

DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL

MASTER OF ARTS-PHILOSOPHY

SEMESTER-I

WESTERN ETHICS

CORE-101

BLOCK-1

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL

Postal Address:

The Registrar,

University of North Bengal,

Raja Rammohunpur,

P.O.-N.B.U., Dist-Darjeeling,

West Bengal, Pin-734013,

India.

Phone: (O) +91 0353-2776331/2699008

Fax: (0353) 2776313, 2699001

Email: regnbu@sancharnet.in ; regnbu@nbu.ac.in

Website: www.nbu.ac.in

First Published in 2019



All rights reserved. No Part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission in writing from University of North Bengal. Any person who does any unauthorised act in relation to this book may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

This book is meant for educational and learning purpose. The authors of the book has/have taken all reasonable care to ensure that the contents of the book do not violate any existing copyright or other intellectual property rights of any person in any manner whatsoever. In the even the Authors has/ have been unable to track any source and if any copyright has been inadvertently infringed, please notify the publisher in writing for corrective action.

FOREWORD

The Self Learning Material (SLM) is written with the aim of providing simple and organized study content to all the learners. The SLMs are prepared on the framework of being mutually cohesive, internally consistent and structured as per the university's syllabi. It is a humble attempt to give glimpses of the various approaches and dimensions to the topic of study and to kindle the learner's interest to the subject

We have tried to put together information from various sources into this book that has been written in an engaging style with interesting and relevant examples. It introduces you to the insights of subject concepts and theories and presents them in a way that is easy to understand and comprehend.

We always believe in continuous improvement and would periodically update the content in the very interest of the learners. It may be added that despite enormous efforts and coordination, there is every possibility for some omission or inadequacy in few areas or topics, which would definitely be rectified in future.

We hope you enjoy learning from this book and the experience truly enrich your learning and help you to advance in your career and future endeavors.



WESTERN ETHICS

BLOCK-1

Unit - 1: The Study Of Ethics.....	7
Unit - 2:Ethical Relativism And Ethical Objectivism.....	29
Unit - 3:Ethical Relativism And Ethical Objectivism.....	51
Unit - 4: Value	70
Unit - 5: Utilitarianism	90
Unit - 6: Kantian And Deontological Systems	111
Unit - 7: Ethical System Based On Virtues.....	130

BLOCK-2

UNIT 8. Met ethics in the Twentieth Century

UNIT 9. Moral Realism and the Challenge of Scepticism

UNIT 10. Morality, Self-Interest and Future Selves

UNIT 11. Religion and ethics

UNIT 12. Contemporary Challenges to Classical Ethical Theory.

UNIT 13. Feminist Ethics

UNIT 14. The Challenges of Determinism to Moral Responsibility

BLOCK-1 WESTERN ETHICS

In this block, we will understand the study of ethics, ethical relativism, and ethical objectivism. Also learns about Psychological, Ethical egoism and Ultimate principles. Meaning of value, its concept and transvaluation. Utilitarianism, Kantian and Deontological systems and ethical system based on virtues.

Unit 1 explains about the study of ethics. Its meaning and the morality of Socrates and Crito.

Unit 2 explains about the Ethical & Moral relativism and ethical objectivism,

Unit 3 explains about the ethical and psychological egoism and Ultimate principles.

Unit 4 discusses about the meaning of value, the concept of right and wrong and transvaluation of values.

Unit 5 discusses about the utilitarianism, restricted and extreme utilitarianism.

Unit 6 explains about the metaphysic morals, Kantian formula, moral luck, doctrine of double effect and intentions, actions, and consequences of the doctrine of double effect.

Unit 7 explains about the ethical system based on virtues. Its ethics and moral life and nature.

