Natural Faculties

1. We acquire the potentialities and later actualize them.
2. We have senses before use and not from use.

C. Acquiring Virtues

1. Virtues are acquired by exercising them, as with arts.
2. Anything we have to learn we learn by doing.
3. People become builders by building and instrumentalists by playing instruments.
4. People become just by performing just acts, temperate by performing temperate ones, brave by performing brave ones.

D. City States

1. That virtues are acquired by habit is supported by what happens in city states.
2. Legislators make citizens good by habituation.
3. This is the intention of every legislator.
4. Failing it, they fail their object.
5. This distinguishes a good constitution and a bad one.

E. Learning Crafts

1. The causes that bring out an excellence are the same that destroy it
 - a. By playing the harp people become good or bad harpists.
2. The same applies to builders and other craftsmen.
3. Otherwise there would be no need to teach: they would be born good or bad.

F. Learning Virtues is the Same as learning crafts.

1. How we behave in dealing with others makes us just or unjust.
2. How we behave when in danger makes us brave or cowardly.
3. Like activities produce like dispositions.
4. The habits formed from the earliest age make all the difference in the world.

II General Rules

A. General Rules

1. In a practical science so much depends on particular circumstances that only general rules can be given.

B. Ethics is not theoretical

1. This branch of philosophy unlike others is not theoretical.
2. We are studying not to know goodness, but how to become good men.
3. Otherwise it would be useless.

C. Right Principle

1. That we should act according to right principle is assumed as a basis for discussion.

D. Outline

1. Any account of conduct must be stated in outline and not in precise detail.
2. Questions of conduct and expedience are as little fixed as what is healthful.
3. Its application to particular problems allows no precision.
4. They do not fall under any art or professional tradition.
5. The agents must at every step to think out for themselves what the circumstances demand.
6. Just as in medicine and navigation.

E. Cardinal rule

1. Right conduct is incompatible with excess or deficiency in feelings and actions.

F. Analogy to health-Destroying

1. Moral qualities are destroyed by deficiency and excess, like health.
2. Excessive and insufficient exercise destroy one's strength
3. Eating and drinking too much or too little destroy health.
4. The right quantity produces, increases, and preserves health.

G. Virtue: Excess & Deficiency

1. What is true for health is true for the virtues.
2. One who fears everything becomes a coward.
3. One who is afraid of nothing becomes foolhardy.
4. One who indulges in every pleasure without restraint becomes licentious.
5. Temperance and courage are destroyed by excess and deficiency and preserved by the mean.

F. Fostering of Virtues

1. Virtues are exercised in the same kinds of action as gave rise to them.
2. Virtues are fostered by the same actions that destroy them.
3. The activities that flow from them consist in the same sort of actions.

G. Health Analogy-Fostering

1. Physical strength results from plenty of nourishment and severe training.
2. The strong best carry out this program.

H. Fostering Virtues

1. Analogous to fostering health.
2. By refraining from pleasures we become temperate.
3. The temperate are most able to abstain from pleasures.
4. By facing alarming situations we become brave.
5. The brave are most able to face alarming situations.

III Pleasure & Pain

A. Index of Moral Progress

1. The pleasure or pain of actions serves as an index of moral progress.
2. Good conduct lies in a proper attitude towards pleasure and pain.
3. The pleasure or pain that accompanies acts is a sign of their dispositions.
4. Example: bodily pleasures.
 - a. One who enjoys abstaining is temperate.
 - b. One who finds abstaining irksome is licentious.
5. Example: facing danger.
 - a. The brave do so gladly or without distress.
 - b. The coward feels distressed.

B. Moral Goodness

1. It is with pleasures and pains that moral goodness is concerned.
2. Pleasure induces to behave badly.
3. Pain induces us to shrink from fine actions.
4. Plato: true education is being trained from infancy to feel joy and grief at the right things.
5. Every feeling and action is accompanied by pleasure or pain, so virtue is concerned with both.
6. People become bad because of pleasures and pain by shunning or seeking the wrong ones or at the wrong times, or in the wrong way.
7. Three factors for choice: the fine, the advantageous, the pleasant.
8. Three factors for avoidance: the base, the harmful, the painful.

C. Standards of Regulating Actions

1. Pleasure and pain are the standards used to regulate our actions.
2. Feeling pleasure and pain rightly or wrongly affects conduct, so our whole inquiry must be concerned with these sensations.
3. Heraclitus: it is hard to fight the emotions and even harder to fight pleasure.
4. The harder course is always the concern of art and virtue because success is better in the face of difficulty.

D. Concern

1. The concern of morality and political science must be with pleasures and pains.
2. One who treats them rightly will be good and one who treats them wrongly will be bad.

IV An Objection & Replies

A. Objection

1. How can we say that people must perform virtuous actions to become virtuous?
2. If they do what is virtuous, they are already virtuous.
3. This is analogous to: if people use words correctly or play music correctly, they are already literate or musical.

B. First Reply-Arts

1. This is not true even in the arts.
 2. One can put a few words together correctly by accident or at another's prompting.
 3. One will only be literate if he does a literate act in a literate way-in virtue of his own literacy.
- C. Reply- Distinguishing Incidentally Virtuous acts From True Virtuous Acts
1. Works of art have merit in themselves; so it is enough to produce them with a certain quality.
 2. Virtuous acts are not done in a just or temperate way merely because they have a certain quality.
 3. They are only virtuous if the agent also acts in a certain state: he
 - a. Knows what he is doing.
 - b. Chooses to do it and chooses it for its own sake.
 - c. Does it from a fixed and permanent disposition.
 4. These, knowledge excepted, are not necessary qualifications for the arts.
 5. For acquiring virtues, knowledge is of little or no force.
 6. For acquiring virtue, the others are of supreme importance since repeated performance of virtuous acts make us virtuous.
- D. Reply-Distinguishing & Acquiring
1. Acts are called just and temperate when they are such as a just or temperate man would do.
 2. What makes the agent just or temperate is not acting but acting as a just and temperate man does.
 3. A man becomes virtuous by virtuous acts.
 4. There is no likelihood of a man becoming good by not doing them.
- E. Medicine Analogy
1. Most have recourse to their principle, imagining they are philosophical, and so will become serious-minded.
 2. They are like invalids who listen to a doctor but do not carry out his instructions.
 3. Just as bodies of invalids don't benefit from such treatment, their souls will get none from philosophy.

V Practice

- A. Putting it into Practice
1. In the case of conduct the end is not theoretical knowledge, but putting knowledge into practice.
 2. It is not enough to know about goodness.
 3. We must endeavor to possess and use goodness or adopt any means to become good.
- B. Discourses on Morality
1. If discourse were enough to make people moral, then such discourses would be what is needed.
 2. Discourse on morality can
 - a. Encourage the young who are liberal-minded.
 - b. Render a generous and idealistic character susceptible of virtue.
 3. Discourses on morality cannot impel the masses towards human perfection.
- C. The Many & Discourse
1. It is the nature of the many to:
 - a. Be ruled by fear rather than by shame.
 - b. To refrain from evil not because of disgrace but because of punishments.
 2. Living under the sway of their feelings, the many
 - a. Pursue their pleasures and the means of obtaining them.
 - b. Shun the pains opposite their pleasures.
 - c. Have no conception of what is fine and truly pleasurable, because they have never tasted it.
 3. The many cannot be reformed by discourse because dislodging by arguments long embedded habit is difficult if not impossible.
- D. All Means
1. We should be content if the combination of all the means to make us good enables us to attain some portion of goodness.
- E. Nature & Instruction
1. Goodness can only be induced in a suitably receptive character.
 2. Some claim it is by nature or habit or instruction that some people become good.
 3. The bounty of nature is beyond our control and is bestowed by divine dispensation upon the fortunate.
 4. Discussion and instruction are not effective in all cases.
- F. Analogy to land
1. Land has to be prepared before planting.
 2. The mind of the pupil has to be prepared in its habits if it is to enjoy and dislike the right things.
 3. One who lives by feelings would not listen to an argument to dissuade him or understand it.
 4. When a man is in that state it is not possible to persuade him out of it.
 5. In general, feeling yields to force, not argument.
 6. We must have a character to work on that has an affinity to virtue-appreciates what is noble and objects to what is base.

VI Education in goodness is best undertaken by the state.

A. First Argument-Education of the Youth

1. Obtaining a right training for goodness from an early age is hard, unless one has been brought up under the right laws.
2. This is because a temperate and hardy way of life is not pleasant to most people, especially when young.
3. Therefore, upbringing and occupations should be regulated by law, because they will cease to be irksome when they have become habitual.

B. Second Argument-Regulation of Life

1. It is not enough to have received the right upbringing and supervision in youth.
2. They must keep observing their regimen and accustoming themselves to it even after they are grown up.
3. Laws will be needed to regulate these activities and to cover the whole of life.
4. For most people are readier to submit to compulsion and punishment than to arguments and fine ideals.
5. Some think that Legislators should
 - a. Encourage people to goodness and appeal to their finer feelings, in the hope that their habits will respond.
 - b. Also inflict chastisement and penalties on any who disobey through deficiency of character and to deport the incorrigible.
6. A good man, whose life is related to a fine ideal, will listen to reason.
7. The bad man, whose object is pleasure, must be controlled by pain, like a beast of burden.
 - a. The pains inflicted should be those most contrary to the favored pleasures.

D. Third Argument-Guidance

1. To be a good man one must have been brought up in the right way and trained in the right habits and must spend the rest of his life in reputable occupations, doing no wrong either with or against one's will.
2. This can be achieved by living under the guidance of some intelligence or right system that has effective force.
3. The orders that a father or an individual gives have no forceful or compulsive power in general, unless he is a king.
4. Law, being the pronouncement of a kind of practical wisdom or intelligence, does have the power of compulsion.
5. Although people resent it when their impulses are opposed by human agents, even if they are in the right, the law causes no irritation by enjoining decent behavior.

E. Parents-Second Choice

1. If neglected by the state, it can be supplied by the parent; but it calls for some knowledge of legislative science.
2. The best solution would be to introduce a proper system of public supervision of these matters.
3. If neglected by the state, it would be right for each individual to help his children and friends on the way to goodness, and that he should have the power or at least the choice of doing this.
4. Producing a right disposition in a person is not a task for anybody: if anyone can do it, it is the man with knowledge.
 - a. Just as in the case of medicine and all other professions that call for application and practical understanding.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau

Created: 9/9/2005

I Background

A. Life

1. Born on June 28, 1712 in Geneva, Switzerland and died on July 2, 1778.
2. His mother died shortly after he was born and his father fled Geneva to avoid prison.
3. He arrived in Paris in 1742 and worked a variety of jobs.

B. Some Works

1. Discourse on the Arts and Sciences, 1750
2. Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality Among Men, 1754
3. Discourse on Political Economy, 1755
4. The New Heloise, 1761
5. Emile, or Education, 1762
6. The Social Contract, Or Principles of Political Right, 1762

II The Corruption of Man

A. Emotional

1. He is known for placing an emphasis on emotions and passions.

B. The Noble Savage

1. His early writings characterized man as naturally good.
2. Man is a "noble savage" when in the state of nature.
3. Good people are corrupted by society, which is artificial and corrupt.
4. Society transforms positive self-love into pride which leads people to compare themselves to others.
 - a. This creates fear.
 - b. This permits men to enjoy the pain and weakness of others.
4. Hence society is the source of unhappiness.
5. His view of natural goodness conflicts with the doctrine of original sin and this led to trouble with the church.

C. Discourse on the Arts and Sciences

1. He argues that art and science has not been beneficial to mankind.
2. He contends that advances have made governments more powerful at the expense of individual liberty.
3. He regarded material progress as undermining friendship because it leads to jealousy, fear and suspicion.

D. Discourse on Inequality

1. Examines mankind's move from the state of nature to artificial society.
2. He indicates that the earliest humans were ape like beings that differed from other animals in their free will and perfectibility.
3. The early humans possessed a drive for self preservation as well as a natural inclination for compassion.
4. Population growth forced humans together and lead to a psychological change so their well being depended, in part, on the opinions others held of them
 - a. He saw this a golden age.
5. Agriculture, metallurgy, private property and the division of labor increased inequality.
6. He claims that first state was a social contract created by the powerful and wealthy.
7. He regarded this primal contract as flawed and a trick on the part of the powerful and wealthy to make inequality an enduring aspect of society.
8. He proposes an alternative to this fraudulent contract.
9. He ends by claiming that the desire to be valued by others becomes harmful to integrity and authenticity when society is mired in interdependence, hierarchy, and inequality.

III The Social Contract

A. The work

1. This work was and is extremely influential.

B. Degeneration

1. The state of nature degenerates into lawless state devoid of morality.
2. This creates a need for laws in order for humanity to survive.
3. Man is in competition with man but also dependent-thus threatening survival and independence.

C. Contracting

1. Accepting the social contract permits both survival and liberty.
2. Submitting to the general will
 - a. Prevents individuals from being subordinated to the wills of other individuals.
 - b. Ensures obedience because each is, taken collectively, an author of the contract.
3. Thus, sovereignty lies with the people.