UNIT - 1: THE STUDY OF ETHICS

STRUCTURE

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 The meaning of ‘ethics’.
- 1.3 Plato: The morality of Socrates and Crito
- 1.4 Let Us Sum Up
- 1.5 Keywords
- 1.6 Questions For Review
- 1.7 Suggested Readings And References
- 1.8 Answers To Check Your Progress

1.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Understand the concept of Ethics and how it emerged over the centuries.
- Get an idea about the great philosophers who contributed (e.g. Plato, Socrates etc.)
- Understand the nature and scope of Ethics

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Ethics comprise the very important concepts and fundamental sets of guidelines of cultured human conduct. It is the study of universal ideals such as equal opportunity to all, living in harmony, living in peace with oneself, protecting ourselves as well as the environment we live in. There are many theories about how one should lead their lives. What is real and virtual. Philosophers of ancient times have worked throughout in searching for the answers to the questions. Motivating others to be more inquisitive and not to blindly follow the authorities.

1.2 MEANING OF ETHICS

Ethics: Meaning

Ethics include the vital concepts and fundamental doctrine of civilized human conduct. It is the study of universal values such as basic equality of all women and men, valuing the rights of human or natural rights, respect to the law of land, responsibility for health and safety and, gradually more, also for the natural habitat and environment.

Ethics, mainly expressed in the terms of any action being fairly right and wrong or good and bad. The term is also applicable to any system or premise of just principles.

How should we live our lives in this world? Shall we aim at greatness or happiness? If we opt for happiness, shall it be for us or the happiness of the entire world? Is it right to be deceitful for a good cause? Can we defend living in richness whereas elsewhere in the world people are dying of hunger? Is it right to kill a murderer? Is it justified to let a war take place at the expense of many innocent lives? Is it right to create clones of humans or giving people the authority to be able to select the gender of their child beforehand?

These types of questions are dealt within ethics. It focuses on the primary issues of rational and right decision making, and the most important issue that ethics deals with is determining the key standards to judge between the right and wrong actions.

The expressions morality and ethics have a close relation between them. Now, the phrases like ethical judgments and moral judgments can be used interchangeably. These implementations show the wider aspects of meaning of ethics.

Even though ethics was considered as a part of philosophy, its logical nature has made it associate itself with various other domains of study, that includes sociology, anthropology, history, biology, politics, economy and lastly, theology. Still, ethics persists its difference from these areas of discipline. The reason is that ethics do not deal with facts and information like we see in sciences and various other subjects of study. Rather, it has to do with deciding the fundamental attributes of normative theories and using these principles to solve pragmatic moral problems.

Ethics Origins:

When and how ethics did take birth? With the existence of humans on earth, it can be said, that in their way to find the best way to live their lives, they created a framework of few principles that could guide them about the right values, and wrong actions. This phase where human societies started acknowledging the importance of the presence of some basic standards of right and wrong behaviour, began long after their settlement as a society.

The beginning of ethics was marked by introducing the first set of principles of moral codes and conduct. We now have various accounts of myths that various societies believe in and that also gives us some virtual idea about when and how ethics began.

There are many myths about how the codes of conducts were transferred from higher power to humans. How ethics and moral values are not created by humans but are divine in origin. Code of Hammurabi, is the code of laws which the Sun God presented him. This is shown in a relief in Paris. Another example is the Hebrew Bible. This is an account of Ten Commandments that were passed by God to Moses on Sinai Mountain. (14th - 13th century B.C.E).

In Protagoras, written by Plato, it has been asserted in a mythical account about Zeus taking mercy on miserable humans who were not as strong as other creatures. To help humans Zeus bestowed upon humans a sense of morality and ability for justice and law, So that humans can live in harmony by mutual cooperation. The connection of morals with divinity proves to be a strong reason why these moral principles were acceptable. By assigning a divine origin to morality, priests made themselves its guardian and interpreter and hence saved for themselves a powerful position that they would not easily give away. This connection between religion and morality is so powerfully established that even now, from time to time, it is claimed that there is no morality in absence of religion. Therefore, it makes ethics a part of theology and not a self determining area of study.

There were some issues raised by Plato. In his work Euthyphro he reviewed the idea that it is the divine consent that validates an action a

Notes

good action. Plato specified if this is what the case is then it cannot be said that God allows a action because the nature of the action is good. Then what is the reason behind their approval? Are their approval is purely random? So, according to Plato this was impossible and hence told that there must be some principles on which good or bad actions are based and not merely on the liking or disliking of the Gods. In modern world also, this concept is accepted because clearly the contrary implies that if, the gods gave the consent for torturing children, then torturing them would be considered as good.

Check your Progress-1

1.What do you mean by the term ‘ethics’?

2.What is the difference between ethics and morals?

History of ethics:

The main idea of ethics origin can be traced back to the times of Ancient Greeks in western world.

The approximate time period when ethical thinking started was with the Greek Sophists (5th century BCE) and comes to an end with fall of Rome. The medieval philosophy includes the era of AD400-1400 in Western Europe, roughly between the era of fall of Rome and the Renaissance. The philosophical era that begins after Renaissance is the Modern philosophy, that continues till date.

Ancient Ethics

Ancient Greek ethics: Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle

In the western intellectual tradition, philosophical thinking on ethical rules started with the Greek Sophists (5th century BCE). The sophists were peripatetic teachers who travelled around the Hellenic world giving teachings to young men the way of public speaking that was considered the most essential skill to gain success in the field of politics prevalent at that time. Protagoras, was one of the earliest sophists whose views were contradictory regarding the prevalence of objective moral truth and supported the idea of moral relativism. His emphasis was on the degree of the involvement of humans in the creations and practice of these moral codes and conducts. In *Theaetetus*, written by Plato, he mentioned that “whatever the city establishes as just, is just for that city as long as it judges so”.

Callicles defended the decree of powerful individuals against the weak as the weak individuals support the belief in the righteousness of equality and hence undermine the strong men. His views about democracy is, “the tyranny of the many over the exceptional individual,” and emphasized on citizens allowing themselves to be ruled upon by a strong leader.

He stressed upon the extent to which moral codes are created by the human, sets of norms followed and approved by certain communities. These beliefs are contrary to the natural law that supports natural justice that says, “might is right”. It’s the law of nature that a strong individual should have and absent in weak.

But these conventions serve only to overthrow the laws of natural justice in which “might is right.” It is a law of nature that the strong ought to possess more than the weak. As a consequence, the correct way for a strong individual to live is to follow his own interests, have the right to act in a unjust manner and get away with it. This challenge to the practicality of moral action may be seen as putting fuel for the philosophical thought of Plato, Aristotle and Socrates. But after all this, still there is a question that is left unanswered i.e., ‘why be moral?’

Socrates

Socrates is regarded as one of the best teachers of ethics. He is the one who noticed “the unexamined life is not worth living”. Still, he did not preached his followers about how they should lead their lives, unlike many other philosophers. Socrates, to be exact, taught about the concept

Notes

of inquiry. When the other thinkers boasted about their knowledge and understanding about the subjects of justice, law, temperance, piety, Socrates used to ask those thinkers to give an account, which then he would prove totally wrong. It was due to his way of inquiry, which proved to be threatening to the traditional beliefs, his enemies accused Socrates for corrupting the minds of youths in Athens and planned to have him put behind the bars and consequently he faced death. According to the conventional standards, it was easy to point that Socrates was actually involved in turning the youths of the Athens corrupt, though he himself had a belief system that supports the obliteration of the beliefs that could not stand up to the disapproval as primarily essential for the search of true knowledge. This way of thinking made him different from sophists. It was because, according to Socrates that one can acquire knowledge and sense about what virtue is and a person who is called a virtuous person have the proper knowledge of what virtue is. According to him, a person who knows what virtue will necessarily act virtuously. In today's world, this belief system may sound strange, largely because it is now easy to differentiate between what a person should do and what he actually wants from life. After assuming this, it becomes easy to imagine situations in which an individual knows what he/she should do but move forward to do something entirely different. Picking his interest over the actions he is ought to do. The distinction between virtue and self interest was not prevalent during the ancient Greek period. The Greeks supported that virtue is essential for an individual and the society. They also were of the opinion that living in a virtuous manner might not give us the desired results in the financial areas. But they did not assume that material richness is the main factor in an individual's life irrespective of their life being good or ill. As per the unity of virtue, it implies that an individual cannot have only one virtue. If that individual possesses one virtue he ought to possess all the other virtues. As all virtues are interdependent. Both Aristotle in *Nicomachean Ethics* and Plato, in the *Republic*, support to variations of this idea.