D. Sovereignty and Government

1. The government is to implement and enforce the general will.
2. The government consist of a small number of magistrates.
3. Rousseau rejected the idea of rule by a representative assembly.
4. Instead, he advocated the direct creation of laws.

IV Education

A. Emile

1. A semi-fictitious work about a young boy being educated by Rousseau.
2. He raises Emile in the country because he thinks that is a more natural environment for humans,
3. He believes that cities are physically and mentally corrupting.
4. He claims that education is learning how to live.
5. He claims that education takes place by following a guardian who knows the path to good living.

B Three Sections of Growth

1. The first lasts until the age of 10 or 12 and is a time when complex though is not possible and children are like animals.
2. The second lasts until the age of 15 which he takes to be the start of reason.
3. The last begins at 15 and is the start of adulthood.
4. His overall approach is that a youth must follow his social instincts and must be protected from the corrupting influences of the city-individualism and self-consciousness.

C. Condemnation

1. His theology of nature, as presented by the Savoyard Vicar in *Emile* led to it being condemned by Calvinists and Catholics

Excerpt from *Emile*

Jean-Jacques Rousseau

I The Object of Education

A. Degeneration

1. Coming from the hands of the Author of all things everything is good.

2. In the hands of man, everything degenerates.
3. Man
 - a. Obliges one soil to nourish the productions of another and one tree to bear the fruits of another.
 - b. Mingles and confounds climates, elements, seasons.
 - c. Mutilates his dog, his horse, his slave.
 - d. Overturns everything, disfigures everything.
 - e. Loves deformity and monsters.
 - f. Desires that nothing should be as nature made it, not even man himself.

B. Needs & Education

1. We are born weak, destitute and stupid.
2. So we need strength, assistance and judgment.
3. All that we lack at birth and need when grown up is given us by education.

C. Sources of Education

1. Education comes from nature, other men, or circumstances.
2. The internal development of our faculties and organs is education nature gives us.
3. The use we are taught to make of this development is education from other men.
4. What we learn by experience about things that interest us is the education of circumstances.

D. Nature

1. Watch nature carefully and follow the paths she traces out for you.
2. Nature gives children continual exercise and strengthens their constitution by ordeals and teaches what pain and trouble mean.
3. This is the law of nature.
4. Attempting to correct nature destroys her work and counteracts the effect of all her cares.

II The Education of Emile Age 10 or 12

A. Result: The Pupil at the Age of Ten or Twelve

1. If his method is that of nature and he has made no mistakes, he has conducted his pupil through the region of sensations to the boundaries of childish reason.
2. The first step beyond should be that of a man.

B. Speaking

1. Every age and station in life has perfection, a maturity, all its own.
2. When speaking of what he has thought or done, he speaks of evil as freely as good, not embarrassed by its effect on those who listen.
3. He will use words in all the simplicity of their original meaning.

C. Natural

1. He does not know the meaning of custom or routine.
2. He never follows a rigid formula, or yield to authority or to example.
3. All he does and says is after the natural fashion of his age.
4. Expect no formal speeches or studied manners, but the expression of his own ideas and conduct arising from his inclinations.

D. Moral Ideas

1. He has a few moral ideas in relation to his own concerns, but in regard to men in general, none at all.
 - a. As a child and not yet an active member of society these would be of no use to him.
2. He understands liberty, property, and common consent.
3. He knows why his own things belong to him and those of another do not and beyond this he knows nothing.
4. He does not know the meaning of duty and obedience.
 - a. He does not understand commands.
5. If told that if he will do you a favor, you will do the same for him, then he will readily oblige you.
6. He best likes best to increase his power and to lay you under obligations he knows to be inviolable.
7. Perhaps he enjoys being recognized as somebody and accounted worth something.
 - a. If this is his motive, he has already left the path of nature.
8. Knowing he is free and his own master, he will do nothing from mere thoughtlessness or just to show that he can do it.

III Education of Emile, Age 15

A. Result. The Pupil at the Age of Fifteen

1. He is showing Emile a path to knowledge not difficult, but without limit, slowly measured, endless, and tedious to follow.
2. He is showing Emile how to take the first steps, so that he may know its beginning, but allow him to go no farther.

B. Reason

1. Obligated to learn by his own effort, he employs his own reason, not that of another.
2. Most of our mistakes arise from others.
3. If he is not to be ruled by opinion, he must receive nothing upon authority.
4. Such continual exercise must invigorate the mind as labor and fatigue strengthen the body.

C. Emile's Qualities

1. Emile is industrious, temperate, patient, steadfast, and full of courage.
2. His imagination, never aroused, does not exaggerate dangers.
3. He feels few discomforts and bears pain with fortitude, because he has never learned to contend with fate.
4. He does not yet know what death is, but, accustomed to yield to the law of necessity, he will die when he must, without groan or struggle.
 - a. To live free and to have little to do with human affairs is the best way of learning how to die.

D. More of Emile's Qualities

1. Emile has every virtue which affects himself.
2. To have the social virtues he only needs to know the relations which make them necessary; his mind is ready to receive this.
3. He considers himself independently of others, and is satisfied when others do not think of him at all.
4. He exacts nothing from others, and never thinks of owing anything to them.
5. He is alone in human society, and depends solely upon himself.
6. He has the best right of all to be independent, for he is all that any one can be at his age.
7. He has no errors but such as a human being must have.
8. He has no vices but those from which no one be exempt.
9. He has a sound constitution, active limbs, a fair and unprejudiced mind, a heart free and without passions.
10. Self-love, the first and most natural of all, has scarcely manifested itself at all.
11. Without disturbing any one's peace of mind he has led a happy, contented life, as free as nature will allow...

Equality

I Introduction

A. Equality

1. Moral equality is the view that people are initially moral equals and hence entitled to the same treatment.
 - a. This is consistent with different treatment based on the principle of relevant difference.
 - b. Example: It would be acceptable to treat a good person different from a bad person.
2. Legal equality is the view that people are initially legal equals before the law.
 - a. This is consistent with different treatment based on the principle of relevant difference.
 - b. Example: It is acceptable to punish murderers because their actions provide a relevant difference.
3. The nature of equality is extensively debated because there are many different definitions of "equality."
4. Examples of equality include:
 - a. Equality of opportunity: people are entitled to the same opportunities, but earned inequality is acceptable.
 - b. Equality of treatment/consideration: people are entitled to equal treatment/consideration-perhaps within certain limits.
4. The main debates in this area tend to be over moral and/or legal status.
5. Two main topics of debate in this area are gender equality and racial equality.

B. Questions about Equality

1. What is equality? Are there different types of equality? If so, what are they?
2. Is equality possible? If so, what types are possible? If not, why not?
3. What is inequality? Are there different types of inequality? If so, what are they?
4. Does inequality exist? If so, what are examples of inequality?
5. Why does inequality exist?
6. Is inequality wrong?
7. What, if anything, should be done to put an end to inequality?

Mary Wollstonecraft (April 27, 1759 – September 10, 1797)

I Background

A. Life

1. Born April 27, 1759 in Britain.
2. Married the philosopher William Godwin.
 - a. An atheist.
 - b. A leader in the anarchist movement.
3. Her daughter was Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin (Mary Shelley), the author of *Frankenstein*.
4. She died of puerperal fever on September 10, 1797

B. Feminism

1. She was a feminist.
2. She argued that what is taken as women's nature of women was actually the result of the education imposed by men.
3. She argued that marriage was a form of legal prostitution.
4. She argued in favor of equality and for a rational social order devoid of superstition and prejudice.

C. Works

1. 1787: *Thoughts On The Education Of Daughters: With Reflections On Female Conduct, In The More Important Duties Of Life.*
2. 1790: *A Vindication of the Rights of Men, in a Letter to the Right Honourable Edmund Burke, occasioned by his Reflections on the revolution in France*
3. 1792: *A Vindication Of The Rights Of Woman: With Strictures On Political And Moral Subjects* (1792)
4. 1794: *An Historical And Moral View Of The Origin And Progress Of The French Revolution; And The Effect It Has Produced In Europe.*
5. 1796: *Letters Written During A Short Residence In Sweden, Norway, And Denmark*
6. 1798: *Maria, Or The Wrongs Of Woman*

Vindication of the Rights of Women

-MARY WOLLSTONECRAFT (revised 10/25/03)

I Wealth

- A. Evil flows from the respect paid to property.
 1. Good dispositions are prevented from becoming virtue.
 2. Classes compete to gain respect via property.
 3. Property gains respect that is actually due only to talents and virtue.
- B. Hereditary Wealth
 1. Hereditary wealth and titles produce idleness.
 2. Man can only gain proper use of his faculties by exercising them and won't do so without the motivation of necessity.

II Virtues and Impediments

- A. Acquiring Virtue-Duties
 1. Virtue is acquired only by discharge of duties.
 2. These duties won't seem important to one who has lost his humanity through the flattery of sycophants.
- B. Morality & Equality
 1. More equality in society is needed for morality to gain ground.
 2. Virtuous equality will not be established if half of mankind is continually undermining virtue through ignorance or pride.
- C. Dependence as an impediment to Virtue.
 1. Virtue cannot be expected from women till they are in some degree independent of men.
 2. Natural affection cannot make them good wives and mothers.
 3. While dependent on their husbands they will be cunning, mean, and selfish.
- D. Impediments to Virtue: Wealth, charm, hereditary property.
 1. While wealth enervates men and women live by their charms they cannot discharge the ennobling duties requiring exertion and self-denial.
 2. Hereditary property sophisticates the mind but tends to impede the use of body or mind.
 3. They cannot discern true merit and happiness.
- E. Duties
 1. A society that doesn't compel men and women to discharge their duties is not properly organized.
- F. Happiness
 1. The respect paid to wealth and mere personal charms blights affection and virtue.
 2. When a woman is admired for her beauty and thus neglects the duty of a mother, she sins against herself by not making herself useful and happy.
 4. True happiness (contentment and virtuous satisfaction) arises from well-regulated affections, and affection includes a duty.

II The Slavery of Women

- A. Cause of Misery
 1. Men are unaware of the misery they cause, and vicious weakness they cherish, by only inciting women to be pleasing.
 2. Without realizing, they make natural and artificial duties clash by sacrificing the comfort and respectability of a woman's life to notions of beauty.
 - a. In nature they harmonize.
- B. Distinctions of Rank
 1. A slavery which chains women's souls, keeping her ignorant.
 2. The distinctions of rank
 - a. Make civilization a curse by dividing the world between tyrants and cunning, envious dependents,
 - b. Corrupt every class because respectability is not attached to the discharge of duties of life, but to the station.
 - c. When duties are not fulfilled the affections are too weak to fortify the virtue of which they are the natural reward.
 3. A man might slip free and dare to think and act for himself.

4. For a woman it is a Herculean task, because she has difficulties peculiar to her sex to overcome.

C. Wealth

1. Women and men are rendered weak and luxurious by the relaxing pleasures which wealth procures.
2. Women are made slaves to their persons and must be alluring so men will guide them with their reason.
3. If ambitious, they must govern their tyrants by sinister tricks-without rights there cannot be any incumbent duties.

D. Laws

1. The laws respecting woman make an absurd unit of man and wife.
2. By only considering him responsible, she is reduced to a cipher.

III Duties & Virtues

A. Duties

1. One who discharges the duties of its station is independent.
2. The first duty of women is to themselves as rational creatures.
3. Next as citizens and of a mother.
4. The rank in life which dispenses with this duty necessarily degrades them by making them mere dolls.

B. Society & Duties

1. Someday society will be such that
 - a. A man must fulfill the duties of a citizen or be despised
 - b. His wife, also an active citizen, should be equally intent to manage her family, educate her children, and assist her neighbors.

C. Becoming Virtuous

1. To make her virtuous and useful, a woman must
 - a. Have protection of civil laws.
 - b. Not be dependent on her husband's for subsistence during his life, or support after his death.
2. How can one be generous who has nothing of its own or virtuous who is not free?
3. Take away natural rights, and duties become null.
4. Women must be considered just the wanton solace of men, when they become so weak they cannot exert themselves except in pursuing a frothy pleasure or inventing of a frivolous fashion.

D. Wealth as an Impediment to Virtue & Morality

1. Virtue is not to be acquired by speculation not by the negative supineness that wealth naturally generates.
2. When poverty is more disgraceful than vice morality is cut to the quick.

IV Society

A. Representation

1. Women ought to have representatives, instead of being arbitrarily governed without direct share in the deliberations of government.

B. Problems

1. As the system of representation is only a convenient handle for despotism, they need not complain.
2. They are as well represented as the mechanics supporting the royalty, though they can hardly feed their children.
3. Taxes on necessities of life enable idle royalty to parade before a gaping crowd.
4. Until these monuments of folly are leveled by virtue, similar follies will leaven the whole mass:
 - a. The same character will prevail in society.
 - b. The refinements of luxury or vicious repining of envious poverty, will banish virtue or only allow it to appear as a "stripe in the coat."