Plato

Plato was known to be an exceptional disciple of Socrates. Plato supported Socrates' beliefs in the objectivity of goodness and the connection between knowing what is good and doing it. Plato took over the methods of Socrates of developing a case by proposing an account based on some theory and then exposing the errors and perplexity in the arguments of his oppositions. Plato presented these methods by creating his work in form of dialogues in which Socrates was shown engaging in an argument with other men, generally the Sophists. The early work of Plato showed accurately about how Socrates portrayed his views through arguments and reasoning. But the later dialogues of Plato, after the death of Socrates majorly constituted Plato's personal ideas and thoughts. In one of the famous dialogues of Plato, Politia (The Republic), Socrates is a character who is challenged by the following idea: If a person has achieved a legendary ring of Gyges, that contains a magical property of making the person wearing that ring invisible. Is there any reason left for the person to act justly?

The purpose of this challenge is that according to Sophists which is still prevailing, the only reason for behaving in a just manner is that the person would not be able to get away with it (unjust behaviour). Plato's reaction to this challenge is a lengthy argument in which he develops a position that seems to go ahead of anything that the Great Socrates asserted. Plato believed that true knowledge is not knowing some specific things but having the general knowledge about specific subjects, a common idea that covers all the particular subjects.

This idea, as is known, is taken from the Socrates' idea of stressing upon his opponents to move beyond the idea of only describing a specific act that are just and good and instead describe a general account of justice and goodness. This implies that one should have general account of what is just and right, only then he can be considered to have a correct knowledge about goodness.

The argument between Sophists, who believed that righteousness and justice are relative to the codes of each society or in other words, these are just a cover up for the interests of the powerful individuals and the

Notes

Platonists who believed that the likelihood of knowledge of an objective type of the good.

But the question arises that why should one behave in a just manner if one is making gains by performing acts that are opposite to just. This part of the challenge is still left out that was created in the tale of the ring of Gyges, and is yet to be answered. This is to imply that even though one welcomes the idea that justice and goodness are objective, it does not mean that one has the satisfactory reason to do what is actually good.

Plato believed that justice prevails in a person when the three essentials of the soul i.e., emotion, desire and intellect act in peace with each other. An individual who is unjust lives a life of unsatisfactory state of mind and experiences internal conflicts. This person never overcomes his anxiety of unquenched thirst to achieve but actually all he gets is the mere absence of desire. On the other hand a just person experiences peace and harmony as he is a rationally thinking person and a genuinely satisfied individual enjoy the pursuits of true knowledge. He also believed that the soul of the human is not immortal. And hence even if a good and just person suffers from many unfortunate events like illness, poverty, the Gods will give that person the greatest rewards in his next life.

To sum up , then, Plato stresses upon that we ought to behave justly because in doing so we are “at one with ourselves and with the gods.”

Aristotle

Plato was the founder of the school of philosophy , called as the Academy, in Athens. Aristotle went to that school, there he was studying under Plato but differed in his way of thinking and gave a new direction to the western philosophy. He was also known as the “father of western philosophy”. There were a lot of differences in the way of expressions of idea and the content of their writing. But due to their time together, Aristotle’s work shows the common grounds on which he used to present his work. Hence Aristotle supports the views of Plato in which he (Plato) tells that leading a virtuous life is rewarding for that individual and for the community as well. Aristotle also accepts the idea that the most satisfying way of living is by involving oneself intellectual speculation.

But Aristotle disagreed to Plato's ideas of The Forms. According to him it is not essential to have the awareness about The Form of Good, in order to act in a good manner.

Aristotle's directory of the virtues and vices are different from the list of Christian thinkers that came later on differs from lists compiled by later Christian thinkers. Although courage, temperance, and liberality are recognized as virtues in both periods, Aristotle also introduces a virtue that was *megalopsyche* (in Greek) which means "greatness of soul" and sometimes also seen as pride. This is the characteristic of carrying a reasonable high opinion of oneself. For Christians the equivalent vanity, excess was a vice, on the other hand corresponding humility, deficiency, considered as a virtue.

Later Greek Thinkers:

The two schools, Stoicism and Epicureanism signify the key approaches to question of an individual should live. They dominated the later periods.

Stoicism:

A stoic person is the one who stay unaffected by the sorrows that are a cause of suffering to the rest of the world. If a person is rational, he will choose logic over emotions. And therefore he will remain unbothered by the status of the fulfilment of his physical desires. According to stoicism all humans have the ability to logic and reasoning. They believe in equality. For Stoics, pain is something physical and it would not affect the reasoning of a person. Stoics might favour suicide to avoid an inevitable pain.

Epicureanism:

Epicurus redefined the term pleasure. According to them its meaning is "pleasure of the mind" rather than "bodily pleasures". According to them the highest form of pleasure is the pleasure of achieving tranquility, bliss, peace of mind; which can be achieved by removing unfulfilled desires.

The way in which this could be achieved is by removing all but the simplest desires; these desires can be readily fulfilled even by those who are not rich. They influenced the later thinkers are directed them towards utilitarianism.

Ethics in Medieval ages:

St. Augustine:

St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430) made the first attempt to link philosophy with Christianity. He used Plato's ideas of a just soul in which humans are basically souls, and their body's function is to help them achieve their spiritual goals. According to him, happiness is the "union of the soul with God" after death. It was reason why according to Christianity physical pleasures are inferior.

Reformation: The modern ethics

Thomas Hobbs

Thomas Hobbes is an exceptional example of the freedom of mind that took birth in Protestant countries after the Reformation. He believed that there is not strict demarcation between good or bad, it is relative to a person's desire. This indicates that there are several different goods which differ for different people and not one "overachieving good" that Aristotle along with Aquinas believed. Hobbs was an ethical subjectivist.

David Hume

Hume, believed that logic cannot be the foundation of morality. His main reason for this conclusion was that morality is basically practical i.e., there is no point in judging something good if the judgment does not dispose one to behave accordingly. Reason itself, however, Hume regarded as "the slave of the passions." Reason can guide people how to best achieve their ends, but it cannot decide what those ends should be; it is incompetent of affecting one to do some action except in accordance with some former want or desire. Hence, reason is incapable to create moral judgments.

Immanuel Kant

Kant stressed upon the idea that actions that are a result of desire are not free. Only rational actions can result in achieving freedom. Therefore rational action cannot be dependent on an individual's personal desires but "must be action in accordance with something that he can will to be a universal law". This view is equivalent to the idea of "general will" that opposes an individual's will, a person share with the entire community.

Hegel

Hegel's beliefs said that freedom cannot be achieved until the humans realize that they are a manifestation of this universal mind. Humans ought to feel at home in the universe.

Friedrich Nietzsche

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844 – 1900) criticized Judeo - Christian tradition. According to him Jewish ethics were "slave morality" based on jealousy. In his opinion, Christian were even worse, it makes a virtue out of humility, patience poverty and do not inspire to struggle for what they want. This faith does not support strength. Such an ethics, Nietzsche declared, weaken the human drives that have led to the greatest human achievements. Nietzsche thought that the period of traditional religion was has come to an end.