C. More Problems

1. In the superior ranks every duty is done by deputies, as if duties could be waived.
2. The vain pleasures which idleness forces the rich to pursue appeals so much to wealth seekers they sacrifice all to follow.
3. Procured by interest and sought for the good company, the most sacred trusts are considered sinecures.
4. Women all want to be ladies: having nothing to do, but listlessly to go they scarcely care where.

D. Solution

1. Women might
 - a. Study the art of healing and be physicians as well as nurses.
 - b. Study politics and settle their benevolence on the broadest basis.
 - c. Pursue business if they were educated in a more orderly manner, which might save many from prostitution.
2. Women would not then marry for a support and neglect the implied duties.
3. Nor would the attempt to earn their subsistence sink them almost to the level of prostitution.
4. The few employments open to women are menial.

E. Government & Virtue

1. Government is very defective, and very unmindful of the happiness of half its members, that does not provide for honest, independent women, by encouraging them to fill respectable stations.
2. To render their private virtue a public benefit, they must have a civil existence in the state, married or single.

3. Or we shall continually see some worthy woman droop like "the lily broken down by a plowshare."

V Respect & Protection

A. Respect

1. The most respectable women are the most oppressed.
2. From being treated as contemptible beings they become contemptible.
3. Women thus waste life away the prey of discontent, who might have
 - a. Been physicians,
 - b. Regulated a farm,
 - c. Managed a shop,
 - d. Stood erect, supported by their own industry.
4. The woman who earns her own bread by fulfilling any duty is more respectable than the most accomplished beauty.

B. Protection

1. Proud of their weaknesses they must be protected and guarded from care and all the rough toils that dignify the mind.
2. If they make themselves insignificant and contemptible, they cannot expect to be valued when their beauty fades.
 - a. It is the fate of the fairest flowers to be admired and pulled to pieces.
3. She fears woman will not listen nor resign the privileges of rank and sex for the privileges of humanity, to which those have no claim who do not discharge its duties

VI Conclusion

A. Entreaty

1. She entreats men to assist to emancipate their companion, to make her a helpmeet for them.

B. Motivation for Men

1. Would men snap the chains, and be content with rational fellowship instead of slavish obedience, they would find
 - a. more observant daughters,
 - b. more affectionate sisters,
 - c. more faithful wives,
 - d. more reasonable mothers
 - e. better citizens.
2. Woman would then love men with true affection, because
 - a. They would learn to respect themselves;
3. The peace of mind of a worthy man would not be interrupted by the idle vanity of his wife, nor would babes sent to nestle in a strange bosom, having never found a home in their mother's.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (January 15, 1929 – April 4, 1968)

I Background

A. Life

1. Born in Atlanta on January 15, 1929
2. Married Coretta Scott on June 18, 1953.
3. Assassinated on April 4, 1968.

B. Education

1. 1948: B.A. in sociology from Morehouse College.
2. He was rejected by Yale Divinity.
3. 1951: Bachelor of Divinity from Crozer Theological Seminary in Chester, Pennsylvania.
4. 1955: Ph.D. in Systematic theology from Boston University.
 - a. It was determined by King Papers scholars that portions of his dissertation and academic papers were plagiarized.
 - b. Boston College did not revoke his degree.

C. Accomplishments & Contributions

1. Nobel Laureate
2. Baptist Minister.
3. Civil rights activist.
4. One of the most significant American leaders.
5. Developed the method of civil disobedience into an effective tool of social change.

I have a Dream

by Martin Luther King, Jr.

Delivered on the steps at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington

D.C. on August 28, 1963

I Why, When and How

A. 100 years ago and now: The problems that remain.

1. The Emancipation Proclamation was signed 100 years ago.
2. The Negro is still not free.
3. The Negro is still crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination.
4. The Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity.
5. The Negro is still languishing in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land.

B. The Basis of the claim (Consistent application).

1. We have come to cash a check.
2. The Constitution and the declaration of Independence are a promissory note to Americans.
3. A promise that all men would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.
4. America has defaulted on this promissory note to her citizens of color.
5. America has given the Negro people a bad check which has come back marked "insufficient funds."
6. We refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt.
7. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity.
8. We have come to cash this check that will give us the riches of freedom and the security of justice.

C. When?

1. The fierce urgency of now.
2. This is no time for the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism.
3. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice.
4. Now is the time to open the doors of opportunity to all of God's children.
5. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood.
6. It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment and to underestimate the determination of the Negro.
7. This sweltering summer of the Negro's legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality.
8. There will be no rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights.
9. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges.

D. How?

1. In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds.
2. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred.
3. We must conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline.
4. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence.
5. We must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force.
6. The militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to distrust of all white people.
7. Many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny and their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom.
8. We cannot walk alone.

E. Marching Ahead

1. We shall march ahead.
2. We cannot turn back.
3. We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities.
4. We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one.
5. We can never be satisfied as long as a Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and a Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote.
6. We will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

II The Dream

A. A dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

1. One day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal."
2. One day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at a table of brotherhood.
3. One day even the state of Mississippi, a desert state, sweltering with the heat of injustice and oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.
4. My four children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.
5. One day the state of Alabama will be transformed into a situation where little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls and walk together as sisters and brothers.
6. One day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

B. Hope, Faith and Freedom

1. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope.
2. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood.

Animals

I Introduction

A. Animals

1. Although concern about ethics and animals is often seen as a relatively recent phenomenon, it has been of concern for centuries.

2. The main debate has centered on the treatment of animals.

B. Common Uses of Animals

1. Food
2. Labor
3. Pets
4. Research
5. Commodities (leather, chemicals, bones, etc.)
6. Entertainment (racing, shows, fighting, etc.)

C. Questions

1. What is the moral status of animals?
 - a. Do they have intrinsic value?
 - b. Do they merely have extrinsic value?
2. Do animals have rights? If so, what are they? If not, why not?
3. Are there moral limits on humanity's use of animals? If so, what are these limits? If not, why not?

D. Views

1. The religious view of Aquinas: God authorizes the killing and using of plants and animals.
2. The scientific view of Descartes: since animals lack minds, killing or eating them is not a crime.
3. The psychological view of Kant
 - a. Animals lack self-consciousness and are hence means not ends.
 - b. The mistreatment of animals inclines a person to mistreat humans.
 - c. People should treat animals well so as to make it more likely that people will treat other people well.
4. The utilitarian view: Animals can count morally and their treatment can be a matter of ethical concern.

Whether It Is Unlawful to Kill Any Living Thing**THOMAS AQUINAS**

From Summa Theologica (c. 1270)

I Objections

A. Objection 1.

1. It seems unlawful to kill living things.
2. Resisting the ordinance of God purchases damnation.
3. Divine providence ordains that all living things should be preserved.
4. Therefore it seems unlawful to take the life of any living thing.

B. Objection 2.

1. Murder is a sin because it deprives a man of life.
2. Life is common to all animals and plants.
3. Hence it is a sin to slay dumb animals and plants.

C. Objection 3.

1. In Divine law a special punishment is only for a sin.
2. A special punishment had to be inflicted by Divine law on one who killed another man's ox or sheep.
3. Therefore the slaying of dumb animals is a sin.

II Augustine

A. Augustine

1. Augustine (De Civ. Dei i, 20): "Thou shalt not kill,"
2. Does not refer to trees because they have no sense.
3. Nor to irrational animals, because they have no fellowship with us.
4. Hence "Thou shalt not kill" refers to the killing of a man."

B. Answer

1. There is no sin in using a thing for the purpose for which it is.
2. The order of things is that the imperfect are for the perfect.

- a. As in the process of generation, nature proceeds from imperfection to perfection.
- 3. Hence just as in the generation of a man there is first a living thing, then an animal, and last a man,
 - a. So things, like plants, having mere life, are for animals, and animals are for man.
- 4. So it is not unlawful for man to use plants for the good of animals, and animals for the good of man, as the Philosopher states (Polit. i, 3).

C. Use

- 1. The most necessary use is that animals use plants, and men use animals, for food, and this requires the deprivation of life.
- 2. So it is lawful to take life from plants for the use of animals, and from animals for the use of men.
- 3. This accord with the commandment of God
 - a. (Gn. 1:29,30): "Behold I have given you every herb ... and all trees ... to be your meat, and to all beasts of the earth"
 - b. (Gn. 9:3): "Everything that moveth and liveth shall be meat to you."

III Replies

A. Reply to Objection 1.

- 1. According to Divine ordinance the life of animals and plants is preserved not for themselves but for man.
- 2. Augustine (De Civ. Dei i, 20): By ordinance both their life and their death are subject to our use.

B. Reply to Objection 2.

- 1. Dumb animals and plants lack the reason to set themselves in motion.
- 2. They are moved by another, by natural impulse.
- 3. A sign of which is they are naturally enslaved and accommodated to the uses of others.

C. Reply to Objection 3.

- 1. He that kills another's ox, sins, not by killing the ox, but by injuring another man in his property.
- 2. This is not the sin of murder but of theft or robbery.

Rene Descartes

I Life & Works

A. Life

- 1. Born March 31, 1596 in La Haye France (now named "Descartes").
- 2. Received a scholastic education at the Jesuit college of La Fleche.
- 3. Earned a degree in law.
- 4. Joined armies to see the world.
- 5. On November 10, 1619, shut in for the winter, he had three vivid dreams.
 - a. The dreams lead to his mission-to solve the mysteries of nature via a philosophy based on mathematical reasoning.
 - b. In gratitude he vowed to make a pilgrimage to the Italian shrine of Our Lady of Loretto.
- 6. In 1649 he became the tutor of Queen Christina of Sweden.
- 7. The cold and his 5:00 am meetings with her eventually lead to his death by pneumonia on February 11, 1650.

B. Published Works

- 1. 1620-Wrote the *Rules for the Direction of the Mind*.
 - a. Published after his death.
- 2. 1633-Wrote *Le Monde (The World)*.
 - a. A work on physics-the world as matter in motion.
 - b. Galileo has been condemned by Rome for a similar view so it was not published until 1664.
- 3. 1637- *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting One's Reason and Seeking the Truth in the Sciences*.
 - a. Written in French rather than Latin.
- 4. 1641-*Meditations on First Philosophy*.
- 5. 1644 *Principles of Philosophy*
 - a. Intended to replace the textbooks based on Aristotle that were used in universities.
- 6. 1649-*Passions of the Soul*

The Automatism of Animals

RENE DESCARTES

From "Letter to Henry More" (c. 1648)

I Error and Motion

A. Error

- 1. The greatest prejudice is believing animals think.
- 2. The error comes from seeing that animals' bodies are similar to ours' in shape and movements.
- 3. It also comes from the belief that our mind is the principle of motions in us, leading us to believe that animals have a mind similar to our own.

B. Two Different Principles of Movements

1. Corporeal Soul: Causes movements that are
 - a. Entirely mechanical and corporeal.
 - b. Depend solely on the force of the animal spirits and the configuration of the bodily parts.
 2. Incorporeal Soul/Mind: a substance which thinks.
 3. After careful inquiry, he demonstrated we cannot prove animals have a soul that thinks.
- C. Appearance of Thought
1. He is not disturbed by the cunning tricks of dogs and foxes, nor by what animals do, from fear, hunger or sport.
 2. This can easily be explained by the conformation of the parts of the animals.
- D. Proof?
1. It is demonstrated that it cannot be proved that the animals have thought.
 2. It cannot be demonstrated that the contrary is not true.
 3. Because the human mind cannot penetrate into the heart to know what goes on there.
- E. Argument For Animals Thinking
1. There is no reason to prove that animals think except that by having organs of sense like ours, it is likely they have sensations as we do.
 2. As thought is involved in our sensations, a similar faculty of thought must be attributed to them.
- F. Criticism of the Argument
1. Being easy, this argument has held possession of all minds from infancy.
 2. There are stronger arguments for the opposite, which fail to readily present themselves.
 3. Example: it is more reasonable to make earthworms, flies, caterpillars, and other animals move as machines do, than to endow them with immortal souls.

II Bodies

- A. Bodies & Motion Argument
1. Animal and human bodies contain bones, nerves, muscles, blood, animal spirits, and other organs which can produce themselves without aid of thought.
 2. In convulsive movements of animals the body often moves with more violence and variety than it with the aid of the will.
- B. Automata Argument
1. Humans can construct automata that move without thought.
 2. If art imitate natures, nature might produce automata, and far more excellent one, as animals are, than those made by people.
 3. So, there is no reason why thought occurs in all cases where there is conformity of bodily members as with animals.
 3. It is more surprising for a soul to be in every human body than none in the animals.
- B. Language Argument -The principal argument that animals are devoid of reason.
1. Some animals in a species are more perfect than others, as among people.
 2. This is particularly noticeable in horses and dogs-some have more capacity to retain what is taught.
 3. All make us understand their natural movements of anger, of fear, of hunger, etc. by voice or other bodily motions.
 4. It has yet to be observed that any animal has such a degree of perfection as to use true language.
 - a. They have not indicated by voice or other signs anything referring to thought alone, rather than to movement of mere nature.
 5. The word is the sole sign and only certain mark of the presence of thought in the body.
 6. All people, even the stupid and foolish, even those lacking organs of speech, use signs.
 7. Animals never do anything of the kind.
 8. This is the true distinction between humans and animals.
- C. Life
1. He speaks of the thought of animals, not of their life, nor sensation.
 2. He does not deny the life of any animal if it consists solely in the warmth of the heart.
 3. He does not refuse to them feeling as far as it depends only on the bodily organs.
 4. His opinion is not so cruel to animals favorable to humans.
 5. He speaks to those not committed to the extravagant position of Pythagoras, who held people under suspicion of a crime who ate or killed animals.