Check your Progress-2

3. Discuss the viewpoints of Socrates?

4. How did the Stoics and Epicurus influenced the later thinkers?

5. What did the theories of Immanuel Kant said about ethics?

Ethics in 20th century:

As described in the brief account above, the history of Western ethics from the time of the Sophists towards the end of 19th century indicated three invariable themes. First one shows that , there is the in-discrepancy about whether ethical judgments are truths about the world or only contemplation of the desires of those who make those judgements. Secondly, there is the attempt to explain, that doing the right thing is a rational thing to do. And thirdly, there is the argument about the standard of right and wrong and essence of goodness. In the 20th century these themes are applied in solving practical moral issues. The history of ethics from 20th century to the present time will be divided into their main areas: Meta-ethics, Normative ethics and applied ethics.

Meta-ethics works with the nature of moral judgements. It deals with the meaning of ethics and origin of ethics.

Normative ethics determines the standard of moral judgements and criteria for determining about right and wrong.

Applied ethics include the current and essential topics like animal rights, ethical issues in medical procedures (bioethics), ethical issues in research and development, war, capital punishment.

Check your Progress-3

6. How is ethics after 20th century different from the ethical ways of earlier times?

7. Briefly explain the three divisions in which ethics is divided in 20th century?

1.3 PLATO: THE MORALITY OF SOCRATES AND CRITO

The life of Socrates illustrated one example of a person who is seeking a justification for his or her moral behaviour. Socrates focuses on using logic and reasoning instead of his cultural values, to decide whether a behave is right or wrong. The dialogue 'Crito' throws a light upon the views of Socrates, who is stressing upon the use of a moral point of view rather than blindly following the point of view of an individual's religion or society.

The tale:

Socrates was a very great philosopher, born in Athens (469 - 399 B.C). He was imprisoned and was waiting for his execution. He was found guilty of impiety, which implies that he was a non believer of the Gods and was found inventing new gods. Secondly, he was accused for corrupting the minds of youth of Athens, and thirdly, studying the things present below the earth and in the sky. At that period, a ship was sailing on a sacred operation and no killings were to be done during its absence. Because of that Socrates was restrained to his cell for a month. There was an old friend of Socrates, named Crito, who came to visit Socrates two days prior to his execution. Crito's intention for visiting Socrates was to prepare Socrates to escape from the jail and migrate to another country. But Socrates had something else in his mind altogether. Socrates asserts that by escaping the jail, he would be violating the laws. And hence, the question that arises in this dialogue was, "Ought I to break the laws?" The chief content of the dialogue consists of Socrates response and analysis to Crito's arguments about why Socrates should escape the jail.

The main contents of the dialogue:

Introduction

Crito's plan of action

The opinion of many versus the opinion of experts

The principle and its consequences that says "one should never do wrong."

The laws

Introduction: In the first segment of the dialogue, the characters, Socrates and Crito are introduced, and the audience get to know about the situation of Socrates. After analysing the dream of Socrates and the news brought to him by Crito about his execution, it is clear that execution will take within next 2 to 3 days.

Brief about the characters:

Socrates: In Plato's dialogue, Socrates is the hero (for the audience). The audience get to know that he is calm and composed, cheerful and being his usual self.

Crito: The audience learns that, Crito is an old friend of Socrates. In addition to that, he is kind and loyal friend of Socrates who could readily take up any risk to help him. As is evident in the dialogue Crito lacks the knowledge about the ethical principles that Socrates was talking about, hence can say that he might not have received sufficient philosophical education. In the text the audience will see that Crito is bribing to guard to enter into the cell and was ready to do this again if needed. In other context, Socrates characterized Thessaly (where Crito's friends were living) as a place without order and licence. Above two instances show that Crito's ethics were questionable.

Crito's Proposal:

Early in the morning, Crito reaches Socrates' prison, before the visitors may come to visit the prisoners. He bribes the guards for entering the jail and sits beside Socrates until he is awake. Crito has come there to rescue Socrates as he gets the news about Socrates' execution that will be in next few days. His plan was to make Socrates escape the jail. But finding Socrates unaffected by the news of his execution and unwilling to escape, he starts explaining to him the reasons why he should leave the jail with him.

Crito explains Socrates that he would not want to lose a friend like Socrates. And if he refuses to leave jail, Crito and others friends of Socrates will come in bad light in the view of many. There is a proper planning of escape and this was the right time to do it. There is no issue

regarding money matters and expenses that will result from the execution of this plan. Crito tells Socrates that in Thessaly, safe heaven can be found. And above all, Socrates have children, who would need him. In his absence they will be deprived of a proper livelihood and might suffer from crisis situations. By staying in the prison, soon he will face the state assisted suicide. Such a deliberate attempt to accept his own death is not right is shameful and not honourable. It's not Socrates' duty to accept the punishment as he was wronged the State itself.

The opinion of many versus the opinion of experts:

To the arguments presented by Crito where Socrates' other friends and Crito himself would come in the bad light if they did not help Socrates, Socrates responds by saying that opinions of majority is not what he is concerned about. He gives the following reasons:

First, the opinion of majority many a time proves to be wrong and following it is equal to fooling one-self and cause the greatest harm. On the contrary one should strive to be wise. Here Socrates' value system gives total preference to wisdom. Giving validity to an opinion of majority on the bass of it being popular is foolish. Socrates makes use of an example where he says that an athlete listens to the opinions of his physician rather than that of his fans, because a physician is an expert and will provide the athlete with correct information.

Giving way to Socrates' argument in support of experts, who can be an expert in deciding whether to escape the prison or not? Is it the Philosophers? Or is it Socrates? Or Nobody? The dialogue provide no specific answer to this query, but the fact that he continues with considering the matter for himself tells us that the answer is between one of the latter two.

The principle and its consequences that says “one should never do wrong.”

After rejecting Critos's idea about the opinion of the many, Socrates arrives to the main argument of the dialogue. According to Socrates, The central moral principle suggests that one should never do injustice. This asserts is neither a reason nor a final conclusion.

The Argument for the Central Moral Principle:

1. What is the significance of life is only to live a good life.
2. If our body is contaminated, then our life is not a good life and is not worth living.
3. The soul, which is the part of a person that is concerned with right and wrong, carried more value than body. And if soul is found to be corrupted then life is not worth living.
4. The soul gets deteriorated by injustice and can be healed by justice.
5. We should never do injustice.

In this Socrates avoids using the word “soul”, while he has used it in other dialogues, like in Apology. This shows that the word shows a *new* concept, which is not known to those lack an education in philosophy, in this case, Crito. In fact, we can see here almost the birth of a new philosophical idea that is so known to us.

In the argument presented by Socrates, it suggests that doing injustice to others would not really harm others but instead will corrupt the soul of the wrong doer. By doing wrong action one is incurring damage to their soul, which will get eaten away step by step.

The Consequences of the Central Principle:

One is ought to do the right thing.

Therefore, one must not do wrong to others even if one is harmed.

One should never injure another. Never injure other person in return also.

Therefore, even if one is oneself injured, one should not injure the other in return.

The main questions:

- Is escaping from jail is a wrong action?
- Is anyone harmed by Socrates' escape?

The Laws

The laws says that by running away from prison Socrates would violate the laws and the state since the state is shattered if the judgement of its courts have no force but neutralized by private persons. Objection (suggested by Socrates and heartily agreed heartily by Crito): it was the city who wronged Socrates and it was not right. There was an objection that it was the states that wrong Socrates and not the Laws. To which Crito also agreed.

Answering this objection the Laws provide three additional point of views (the Laws do not talk about that Socrates should not damage the state, according to his own moral values, even if he was hurt by the state first).

The Laws also suggest that concerning them we have the choice of obeying it or persuading the state against it?

For Socrates and for general citizens:

Following the laws and respecting them, carrying out our duties as a citizen, persuading the state if there is something wrong n the laws and accepting the penalty for doing wrong.

The question that now arises is whether this argument suggests people to accept the penalty even if they are innocent? Answer to this is even if one assumes such an argument; it is difficult to believe that one is compelled to admit to an unjustifiable punishment. Furthermore, this unforgiving penalty might be considered as a infringement of agreement on the part of the Laws/State.