Duties Towards Animals

IMMANUEL KANT

From Lectures on Ethics (c. 1780)

I Animals

- A. Animals
1. Baumgarten speaks of duties towards beings which are beneath us and beings which are above us.
 2. We have no direct duties to animals.
- B. Animals are Merely Means

1. Animals are not self-conscious and hence merely means to an end.
 2. That end is man.
 3. We can ask, "Why do animals exist?"
 4. "Why does man exist?" is a meaningless question.
 5. Our duties towards animals are merely indirect duties towards humanity.
- C. Animal nature is analogous to human nature.
1. By doing our duties to animals in respect of manifestations corresponding to manifestations of human nature, we indirectly do our duty to humanity.
 2. A dog who has served his master long and faithfully, by analogy to human service, deserves reward.
 3. When the dog has grown too old to serve, his master ought to keep him until he dies.
 4. Such action helps support us in our duties towards humans, where they are bounden duties.
- C. Duties Towards Animals
1. If any acts of animals are analogous to human acts and arise from the same principles, we have duties towards the animals because thus we cultivate the corresponding duties towards humans.
 2. If a man shoots his dog because the animal cannot serve:
 - a. He does not fail in his duty to the dog, for the dog cannot judge.
 - b. But his act is inhuman and damages the humanity which it is his duty to show to mankind.
 3. To avoid stifling his human feelings, he must practice kindness towards animals.
 4. He who is cruel to animals becomes hard in his dealings with men.
 4. We can judge the heart of a man by his treatment of animals.
- D. Hogarth's engravings
1. They show cruelty grows and develops.
 - a. A child's cruelty to animals, pinching the tail of a dog or a cat.
 - b. The grown man in his cart running over a child.
 - c. The culmination of cruelty in murder.
 2. He shows the rewards of cruelty.
- E. Love of Animals
1. The more we come in contact with and observe animals, the more we love them, for we see how great their care is for their young.
 2. It is then difficult to be cruel in thought even to a wolf.
- F. Leibniz
1. Leibniz observed a tiny worm and carefully returned it so to avoid harming it.
 2. He would have been sorry to destroy it—a natural feeling for a humane man.
- G. Tender Feelings
1. Tender feelings towards dumb animals develop humane feelings towards mankind.
 2. In England butchers and doctors do not sit on a jury because they are accustomed to the sight of death and hardened.
- H. Treatment of Animals
1. Vivisectionists, using living animals in experiments, act cruelly, though their aim is praiseworthy,
 2. They can justify their cruelty, since animals must be regarded as man's instruments.
 3. Such cruelty for sport cannot be justified.
 4. A master who turns out his ass or his dog because the animal can no longer earn its keep manifests a small mind.
 - a. The Greeks' ideas in this were high-minded, as in the fable of the ass and the bell of ingratitude.
- I. Conclusion
1. Our duties towards animals, then, are indirect duties towards mankind.

Utilitarian Argument

I Argument

- A. Introduction
1. Utilitarian arguments are commonly used to argue in favor of better treatment for animals.
 2. They can also be used to argue against better treatment for animals.
 3. Naturally, such arguments rest on the assumption that utilitarianism is the correct moral theory.
- B. Principle & Scope
1. For the utilitarian, an action is right if it creates more utility for the morally relevant beings than disutility.
 2. A key part of the debate for the utilitarians is the moral status of animals: are they morally relevant or not?
 3. If animals are not morally relevant, then their treatment would not be morally significant.
 4. If animals are morally relevant, then their treatment would be relevant to the moral assessment of actions.
 5. It is possible to accept that animals are morally relevant, but to argue that humans count more than animals.
 - a. Mill argues that humans have higher faculties.
 - b. In such cases animals would count, but would count less than humans.

C. Standard Argument for Animals being Morally Relevant.

1. Most utilitarians, such as Mill, argue that pleasure is of positive value (utility) and pain is of negative value (disutility).
2. Since animals feel pleasure and pain, they would play a role in the calculation of utility and hence would be relevant beings.
 - a. Mill explicitly includes sentient beings within his scope of morality.

D. Template for arguing about specific practices:

1. The utility generated by the practice is assessed.
2. The disutility generated by the practice is assessed.
3. If the disutility outweighs the utility, then the action is immoral.
4. If the utility outweighs the disutility, then the action is moral.

E. Example:

1. Humans enjoy eating veal and gain some pleasure from this.
2. The creation of veal involves imprisoning a calf in a stall that is too small for movement, force feeding the calf which causes the calf to have various problems, and then killing the calf.
3. The horrible treatment of the animals creates more pain than the eating of veal generates.
4. Therefore the treatment of the animals is morally wrong.

F. Example:

1. Humans test important medicines on animals and develop treatments for serious health conditions.
2. The animals involved in the testing suffer from these experiments.
3. However, the animals are treated as humanely as possible and the medicines significantly increase the patients' quality of life and even permit them to keep on living.
4. The benefits of such testing outweigh the suffering of animals, therefore the testing is morally acceptable.

Part Four: Rights & Liberty

Rights & The Basis of Society

I Rights

A. Questions

1. Do people have natural rights?
2. If people have natural rights, what is the basis for those rights?
3. What artificial rights should people have?
4. What rights should people have against the state?

B. Rights

1. A positive right is an entitlement.
 - a. Example: Hobbes' right to all things.
2. A negative right forbids others from taking a specific action against the person.
 - a. Example: A right to free speech forbids others from interfering with such speech.
3. Sometimes whether a right is positive or negative is a matter of perspective.
 - a. Example: the right to life could be seen as entitling people to life or forbidding others to kill them.

C. The Purpose of Rights

1. To define limits on human actions.
2. To define entitlements.

D. Natural Rights

1. Natural rights are rights that a person possesses in virtue of being a person.
2. Natural rights are not dependent on society.
3. There is considerable dispute over whether there are such rights.
4. There is also considerable dispute among those who accept such rights in regards to their basis and content.
 - a. Locke bases his natural rights on God.
 - b. Hobbes bases his natural rights on nature and reason.

E. Artificial Rights

1. Artificial rights are those that are granted by the rules/laws of society or other organization.
2. These rights are created by people and enforced (or not) by people.
3. These include such things as legal rights, civil rights, employee rights, etc.
4. The artificial rights might or might not be regarded as being grounded on something other than convention.
5. People sometimes tend to come to regard artificial rights as being natural rights or as guaranteed entitlements.
6. People often make the mistake that a right in one area entail a comparable right in another area.
 - a. Example: People often take the 1st Amendment as granting a moral right against censorship to artists.

F. Rights in Society

1. According to most natural rights theorists, some natural rights are given up when one enters society.
 - a. Example: For Hobbes, a person gives up his right to all things when entering society.
2. According to most natural rights theorists, some natural rights are retained when entering society.
 - a. Example: For Locke, one retains the rights to life, liberty and property.

G. Rights against the government

1. One matter of debate is what rights citizens have against their own government.
2. Such rights limit, in theory, the power of the government over the people.
3. Artificial rights often include limits the government has set on itself by the lawmakers.
 - a. Example: The US Constitution specifies many rights that limit the government.
4. Natural rights are often taken as limiting the government.
 - a. Example-Locke: The rights to life, liberty and property restrict the government.
 - b. Example-Hobbes: People have only the right to attempt self preservation against the sovereign.

II The State of Nature

A. The State

1. A situation in which there is a complete absence of political and legal authority.
2. There is no state, government, artificial laws or other societal limits on behavior.

B. Purpose

1. The state of nature is primarily used to examine the basis for governmental authority.
2. Thinkers consider what is involved in making the transition from the state of nature to the civil state.
3. It is also used to examine the basis of both natural and artificial rights.
4. Thinkers consider what rights people might possess prior to society and then in society.

C. Real?

1. There is some dispute over whether there ever was such a general state in the past.
2. Some thinkers present it as purely theoretical device.
3. Some thinkers, such as Locke, claim that such a general state did exist.
4. It is generally accepted that nations exist in the state of nature.
5. It is generally accepted that the state of nature does arise in certain circumstances.
 - a. Example: Failures of civil authority in disasters and riots.
6. In any case, whether the state did exist or not does not seem critical to the purposes for which it is used.

III The Basis of Political Authority

A. Authority

1. Authority is the capacity to be obeyed without the need to expend power (such as force).
2. It is generally accepted that states have authority over their citizens and hence that citizens have an obligation to obey.
3. It is also generally accepted that there are some limits on the authority of states.

B. The Basis of Authority

1. What is the basis of authority?
2. The most practical answer is power-those who can make initially force people to obey eventually gain authority.
3. Some have held that rulers gain their authority from a divine source.
 - a. Example: The European concept of the divine right of kings.
 - b. Example: The ancient view that rulers were of divine origin.
4. Some base it on the consent of the people.
5. Some base it on heredity-authority is passed down within a family.
 - a. This pushes the question back to the original basis of this authority.

C. The Legitimate limits of authority.

1. What are the legitimate limits of authority?
2. Some thinkers place strict moral limits, often based on rights, on the authority of the state.
 - a. Example: Locke.
3. Some thinkers place few or no moral limits on the authority of the state.
 - a. Example: Hobbes.

D. Obedience

1. Are citizens morally obligated to obey the state?
2. Some thinkers argue that citizens are so obligated in varying degrees.
 - a. Examples: Locke, Hobbes, Socrates.
3. Others argue for a moral basis for disobedience in varying degrees.
 - a. Examples: Locke, Thoreau, King, Gandhi.

E. Purpose of the State

1. What is the purpose of the state?
2. Most thinkers take the main functions of the state to be the protection of the citizens and the enforcement of laws.
3. Other thinkers attribute more functions to the state beyond the minimum.
4. Some thinkers, such as Locke, argue that the state is obligated to do good for the citizens.
5. Some thinkers, such as Aristotle, argue that the state should actively make people good.

Thomas Hobbes: Physics & Politics

I View of Politics

A. Experience

1. Hobbes lived during the English civil war.
2. He switched allegiances several times between the royalists and anti-royalists.
3. He always timed his switches badly, often ending up in danger.

B. Conclusions drawn from experience

1. If there is not a stable government, then there is chaos.
2. Chaos is to be avoided at all costs.
3. Chaos can only be prevented by a strong government.

C. Method

1. He attempts to present an analysis that explains society.
2. Using a method derived from geometry, he starts with a set of indubitable axioms about human nature and then deduces theorems from them.
3. His goal is not to present an historical account as to how government arose.

4. His goal is to show how government is justified in terms of the laws of human nature and the required form of a rational government.

II The State of Nature

A. State of Nature

1. A thought experiment.
2. In this state all are equal and everyone has a right to all things.
 - a. Equal in terms of a lack of distinctions based on society such as ranks or privileges.
3. Given his materialism and psychological hedonism, there is no objective moral order that humans are subject to.
4. In the state of nature, "right" means "freedom based on power."
5. "Every man has a right to everything; even to one another's body."

B. Egoism

1. Hobbes takes humans to be egoists, with each looking out for himself.
2. He rejects Aristotle's view that people are social by nature.
3. He claims that people have no natural love or sympathy for other humans.
4. Bodies are driven by their desire to survive and there is nothing to create harmony in the motions.
5. The state of nature is a terrible state devoid of the benefits of civilization.
6. The state of nature is a state "of continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short."

Of the State of Men without Civil Society

Thomas Hobbes Revised 11/8/2005

I Hobbes' Purpose

A. Faculties of Human Nature

1. Faculties of human nature: strength, experience, reason, passion.

B. Purpose

1. To examine the inclinations men bear towards each other.
2. To examine if and how they are born apt for society and to preserve themselves against mutual violence.
3. To show the conditions of society or of human peace.
4. To show the fundamental laws of nature.

II Society & Coming Together

A. Other Thinkers

1. Others suppose man is a born fit for society.
2. The Greeks based their doctrine of civil society on this.
 - a. As if peace and government only required that men make covenants called laws.
3. This is accepted by most but is an error due to not understanding human nature.

B. Why Men Come Together

1. Men come together by accident, not necessity.
2. If by nature men loved one another as men
 - a. Each would equally love every man as being equally man.
 - b. He would not prefer those providing honor or profit.
3. We do not seek society for its own sake but for honor or profit.

C. Why Men Meet

1. How men do meet is best known by observing their meetings:
2. For traffic: men regard their business not their fellow.
3. For office: a market-friendship, more jealously than love, arises
 - a. Faction may arise, but not good will.
4. For recreation:
 - a. What stirs up laughter please most.
 - b. By comparing himself to another man's defects, his self-opinion improves.
 - c. Men are less delighted with the society than their own glory.
 - d. We wound the absent.
5. Relating stories
 - a. If one speaks of himself the others desire to speak of themselves.
 - b. If one tells of a wonder, the rest tell of Miracles.
 - c. Those who pretend to be wiser, would be esteemed masters, or persecute their fellows.

6. All interaction comes from poverty or vain glory- all try to acquire some benefit or honor.

D. Contracting for Society

1. When we contract society we look for what each sees as his good.
2. What seems good is pleasant and relates to senses or mind.
3. The mind's pleasure is glory (to have a good opinion of one's self) and the sensual or conveniences.

E. Motivation to Form Society

1. All society is either for gain or glory-not so much for love of our fellows, as for the love of ourselves.
2. No society can be great or lasting which begins from vain glory;
3. Glory is like honor -if all have it, no one does-they consist in comparison.
4. The society of others doesn't advance my glorying in myself.

F. Dominion

1. Though mutual help is beneficial, more is attained by dominion, than by society.
2. Men would by nature, if fear were removed, rather obtain dominion than gain society.

III Society, Equality and Fear

A. The origin of all great and lasting societies

1. Lies not in mutual good will men had towards each other.
2. Lies in the mutual fear they had of each other.
3. The cause of mutual fear: the natural equality of men and their mutual will of hurting.

B. Equality

1. We cannot expect security.
2. The body is vulnerable even the weakest can easily kill the strongest.
3. No one should conceive himself naturally above others.
4. Equals: those who can do equal things against each other;
5. Those who can do the greatest thing, kill, can do equal things.
6. So, all men are by nature equal.
7. Current inequality stems from civil law.

C. Will to Hurt

1. All in the state of nature have a desire and will to hurt but not from the same cause or equally to be condemned.
2. One according to natural equality permits as much to others as to himself.
 - a. His will to hurt comes from defending himself from violence.
3. Another supposes himself above others and wants to do what he wishes
 - a. His will to hurt comes from vain glory and false esteem for his strength.

D. Combat of Wits

1. Combat of wits is the fiercest, and so causes the greatest discords.
 - a. It is odious to contend and to not consent.
 - b. A failure to approve is tacitly to accuse of error.
 - c. To dissent is like calling him a fool.
2. The sharpest wars are between sects of the same religion and factions of the same commonwealth.
3. Pleasure of the mind consists in finding something in which to triumph and vaunt itself.
4. Men sometimes declare scorn and contempt by laughter, words, gesture, or sign.
5. There is no greater vexation and this yields the greatest desire to hurt.

E. Most Common Cause of the Desire to Hurt

1. Many desire the same thing at the same time.
2. And cannot (or will not) share or divide it.
3. The strongest must have it, and this must be decided by the sword.

III The Right to All Things

A. The Foundation of Natural Right

1. Each desires what is good for him and shuns what is evil.
2. The chief natural evil is death.
3. It is not against reason to use all efforts to defend one's body.
4. What is not contrary to right reason all account to be done justly and with right;
5. Right: the liberty every man has to use his natural faculties according to right reason.
6. The first foundation of natural right: every man as much as in him lies endeavors to protect his life and members.

B. Right to the Means

1. It is vain to have a right to an end if the right to the means is denied.
2. As each has a right to preserve himself, he must be allowed a right to use all means and actions to preserve himself.
3. Whether the means and action are necessary he, by right of nature, must judge.

C. Right to All

1. Nature has given every one a right to all.
2. It was lawful for all in the state of nature, before men had formed covenants or bonds:
 - a. To do what he would against whom he thought fit.
 - b. To possess, use, and enjoy all he would, or get.
3. Whatever a man would do seems good to him because he wills it:
 - a. Either it does or at least seems to contribute to his preservation,
 - b. He is the judge of whether it does or not.
4. In the state of nature, to have all, and do all, is lawful for all.
5. Nature has given all to all and in the state of nature, profit is the measure of right.

IV War of All Against All

A. No Right at All

1. It was the least benefit for men to have a common right to all things.
2. The effects of this right are the same, almost, as if there had been no right at all.
3. Though any might say of every thing, this is mine, he could not enjoy it, because of his neighbor.
4. Who having equal right, and equal power, would pretend the same thing was his.

B. War of All Against All

1. Cause of the war.
 - a. Natural proclivity of men, to hurt each other.
 - b. Chiefly from a vain esteem of themselves.
 - c. The right of all to all, by which one invades and the other resists.
 - d. Perpetual jealousies and suspicions.
2. The natural state of men, before society, was a war of all men against all men.

C. Perpetual War

1. Perpetual war is disagreeable to the preservation of mankind, or each man.
2. It is perpetual because the equality prevents victory.
3. Life was fierce, short, poor, nasty, and deprived of pleasure, and beauty, which peace and society can bring.

D. Not the Best to Continue in the State

1. Who claims it was best to continue in that state contradicts himself.
2. Each by natural necessity desires that which is good for him.
3. No one takes a war of all against all to be good for him.

E. Getting Fellows

1. Through fear of each other we think it fit to rid ourselves of this condition, and get some fellows.
2. If there must be war, it may not be against all men, nor without help.
2. Fellows are gotten by constraint, or consent.
3. Constraint, when the conqueror makes the conquered serve him, by fear of death or fetters.
4. Consent, when men enter into society to help each other, both parties consenting without constraint.

F. Conquering

1. The conqueror may by right compel the conquered or the strongest the weaker.
 - a. As a man in health may one that is sick, or the older a child
2. The right of protecting ourselves proceeded from our danger, and our danger from our equality.
 - a. So it is more reasonable, and more certain for conservation, to use the present advantage to secure ourselves now than when they are grown and strong.
 - b. Nothing is more absurd than discharging one you have in your power, making him both an enemy and a strong one.
3. A sure and irresistible power confers the right of dominion and ruling over those who cannot resist;

G. The Dictate of the Law of Nature

1. No lasting preservation can be expected in the state of nature (of war) because of equality of power, and other human faculties.
2. The dictate of right reason/law of nature: Seek peace when it can be attained and when not enquire out for auxiliaries of war.

Hobbes' Social Contract & Sovereign

I Natural Laws

A. Natural Laws

1. Hobbes does not follow the ancient & medieval view that natural laws are part of an objective moral order.
2. These laws are general rules that are discovered by understanding the nature of the physical world.

B. The Laws

1. The first law is the law of survival, which gives everyone the right to all things.
2. Seek peace, but be prepared to preserve your life by any and all means.
3. We should give up our right to all things, provided that everyone does so, in order to keep the peace.

C. The Sovereign

1. We agree to give up our right to all things out of selfishness.
2. Given that humans are egoists, there must be a coercive power to compel people to abide by their agreements.
3. This is done by having all “confer all their power and strength upon one man or assembly of men, that may reduce their all their wills, by plurality of voices, unto one will.”
4. He calls the sovereign “an artificial man”, the “great leviathan” and “that mortal god.”
5. This is the origin of social contract theory-the theory that governments are created by humans via agreement.

II Social Contract

A. The Contract

1. In the contract each gives up his rights to a sovereign.
2. It is as if each person signs the following agreement: “I authorize and give up my right of governing myself to this man or assembly of men, on this condition, that thou give up thy right to him and authorize all his actions in a like manner.”
3. The contract is between individuals and not between the citizens and the state.
4. Once people agree to create the sovereign, they give up all rights over it-except the right of self-preservation which is still retained.
5. His theory does not require any particular form of government, although he expressed preference for a single ruler.
6. He does not present any notion of a division of power, most likely because he saw the English civil war as arising from a division of power between the king, lords and House of Commons.

B. The Sovereign

1. He considered the worst tyrant to be preferable to no government or a weak government.
2. His sovereign has absolute power.

C. Rights & Morality

1. The only rights citizens possess are those granted by the sovereign.
2. The sovereign cannot act unjustly because all law and justice stem from governmental authority.
3. Hobbes is a legal positivist-what the state defines what is legal and illegal and this determines what is “right” and “wrong.”
4. If people were permitted to decide which laws were just and which unjust, the result would be chaos.

D. Reaction

1. The royalists did not like his rejection of the divine right of kings and wanted a more substantial and dignified foundation to government than a sovereign created out of fear and desperation.
2. Those with democratic leanings did not like the absolute power the sovereign was imbued with.

John Locke

I Background

A. Early years & Education

1. Born in 1632 into a Puritan family.
2. Educated at Oxford in theology, natural science, philosophy and medicine.
3. Described as “a man of turbulent spirit, clamorous and never contented.”
3. He Found Oxford’s Scholasticism to be “perplexed with obscure terms and useless questions.”
4. He read the works of Descartes on his own.
5. He was a lecturer at Oxford in Greek and rhetoric for a short while.

B. Public Life

1. 1667-1683 he served as the doctor and adviser to Lord Ashley (who became the Earl of Shaftsbury).
2. Held a variety of political offices.
3. 1669 He helped draft a constitution for the Carolinas.

C. Revolution

1. The Parliament of England and the throne had been struggling with each other for decades.
2. Locke supported parliamentary rights.
3. Locke fled England for Holland in 1683 when James II took the throne.
4. In 1689, after the Glorious Revolution of 1688 which replaced James II with William of Orange, he returned to England.
5. He held various political offices.

D. Works

1. 1690: *Two Treatises on Government* and *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*.
2. 1689-1692: *Letters Concerning Toleration*.
3. 1693: *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*.
4. 1695: *The Reasonableness of Christianity*.

E. The End

1. In 1691 he entered into partial retirement and moved 20 miles outside of London.
2. He spent his remaining years studying the scriptures and enjoying the company of friends.
3. He died in 1704.

Locke's Political Philosophy**I Background****A. Background**

1. Those supporting a more democratic government and a Protestant monarchy struggled against those supporting a Catholic absolute monarchy.
2. Locke's political theory was a brilliant summary and enhancement of existing ideas.
3. Presented in *Two Treatises on Government* published anonymously in 1690.
4. The preface states that it is intended to justify the 1688 revolution, but he had been writing the essays for several years.

II The State of Nature**A. The State**

1. Prior to government.
2. People are free and independent.
3. People are equal in that no one has jurisdiction over anyone else.
4. His argument does not require that such a state ever existed, though he claims there are examples:
 - a. The American wilderness of his time.
 - b. Relations between states.
 - c. Individuals outside of nations, such as people shipwrecked.
5. A key claim is that the status of the individual is more fundamental than the state.

B. Locke's Assumptions

1. People are independent individuals.
2. Society is a complex entity composed of individuals.

C. Differences from Hobbes' State of Nature

1. Hobbes' state of nature is a war of all against all.
2. Locke's state of nature is one of peace, goodwill and mutual assistance.
3. Locke's state of nature includes property rights.

D. The Qualities of the State of Nature

1. People are governed only by the law of nature and reason which is "intelligible and plain" to all.
2. Individuals are free and independent.
3. There are natural and informal social relations.

OF CIVIL-GOVERNMENT**John Locke**

Revised 11/8/2005

C H A P. I I.**Of the State of Nature****I The State of Nature & Natural Rights****A. The State of Nature**

1. A state of perfect freedom.
2. People do as they think fit with their possessions and persons within the limits of the law of nature.
3. A state of equality-no one has more power and jurisdiction than another.
 - a. Creatures of the same species are equal without subordination or subjection.
 - b. Unless God has given dominion.
4. A state of liberty but not license.
5. Each has an uncontrollable liberty regarding his person or possessions.

B. Rights to life, liberty and property.

1. Man lacks the liberty to destroy himself, or any creature, if a nobler use than its bare preservation requires it.
2. Reason, the law of nature, teaches that being equal and independent, no one ought to harm another's life, health, liberty, or possessions.

C. Men are God's Property

1. Men are creations and servants of God.
2. Men are His property and made to last during his, not one another's pleasure.
3. Having like faculties, sharing all in nature, there is no subordination among us authorizing us to destroy one another.
4. As if we were made for one another's uses, as the inferior ranks of creatures are for our use.

D. Obligation to Preserve Life

1. Everyone is bound to preserve himself.

2. So when his own preservation is not in competition he should preserve the rest of mankind as much as he can.
3. He may not, except for justice, take away, or impair the life, or what aids the preservation of life, liberty, health, limb, or goods of another.

II Punishment & Power

A. The Right to Punish

1. To restrain men from invading others' rights and doing hurt and for the law of nature be observed, which wills the peace and preservation of all mankind:
 - a. The execution of the law of nature is in every one's hands.
 - b. Everyone has a right to punish transgressors of the law to the degree that hinders its violation.
3. The law of nature would be in vain if none had power to execute it.
4. If any in the state of nature may punish another for doing evil all may do so.
 - a. In the state of equality what any may do in prosecution of that law all must have a right to do.
5. Thus one comes by a power over another.

B. Limits of and Justification of Punishment

1. There is no absolute or arbitrary power to use a criminal.
2. Only for retribution proportional to the transgression: as much as needed for reparation and restraint.
3. These are the two only reasons why men may lawfully do harm to another.

C. Further Justification of Punishment

1. By breaking the law of nature, the offender rejects the rule of reason and common equity.
 - a. This rule is the measure God set to the actions of men for mutual security.
 - b. He thus becomes dangerous to mankind.
2. Every man, by the right to preserve mankind, may restrain, or if necessary, destroy noxious things.
3. So each may bring such evil on any who transgress that law to make him repent and deter him, and by his example other.
4. On this ground, every man has a right to punish the offender execute the law of nature.

D. Injury and Reparation

1. Injury is commonly done in crime.
2. The damaged person has the right of punishment, as do all men.
3. Further, the damaged person has a particular right to seek reparation from the injurer.
4. Any other may assist him in recovering from the offender fair compensation for the harm suffered.

E. Right of Punishment & Right of Reparation

1. Two distinct rights:
 - a. The right of punishing the crime to deter other crimes is held by all.
 - b. The right of taking reparation is the right of the injured party.
2. From these the magistrate acquires the right of punishing, but he cannot remit the satisfaction due for damage received.
3. The injured person has a right to demand in his own name, and he alone can remit.
 - a. The harmed person has the power of appropriating the goods or service of the offender, by right of self-preservation.

F. Right to Kill Murderers

1. Thus every man, in the state of nature, has a power to kill a murderer,
2. To deter others from doing like injury, which no reparation can compensate.
3. To secure men from the criminal, who by his murder has declared war against all.
4. And therefore may be destroyed as a wild beast.
5. This is the ground of great law of nature: Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.

III The State of War

A. The state of war Defined

1. A state of enmity and destruction.

B. Initiating the State of War

1. Declaring by word or action a sedate settled design upon another man's life, puts him in a state of war with that man.
2. This exposes his life to the other's power to take it and any who join with him.

C. The Right to Destroy

1. It is reasonable and just to have a right to destroy what threatens me with destruction.
2. By the fundamental law of nature man is to be preserved as much as possible.
3. When all cannot be preserved the safety of the innocent is to be preferred.
4. One may destroy a man making war on him, or is an enmity to him, for the same reason he may kill a wolf or a lion.
5. Such men are not under the common law of reason, have no other rule, but of force and violence.
6. So may be treated as beasts of prey that are sure to destroy him whenever he falls into their power.

D. Attempts to Enslave Initiate the State of War

1. One attempting to get another into his absolute power puts himself into a state of war with him.
2. He who would get me into his power without my consent would use and even destroy me.

3. None desire to have me in his absolute power except to compel by force what is against the right of freedom- make me a slave.
4. Freedom from such force is the only security of my preservation.
5. Reason shows one who would take away the freedom is an enemy to my preservation.
6. One who attempts to enslave me puts himself into a state of war with me.
7. He that, in the state of nature, would take away the freedom of any must be seen as intending to take all the rest.
8. He, that in the state of society, would take away the freedom of society's members, must be seen as intending to take away every thing else, and so be a state of war.

E. The Right to Kill a Thief

1. It is lawful for one to kill a thief, who has not hurt him, nor declared any intent on his life.
2. By his use of force, where he has no right, he gives no reason to think he might take everything else.
3. Thus it is lawful to treat him as if we are in a state of war: I can kill him if I can.
4. The aggressor who introduces the state of war justly exposes himself to the hazard of being killed.

F. The State of Nature and the State of War

1. The state of nature and the state of war are as distant, as a state of peace, good will, mutual assistance and preservation, and a state of enmity, malice, violence and mutual destruction.
2. Men living together according to reason, without a common superior on earth with authority to judge, is the state of nature.
3. But force, or declaration of force without such a superior to appeal to for relief, is the state of war.
4. The lack of such an appeal gives a man the right of war even against an aggressor in society.

G. The Right of Self Defense

1. I can only harm a thief who steals everything by appealing to the law.
2. I may kill him when he tries to rob me.
3. The law, made for my preservation, if it cannot secure my life (which cannot be restored) permits my defense.
4. The right of war permits a liberty to kill the aggressor,
5. Because the aggressor does permit appeal to a common judge, nor the law in a case where the harm may be irreparable.
6. Lack of a judge with authority puts all in a state of nature:
7. Force without right, upon a man's person, makes a state of war, both where there is, and is not, a common judge.

V. Of PROPERTY.

A. Common Property & Appropriation

1. The earth is given by God to men for the support and comfort of their being.
3. Its fruits and beasts belong to mankind in common, since they are the product of nature.
4. No one has originally a private, exclusive dominion in any of them, as they are in their natural state.
5. Being given for the use of men, there must be a means to appropriate them before they can be useful or to any particular man.
6. The fruit, or venison, which nourishes one must be his, and another can not have any right to it, before it can do him any good.

B. The Basis of Property

1. The earth, and inferior creatures are common to all.
2. Every man has a property in his own person and no one else has a right to it.
2. His labor and work are properly his.
3. What he removes out of nature and mixes his labor with, joining to it something of his, makes it his property and removes it from the common state.
4. The Proviso: The labor being the property of the laborer, only he has a right to what it is joined to, at least where there is enough, and as good, left in common for others.

C. Limits of Property

1. Though property is made by labor, one may not take as much as he will.
2. The same law of nature that gives property also bounds that property.
 - a. God has given us all things richly (1 Tim. vi. 12.) and He has given it to us to enjoy.
3. A man may make his as much as he can use to any advantage of life before it spoils.
4. Whatever is beyond this, is more than his share, and belongs to others.
5. Nothing was made by God for man to spoil or destroy.
6. Considering the plentiful resources and the few spenders; and the limits of one man's there was then little room for quarrels or contentions about property so established.

D. Gold & Silver

1. Gold and silver, of little use relative to food, raiment, and carriage, have value only from the consent of men.
2. Men have agreed to a disproportionate and unequal possession of the earth.
3. They have, by tacit and voluntary consent, found a way how one may fairly possess more land than whose product he can use.
4. This is by receiving gold & silver in exchange for the surplus, which may be hoarded without injury since these metals do not spoil or decay.
5. This unequal division of private possessions is made practicable without compact by:
 - a. Valuing gold and silver.
 - b. Tacitly agreeing in the use of money.

6. In governments laws regulate the right of property and the possession of land is determined by positive constitutions.

VI Tyranny

A. Tyranny Defined

1. Tyranny is the exercise of power beyond right, which none have a right to.
2. This is using power, not for the good of those under it, but for his own private separate advantage.

B. Tyranny Occurs When the governor, however entitled:

1. Makes his will and not the law the rule
2. Does not direct his commands and actions to the preservation of the properties of his people,
3. Directs them to the satisfaction of his own ambition, revenge, covetousness, or any other irregular passion.

B. Tyranny

1. Where law ends, tyranny begins, if the law is transgressed to another's harm.
2. One in authority who exceeds the power give by law, and uses force in ways not allowed by law ceases to be a magistrate.
3. Acting without authority, he may be opposed, like any using force to invade the right of another.
4. He that has authority to seize me in the street may be opposed as a thief if he tries to break into my house to execute a writ.
 - a. Even if he has a warrant, and legal authority to arrest me abroad.
5. This holds for the highest and least magistrate.
 - a. It is not right for he eldest, because he has the most, to take away his younger brothers' portions?
 - b. Or that a rich man should have a right to seize the cottage and garden of his poor neighbor?
6. Exceeding the bounds of authority is no more right in a great than a petty officer; no more justifiable in a king than a constable.
7. This is much worse in one who has more trust put in him and has already a much greater share, and is supposed from his education, employment, and counselors, to know more of right and wrong.

Obedience & Disobedience

Revised 11/8/05

I Introduction

A. Questions

1. Do citizens have an obligation to obey the state? If so why? If not, why not?
2. If citizens are obligated to obey the state, what is the extent of that obligation?
3. What should an individual do when his/her conscience conflicts with the orders of the state/authority?
4. Are humans obedient by nature?

B. Stanley Milgram: "Obedience to Authority"

1. Two people would participate.
 - a. The learner, who was an actor
 - b. The teacher
2. The procedure:
 - a. The learner would have an electrode attached.
 - b. The teacher would have a control panel they were told would administer electric shocks ranging in intensity.
 - c. The learner was to learn a list of word pairs, and each error would result in a "shock" being administered.
3. The Results:
 - a. The majority (2/3rds) of people administered the shocks, all the way up to the highest setting.
 - b. This was in despite the pleading and obvious "pain" of the learner.
 - c. They did this when the experiment director told them to continue.
 - d. The experimenter had no power to enforce his imperatives.
5. Those asked to make a moral judgment on appropriate behavior in the situation unflinchingly see disobedience as proper.

C. Basis of Obedience

1. It is generally accepted that citizens have an obligation to obey the state.
2. One common argument is that the obligation is based on the fact that the state benefits the citizens.
3. Another common argument is that the citizens agree to obey the state.
4. In the past, some rulers claimed a divine or other special right to be obeyed.
5. One pragmatic argument is that the obligation is merely practical-citizens should obey to avoid being harmed.

D. Obedience and Disobedience

1. There is extensive debate over the basis and extent of this obligation.
2. One extreme view is that the citizens owe complete and unquestioning obedience to the state.
3. Another extreme view is that the citizens have no obligation at all to obey the state.
4. More moderate views hold that the degree of obedience owed to the state lies somewhere between the two extremes.

E. Conscience

1. The main focus of the moral debate tends to be on the conflict between the individual's conscience and the obligation to obey.
2. In some cases the individual's conscience/morality is good and the orders of the state are morally wrong.

- a. Example: A soldier who morally opposes an order to massacre civilians.
 3. In some cases the individual's conscience/morality is bad and the orders of the state are morally right,
 - a. Example: A racist police officer who is ordered to protect civil rights marchers.
 4. In some cases both are bad or both are good.
 5. One plausible approach to resolving the dispute is by assessing the moral status of the individual and that of the state.
 6. Naturally, there is extensive moral debate over whether the individual's or state's view is actually right or wrong.
- F. Specific Situations
1. The debate over obedience is often focused on specific situations or types of situations.
 2. In some cases, the individual's profession puts the person under a special obligation to obey.
 - a. Example: Soldiers are especially expected to obey authority, but they are still held to standards of moral responsibility.
 - b. Example: Police are also especially expected to obey the authority of the law.
 - c. Example: Government officials are also expected to dutifully obey the laws of the state.
 3. In some cases, the individual's choices or agreements puts the person under a special obligation.
 - a. Example: American males must register for the selective service in order to receive federal financial aid and are expected to serve if called upon.

Socrates & Obedience

I Social & Political Philosophy

A. Distrust of Democracy

1. Since competence is a matter of knowledge, ruling requires knowledge.
2. People with such knowledge, which is philosophical, will be uncommon.
3. As we would not choose a doctor by voting, we should not choose leaders that way.

B. Laws

1. The state should be obeyed.
2. Those that disagree with the laws should either persuade the leaders to change the laws or leave the state.
3. Though Socrates was unjustly convicted, he believed that disobedience would be an injustice and harm him worse than death.
4. He did say that he would practice philosophy even if the state ordered him not to—but this would still show respect for the state. By trying to persuade the leaders to change and by his willingness to accept the consequences of his actions.

C. Social Contract Theory

1. We have an implicit contract with the state.
2. We receive certain goods in exchange for our obedience.
3. We should keep to our just contracts.

D. Natural Law Theory

1. There is a universal moral law that can be known via reason and experience.
2. This law is not created by people and is above the laws of specific states.
3. The laws of specific states can be judged against these laws.

Crito Argument Outline

Revised 11/8/2005

I The issue

A. The issue:

1. Is attempting to escape attempting an injustice?

II The First Argument

A. The state benefited Socrates:

1. The state brought Socrates into the world
2. The state raised him.
3. The state educated him.
4. The state gave him and every other citizen a share of all the good things it could.

B. Freedom to leave

1. Any man who is dissatisfied with the state may take his goods and leave as soon as he reaches manhood and sees the laws and the administration of the state.
2. But anyone who remains having seen how justice is administered and how the state is governed has agreed, by the very fact of remaining here, to do what the laws tell him.

C. He who disobeys us acts unjustly on three counts:

1. He disobeys us who are his parents.
2. He disobeys us who reared him.
3. He disobeys us after he has agreed to obey us, without persuading us that we are wrong.

II The Second Argument

A. Socrates Could have Chosen Exile

1. Socrates could have offered to go into exile at his trial
2. At that time he could have chosen exile with the state's consent rather now escaping into exile without it.
3. But he gloried in being willing to die and said that you preferred death to exile.
4. To try to escape now would not honor those words- he would not respect the laws for he would be:
 - a. Trying to destroy the laws.
 - b. Trying to run away, and breaking the contracts and agreement which he made to live as a citizen.

II The Third Argument

A. The Contract Argument

1. Socrates has agreed not in mere words, but in his actions, to live under the government of Athens.
2. He would be breaking his contracts and agreements with the state.
3. He was not led to make them by force or by fraud.
4. He did not have to make up his mind in a hurry:
 - a. He might have left anytime during his 70 years if he had been dissatisfied with the laws or if the agreement had seemed unjust.
5. But he preferred neither Sparta nor Crete, nor any other state of the Greeks or barbarians.
6. He, far more than other Athenians, was satisfied with the state and with the laws (no one would be satisfied with a state with no laws).
7. To now not abide by his agreements and leave Athens would make him look ridiculous.

Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862)

I Background

A. Life

1. 1817: Born in Concord, Massachusetts.
2. 1837: Graduated from Harvard.
3. Resigned from teaching in Concord to protest the whipping of students.
4. Worked in his father's pencil factory.
5. 1838: Opened a private school in Concord with his brother John.
 - a. The school was based on transcendentalism.
 - b. A literary and philosophical movement supported by Ralph Waldo Emerson, Bronson Alcott, and Orestes Brownson
 - c. There is an ideal spiritual state 'transcends' the physical and empirical world.
 - d. This state is only known by intuitive awareness.
6. July 4, 1845 to September 6 1847 he lived on Emerson's land by Walden Pond.
7. He was jailed for one night for refusing to pay the poll tax that was supporting the war in Mexico.
8. He opposed slavery.
9. By 1857 he met John Brown and later wrote in his defense.
10. He died in 1862 of tuberculosis.

B. Works

1. 1849: 'Resistance to Civil Government'/'On the Duty of Civil Disobedience.'
 - a. Advocates civil resistance to unjust laws.
2. 1854: *Walden, Or Life in the Woods*.
 - a. He presents how a person should live in accord with his own nature and Nature.

C. Impact

1. He was not well known in his own time.
2. *Walden* became an influential book in the 20th century.
3. His work on civil disobedience was applied by Gandhi and latter by King.

On the Duty of Civil Disobedience

by Henry David Thoreau

Modified 11/13/05

I Government

A. The Best Government

1. "That government is best which governs least"
2. "That government is best which governs not at all."

B. Government

1. Government is an expedient.
2. Most governments are usually, and all governments are sometimes, inexpedient.
3. The government, the mode the people have chosen to execute their will is liable to be abused and perverted before the people can act through it.

C. Less and Better Government

1. Governments show how successfully men can be imposed upon, even by themselves, for their advantage.
2. The government never furthered any enterprise except by getting out of its way.
3. Government is an expedient, by which men would succeed in letting one another alone.
4. Trade and commerce continuously face obstacles placed by legislators.
5. I ask for, not at once no government, but at once a better government.

D. Majority Rule

1. When the power is in the hands of the people, a majority is permitted to rule:
2. Not because they are most likely to be right or this is fairest to the minority.
3. Because they are physically the strongest.
4. A government in which the majority rules in all cases cannot be based on justice.

II Conscience

A. Conscience & Law

1. Must the citizen resign his conscience to the legislator?
2. Why then does each have a conscience?
3. We should be men first, and subjects afterward.
5. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law, so much as for the right.
6. The only obligation I have a right to assume is to do what I think right.
7. Law never made men more just and their respect for it makes them agents of injustice.

B. Military & Police

1. Are soldiers men or small movable forts at the service of some unscrupulous man in power?
2. The mass of men serves the state not as men, but as machines, with their bodies.
 - a. The standing army and the militia.
 - b. Jailers, constables, posse comitatus.
3. In most cases there is no free exercise of judgment or moral sense.

C. Office Holders and Others

1. Legislators, politicians, lawyers, ministers, and office-holders serve the state with their heads.
2. They rarely make moral distinctions and are as likely to serve the devil, without intending it, as God.

D. Heroes

1. A very few- heroes, patriots, martyrs, reformers- serve the state with their consciences.
2. So they necessarily resist it for the most part.
3. So they are commonly treated as enemies by it.

III Revolution & Submission

A. Revolution

1. All recognize the right of revolution.
2. The right to refuse allegiance to, and resist, the government, when its tyranny or its inefficiency are great and unendurable.
3. All machines have their friction-possibly it does enough good to balance the evil.
4. When the friction has its machine, and oppression and robbery are organized, let us not have the machine.

B. Paley, "Duty of Submission to Civil Government"

1. Paley resolves all civil obligation into expediency.
2. As long as government cannot be resisted or changed without public inconvenience, it is the will of God that it be obeyed.
3. The justice of each resistance is reduced to a computation, judged by each,
 - a. Of the danger and grievance on one side.
 - b. Of probability and expense of redress on the other.

C. Assessment of Paley

1. Paley did not consider cases to which the rule of expediency does not apply, in which justice must be done regardless of cost.
2. If I have unjustly wrested a plank from a drowning man, I must restore it to him though I drown.
3. This, according to Paley, would be inconvenient.
4. In their practice, nations agree with Paley.

IV Voting & Goodness

A. Goodness & Doing Nothing

1. People think that it is not as important that many should be good, as there being some absolute goodness to leaven the whole.

2. Thousands opposed slavery and war in their opinions but did nothing.
3. They hesitate, regret, and sometimes petition.
4. They do nothing in earnest and with effect.
5. They will wait, well disposed, for others to remedy the evil.
6. At most, they give up only a cheap vote.

B. Voting

1. Voting is gaming with a moral tinge and betting naturally accompanies it.
2. The character of the voters is not staked.
 - a. I cast my vote as I think right; but without vital concern that right should prevail.
 - b. I am willing to leave it to the majority.
3. Voting for the right does nothing for it-it is a feeble expression of the desire that it should prevail.
4. The wise will not leave right to chance, nor wish it to prevail through the power of the majority.
 - a. There is little virtue in the action of masses.

V Duty & Action

A. Duty & Wrongs

1. It is a man's duty to devote himself to the eradication of any wrong.
2. He may still properly have other concerns.
3. It is his duty, at least, to wash his hands of it, and not to give it his support.
4. If devoted to other pursuits and contemplations, I must not pursue them sitting on another's shoulders.

B. Error Supported by Virtue

1. Inconsistency: A soldier is applauded who refuses to serve in an unjust war by those who sustain the government making war.
2. The broadest and most prevalent error requires the most disinterested virtue to sustain it.
3. Those who, while disapproving of a government, give it allegiance and support are its most conscientious supporters and often the most serious obstacles to reform.

C. Opinion and Action

1. A man cannot be satisfied to merely have an opinion.
2. If cheated of a single dollar by your neighbor
 - a. You are not satisfied with knowing or saying you are cheated or with petitioning him to pay.
 - b. You take steps to get the money and avoid being cheated again.
3. Action from principle, the perception and the performance of right, changes things and relations.

D. Unjust Laws & Inaction

1. Unjust laws exist.
2. Men think they should wait until the majority is persuaded to alter them.
3. They think if they resist, the remedy would be worse than the evil.
4. It is the government's fault the remedy is worse because it makes it worse.

VI Resisting Injustice

A. Punishment

1. One would think a deliberate and practical denial of its authority is the only offense not contemplated by government.
2. Because it has not assigned a definite, suitable and proportionate, penalty.
3. If one without property refuses once to earn nine shillings for the State, he is imprisoned indefinitely.
3. If he steals ninety times nine shillings from the State, he is soon set free.

B. Breaking the Law

1. If injustice is part of the necessary friction of the machine of government, perhaps it will wear smooth-certainly the machine will wear out.
2. If the injustice has a part exclusively for itself, the remedy might be worse than the evil.
3. If it requires you to be the agent of injustice to another, then break the law.
4. Be a counter-friction to stop the machine.
5. I have to see that I do not lend myself to the wrong I condemn.
6. Any man more right than his neighbors constitutes a majority of one already.

C. Prison

1. Under a government which imprisons unjustly, the true place for a just man is also a prison.
2. Their influence would not be lost there, they would be as an enemy within its walls.
3. Truth is much stronger than error.
4. One who has experienced injustice can much more eloquently and effectively combat it.

D. Peaceable Revolution

1. Cast your whole vote, not merely a strip of paper, but your whole influence.
2. A minority is powerless while it conforms to the majority.
3. It is irresistible when it clogs by its whole weight.

4. If the choice is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will give them up.
5. If a thousand men did not pay taxes, it would not be as violent or bloody as paying them and enabling the State to commit violence and shed innocent blood.
 - a. This is the definition of a peaceable revolution.
6. The tax-gatherer or public officer should resign.
7. When the subject refuses allegiance and the officer resigns, then the revolution is accomplished.

VII Property & Protection

A. Property

1. He has focused on imprisonment rather than seizure of goods.
2. Those who assert the purest right, and hence most dangerous to a corrupt State, commonly have accumulated little property.
3. To such the State renders little service, and a small tax appears exorbitant.

B. Money & Virtue

1. The rich man is always sold to the institution that makes him rich.
2. The more money the less virtue.
 - a. Money comes between a man and his objects, and obtains them for him.
 - b. It was no great virtue to obtain it.
3. Thus his moral ground is taken away.
4. The opportunities of living are diminished in proportion as the "means" are increased.

C. Protection of the State

1. His neighbors cannot spare the protection of the government, and dread the consequences of disobedience.
2. He never relies on the protection of the State.

D. Taking Property

1. If he denies the authority of the State to tax him, it will take his property.
2. This makes it impossible for a man to live both honestly and comfortably.
3. It will not be worth it to accumulate property for it will be taken.

E. Confucius

1. If a state is governed by the principles of reason, poverty and misery are subjects of shame.
2. If a state is not governed by the principles of reason, riches and honors are subjects of shame.

F. Refusal of Allegiance

1. Until he wants the protection of the state he can afford to refuse allegiance to it, and her right to his property and life.
2. It costs him less in every sense to incur the penalty of disobedience than it would to obey.
3. He would feel worth less in that case.

VIII The State and Prison

A. Jail

1. The jail is a foolish institution because it acts as if he is mere flesh blood and bones, to be locked up.
2. They locked the door on his meditations, which followed them and they were what was dangerous.
3. Unable to reach him, they resolved to punish his body.

B. The State & Force

1. The state never intentionally confronts a man's intellectual or moral sense but only his body.
2. It is not armed with superior wit or honesty but superior physical strength.
3. He was not born to be forced and will breathe after his own fashion.

C. Taxes

1. When the government says, "Your money our your life," why should I be in haste to give it money?
2. It may be in great strait, and not know what to do-it must help itself.
3. He is not responsible for the successful working of the machinery of society.

D. After He was out of Prison

1. He saw the state more distinctly.
2. He saw to what extent his neighbors could be trusted as good neighbors and friends.
3. Their friendship was for summer weather only.
4. They did not greatly propose to do right.
5. They were made distinct from him by their prejudices and superstitions.
6. In their sacrifices to humanity they ran no risks, not even to their property.

IX Taxes & Resistance

A. Taxes

1. I pay the highway tax, because I desire to be as good a neighbor as a bad subject.
2. I don't pay because I wish to refuse allegiance to the State, to withdraw from it effectually.
3. I do not care to trace the course of my dollar till it buys a man a musket-the dollar is innocent.

4. I am concerned to trace the effects of my allegiance.

B. People

1. The people mean well and are only ignorant; they would do better if they knew how.

2. Why give your neighbors this pain to treat you as they are not inclined to?

3. This is no reason why he should do as they do, or permit others to suffer greater pain of a different kind.

C. Resisting

1. When millions without ill will, demand of you a few shillings, without possibility of retracting their demand and without the possibility of you appealing to other millions, why expose yourself to this overwhelming brute force?

2. You do not resist natural forces thus obstinately-You do not put your head into the fire.

3. This is not wholly a brute force, but partly a human force.

4. He has relations to the millions as men, and not mere brute or inanimate things, so appeal is possible:

a. From them to the Maker of them.

b. From them to themselves.

5. If he puts his head into the fire, there is no appeal to fire or to the Maker-he has only himself to blame.

6. The difference between resisting this and a brute or natural force, is that he can resist this with some effect.

X Progress of the State

A. Authority

1. The authority of government is still an impure one.

2. To be strictly just, it must have the sanction and consent of the governed.

3. It can have no pure right over my person and property but what I concede to it.

B. Progress

1. The progress from an absolute to a limited monarchy, from a limited monarchy to a democracy, is a progress toward a true respect for the individual.

2. The individual is the basis of the empire.

3. A democracy is not the last improvement possible in government.

4. It is possible to take a step further towards recognizing and organizing the rights of man.

5. There will never be a free and enlightened State until it recognizes the individual as a higher and independent power, from which it derives its own power and authority and treats him accordingly.

C. He Imagines a State that can

1. Be just to all men.

2. Treat the individual with respect as a neighbor.

3. Accept if a few were to live aloof from it, not meddling with it, nor embraced by it, who fulfilled all the duties of neighbors and fellow men.

4. This state would prepare the way for a still more perfect and glorious State.

Liberty

11/9/2005

I Introduction

A. Questions

1. What is the nature and extent of liberty?

2. Who/what should determine the extent of liberty?

3. When liberty and security are in conflict, which should be given precedence?

4. On what grounds, if any, should liberty be limited?

B. Liberty

1. The main debate focuses on the nature and extent of liberty.

a. What are people free to do and why do they have such freedom?

2. Liberty is most commonly considered in the context of the state-in terms of what the state permits or must accept.

3. Liberties are often discussed in terms of rights.

4. Liberties are often classified in terms of legal, political and moral liberties.

C. Positive & Negative Liberty

1. A concept developed by Isaiah Berlin (1909-1997).

2. Negative liberty: an absence or lack of impediments, obstacles or coercion.

3. Positive liberty: a capacity for behavior and the presence of the conditions of freedom.

D. Who/What Determines Liberty?

1. One point of debate is the matter of what/who is to determine the extent of liberty.

2. Some thinkers argue that the state should determine the extent of liberty permitted.

- a. Example: Mussolini
- 3. Some thinkers argue that the extent of liberty is to be determined on moral grounds.
 - a. Example: Mill
- E. The Conflict between Liberty & Security.
 - 1. One main debate is over the conflict between liberty and security.
 - 2. Some thinkers argue that people should give up liberties in exchange for increased security.
 - a. Example: Some contend that people should give up certain civil liberties to help fight terrorism.
 - 3. Other thinkers argue that people should not give up certain or perhaps even any liberties for increased security.
 - a. Example: Some contend that people should not yield their right of privacy even if doing so would make it easier to find terrorists.
- F. Other Grounds for Limiting Liberty
 - 1. In addition to security, some argue that there are other grounds for limiting liberty.
 - 2. Some argue that people should not have the liberty to do immoral deeds.
 - a. Example: Some contend that people should be denied the liberty of same sex marriage because it is immoral.
 - 3. Some argue that people should not have the liberty to do things that are harmful to others or to themselves.
 - a. Example: Some contend that people should not have the liberty to use drugs because drugs are harmful.

Benito Amilcare Andrea Mussolini (July 29, 1883 -April 28, 1945)

I Background

A. Life

- 1. Born in Predappio, Italy in 1883.
- 2. Was the leader of Italy from 1922 until his overthrow in 1943.
- 3. He transformed Italy into a fascist state.
- 4. He joined Nazi Germany in making war on Europe.
- 5. He was killed by the Italians in 1945.

What is Fascism

Benito Mussolini & Giovanni Gentile, 1932

Revised 11/9/2005

I Fascism

A. Peace

- 1. Fascism rejects the possibility and utility of perpetual peace.
- 2. It repudiates Pacifism.
 - a. A renunciation of struggle.
 - b. Cowardice in the face of sacrifice.

B. Only War

- 1. Brings all human energy to its highest tension.
- 2. Puts the stamp of nobility on those who have courage to meet it.
- 3. All other trials are substitutes-they never force men to make the great decision- the alternative of life or death.

C. Life

- 1. The Fascist accepts life, loves it and despises suicide.
- 2. The Fascist conceives of life as duty, struggle, conquest, and above all for others.

II Fascism and Other Views

A. Marxism and Fascism

- 1. Fascism is the opposite of Marxian Socialism.
- 2. Marxism is materialist conception of history that holds human civilization can be explained
 - a. Through the conflict of interests among social groups.
 - b. By the change and development in the means and instruments of production.
- 3. Fascism believes in holiness and heroism and denies that actions are influenced by economic motives, directly or indirectly.

B. Fascism denies:

- 1. The economic conception of history.
- 2. That men are puppets carried by the waves of chance.
- 3. The real directing forces are out of their control.
- 4. The existence of an unchangeable and unchanging class-war.
- 5. That class-war can be the preponderant force in the transformation of society.

C. Democracy and Fascism

- 1. Fascism combats and repudiates democratic ideology in its theoretical premises or practical application.

2. It denies that the majority, by the simple fact that it is a majority, can direct human society.
3. It denies that numbers alone can govern by means of a periodical consultation.
4. It affirms the immutable, beneficial, and fruitful inequality of mankind.
5. Inequality can never be permanently leveled through a mechanical process such as universal suffrage.
6. It denies political equality in the garb of collective irresponsibility, the myth of "happiness" and indefinite progress.

D. Predictions

1. The 19th century was one of Socialism, Liberalism, and Democracy, but it does not follow that the 20th must also.
2. Political doctrines pass, but humanity remains.
3. It may be expected this will be a century of authority...a century of Fascism.
4. If the 19th century was a century of individualism, this will be the century of collectivism and hence the century of the State.

II Foundation of Fascism

A. Fascism

1. The foundation of Fascism is the conception of the State, its character, its duty, and its aim.
2. The State is an absolute, in comparison with which individuals or groups are relative- only to be conceived in their relation to the State.
3. The Liberal State is not a directing force, guiding the material and spiritual development of a collective body.
4. The Liberal state is merely a force limited to recording results.

B. The Fascist State

1. The State is conscious and has a will and a personality- it is the "ethic" State.
2. The State organizes the nation.
3. The State leaves a sufficient margin of liberty to the individual.
4. The individual is deprived of all useless and possibly harmful freedom, but retains what is essential.
5. The deciding power in this question cannot be the individual, but the State.

C. Empire

1. The growth of empire is an essential manifestation of vitality, and its opposite a sign of decadence.
2. A people rising, or rising again after decadence, are always imperialist.
3. Renunciation is a sign of decay and of death.
4. Fascism is the doctrine best adapted to represent the tendencies and the aspirations of a people.
5. Empire demands discipline, the coordination of all forces and a deeply felt sense of duty and sacrifice.
6. This explains
 - a. Many aspects of the practical working of the regime.
 - b. The character of many forces in the State.
 - c. The necessarily severe measures that must be taken against those who would oppose it.

Liberty

J.S. Mill

I Goal and History of Liberty

A. Mill's Goal

1. Goal: to determine the nature and limits of power legitimately exercisable by society over the individual.
2. The struggle between Liberty and Authority was between subjects and government.

B. Liberty & Rulers

1. Liberty was protection against the tyranny of political rulers.
2. The rulers were seen as necessarily antagonistic to the ruled.

C. Liberty as Limiting Power

1. To prevent the weaker from being preyed on a stronger predator was commissioned.
2. As the king was as likely to prey on the weak a constant attitude of defense was indispensable.
3. The aim of patriots was to limit the power of the ruler over the community-This was liberty.

D. History of Limiting Power of Rulers.

1. Obtaining recognition of certain immunities- political liberties or rights.
2. The establishment of constitutional checks.
3. Governors were not seen necessarily as an independent power opposed to the ruled
4. The rulers should be their delegates, revocable at their pleasure.
5. The rulers should be identified with the people.

II The Tyranny of the People

A. The Will of the People

1. That the people have no need to limit their power over themselves might seem axiomatic.
2. Phrases like "self-government" don't express the truth- it is not the government of each by himself but of each by the rest.

3. The will of the people means the will of:
 - a. The most numerous or most active.
 - b. The majority.
 - c. Those who make themselves accepted as the majority.
 4. The people may desire to oppress a part of their number and precautions are needed against this.
- B. The tyranny of the majority
1. Protection against the tyranny of the magistrate is not enough.
 2. Protection is needed against the tyranny of prevailing opinion and feeling.
 3. Protection is needed against society's tendency to
 - a. Impose its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct.
 - b. Fetter the development or prevent the formation of individuality not in harmony with its ways.
 - c. Compel all to fashion themselves upon its model.

III Limits, Rules and Principle

- A. The Limit of Legitimate Interference
1. There is a limit to the legitimate interference of collective opinion with individual independence.
 2. What makes existence valuable depends on the enforcement of restraints on others' actions.
 3. Some rules of conduct must be imposed by law and by opinion on things not fit for law.
 4. What these rules should be is the principal question in human affairs.
- B. The Basis of Rules
1. People regard their own rules as self-evident and self-justifying.
 2. The practical principle guiding opinions on conduct is each person's feeling that all should be required to act as he would like.
 3. A country's morality mostly comes from
 - a. Class interests and feelings of superiority of any ascendant class.
 - b. Servility towards the preferences or aversions of their masters or gods.
 4. The likings and dislikings of society, or a powerful portion, mainly determine the rules of law or opinion.
- C. No Principle
1. There is no principle by which the propriety or impropriety of government interference is tested.
 2. Men side in a case according to
 - a. Their sentiments.
 - b. The interest they feel about what the government should do.
 - c. Their belief that the government would, or would not, do it in a manner they prefer.
 3. Men very rarely chose a side because of a consistently held opinion about what is fit to be done by government.
- D. Mill's Principle
1. Principle: the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection.
- E. Rightful Exercise of Power
1. The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others.
 2. His own good, physical or moral, is not sufficient warrant.
 3. He cannot rightfully be compelled to do or forbear because
 - a. It will be better for him.
 - b. It will make him happier.
 - c. Others think it would be wise or right.
 4. These are good reasons for remonstrating or persuading him, but not for compelling or doing evil if he does otherwise.
 5. The only part of the conduct for which one is amenable to society, is what concerns others.
 6. What merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute.
 - a. Over himself, his body and mind, the individual is sovereign.
- F. Limits in Application of the Principle: Children & those in need of care.
1. This doctrine applies only to humans with mature faculties.
 2. Children and those below the legal age of adulthood are excluded.
 3. Those requiring the care of others must be protected against their own actions and external injury.
- E. Limit in Application of the Principle: Barbarians
1. Backward states of society where the race may be considered as immature are excluded.
 2. A ruler full of the spirit of improvement is warranted to use any expedients that will attain the end.
 3. Liberty, as principle, has no application to a state before people can be improved by free and equal discussion.
 4. Once mankind can be guided to improvement by conviction or persuasion, compulsion is not admissible as a means to their good, and justified only for the security of others.

IV Utility as the Foundation of Liberty

A. Utility

1. Mill rejects the idea of abstract right independent of utility.
2. Utility is the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions.
3. It must be utility in the largest sense, grounded on the permanent interests of man as a progressive being.
4. These interests authorize the subjecting individuals to external control only for actions concerning the interest of others.

B. Punishment

1. If one hurts others, there is a prima facie case for punishing him.

C. Compelling

1. There are positive acts benefiting others that he may rightfully be compelled to do.
 - a. Giving evidence in a court of justice.
 - b. Bearing a fair share of common defense or work necessary to the interest of society.
 - c. Performing certain acts of individual beneficence, such as saving another's life, or protecting the defenseless.
2. Things obviously a man's duty to do, he may rightfully be made responsible to society for not doing.

D. Accountability

1. A person may cause others evil by actions or inaction and he is accountable.
2. To make one answerable for doing evil to others is the rule.
3. To make one answerable for not preventing evil is the exception.
4. There are many cases clear and grave enough to justify the exception.
5. Reason for not holding him responsible must arise from special expediency: either because
 - a. He is likely to act better if left alone than if controlled by society.
 - b. The attempt to exercise control would produce greater evils than it would prevent.
6. When such reasons preclude enforcement of responsibility, the conscience of the agent should judge.

V Sphere of Action and Regions of Liberty

A. Sphere of Action

1. The sphere of action in which society has at most indirect interest is the parts of a person's life and conduct which affects only him or others with free, voluntary, and undeceived consent and participation.
2. Objection: Whatever affects him may affect others through himself-he replies to this later in his work.

B. First region of human liberty: The inward domain of consciousness.

1. Liberty of conscience.
2. Liberty of thought and feeling.
3. Freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral, or theological.
4. The liberty of expressing and publishing opinions.
 - a. May seem to be another principle since it concerns other people.
 - b. Almost as important as liberty of thought.
 - c. Based on the same reasons, is practically inseparable from it.

C. Second region of human liberty: Tastes and pursuits:

1. Framing the plan of our life to suit our character.
2. Doing as we like, subject to possible consequences
3. Doing so without impediment if we do not harm others even if they think our conduct foolish, perverse, or wrong.

D. Third region of human liberty: From the liberty of each follows the liberty of combination among individuals.

1. Freedom to unite, for any purpose not involving harm to others.
2. If they are adults and not forced or deceived.

E. Freedom

1. A society that does not respect these freedoms is not free, regardless of the type of government.
2. None is completely free in which they do not exist absolute and unqualified.
3. True freedom is pursuing our own good our own way, provided we do not deprive others or impede their efforts to obtain it.
4. Each is the proper guardian of his own health- bodily, or mental or spiritual.
5. We gain more by allowing each to live as seems good to them, than by compelling each to live as seems good to the rest.

VI Opposition

A. Opposes

1. This doctrine opposes the general tendency of existing opinion and practice.

B. Ancient commonwealths

1. The ancient commonwealths thought they had the right to regulate all private conduct
2. They had an interest in the bodily and mental discipline of every citizen.
3. This might have been admissible given the conditions.

C. Modern Commonwealths

1. Larger communities and separation of spiritual and secular authority prevent as much interference by law in private life.
2. Engines of moral repression are used more against divergence from reigning opinion in private rather than social matters.

3. Religion was almost always run by the ambition of a hierarchy, seeking control over all conduct or by the spirit of Puritanism.

D. Tendencies Against Liberty

1. There is an increasing inclination to expand the powers of society over the individual by force of opinion and legislation.
2. The tendency is to strengthen society and diminish the power of the individual.
3. This encroachment is not an evil that spontaneously disappears-it tends to grow more formidable.
4. The disposition of mankind to impose their opinions and inclinations as a rule of conduct on others, is so energetically supported by the best and worst feelings that it is generally only restrained by lack of power.
5. Since power is growing, without a strong barrier of moral conviction against mischief, it will increase.