Finally, as specified by Robert Nozick, following are the two principles that are readily acceptable:

The ones who prove to be guilty should be punished (for the well being of our society)

No innocent should face any punishment.

The two principles, on the other hand, could not be accepted, given the rational limitations of human knowledge. And therefore, it is an impossible benchmark, that no innocent must ever be punished.

After going through the whole dialogue, it becomes clear that Socrates is a philosopher whose life's main goal is to find the truth and developing virtue. He is not going to adjust according to others opinion of him. Even if one threatens him, he is unaffected by that and continues to believe in his values and principles. The story of his life show that he lived it with a high degree of integrity and is resolute in his mind that he is going to stay that way until his death in the prison.

1.4 LET US SUM UP

Ethics is only feasible since we can operate against our character, based on our principles. It prevents us from merely unfolding what is liable to

take place, and allows us to make decision about what *must* happen. Out of all, doing which action would be considered the best possible way? What choices and decisions would lead us towards the reality? These are the queries ethics seeks to answer.

Ethics urge us to understand our responsibility for our beliefs and our behaviour, and live our lives in best possible way.

Ethics isn't the only a source of ideas about what a "best" decision would seem like. In some individual's opinion it might be to make advances towards their aim n life and achieve success and their look towards fulfilling their objectives (like making money). And some might prefer to the most popular choice.

At the core of these is a piece of ethics, but each is a distracting the reader from the questions that really matter. Ethics tells the best choices as the one which best achieves what is right and constant with the nature of the things in question. These are referred as, 'purpose', 'principles' and 'values'.

Ethics is the process of inquiring, finding and supporting our purpose, principles and values. It's about finding our purpose, the meaning of our existence. Acquiring wisdom about the right way of living each moment. Committing to our values and principles even in the worst situations in our lives.

1.5 KEYWORDS

Meta-ethics: Meta-ethics is the effort to recognize the nature of mind (metaphysical), philosophical theory of knowledge (epistemological), philosophical study of language and texts (semantic), and psychological commitments of moral thoughts and practices.

Normative ethics: It deals with the fundamental moral standards that are justified.

Bioethics: the study of characteristically controversial ethics that occurs in advanced medicine and biology. It is also moral standards which sets some principles to be followed while making medical policies, practice, and research.

Objectivism: It is the philosophy of rational individualism.

Subjectivism: is the premise that perception (or consciousness) is truth, and that there is no secondary, accurate reality that prevails independent of perception. The character of reality is dependent on the consciousness of the individual.

Relativism: the set of guidelines that says, morality, knowledge, and truth exist in relation to society, or culture or historical context, and are not completely absolute.

1.6 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What is the meaning of ethics? When did it come into existence?
2. Write a brief account of the ancient Greek philosophers?
3. Give a brief account of the role of St. Augustine in philosophy?
4. What are the ways in which 20th century philosophers different from the early philosophers?
5. Brief account of the arguments made in Plato's dialogue Crito?

1.7 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1. Taylor, Richard (2000). *Good and Evil*. Prometheus Books.
2. Mill, J. S., & Sher, G. (1979). *Utilitarianism*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co.
3. Annas, J., and Rowe, C., (2002). *New Perspectives on Plato, Ancient and Modern*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
4. Nehamas, A., (1999). *Virtues of Authenticity; Essays on Plato and Socrates*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

1.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Ethics include the vital concepts and fundamental doctrine of civilized human conduct. It is the study of universal values such as basic equality of all women and men, valuing the rights of human or natural rights,

respect to the law of land, responsibility for health and safety and, gradually more, also for the natural habitat and environment. Ethics, mainly expressed in the terms of any action being fairly right and wrong or good and bad. The term is also applicable to any system or premise of just principles..... (answer for Check your Progress 1, Q1.)

2. The difference between morals and ethics are, morals are the codes of conduct created by a group of people. They tell us about with right and wrong actions. On the other hand, ethics tells the character of a person. It also determines whether a person's actions are just or unjust in a specific situation. (answer for Check your Progress 1, Q2)

3. **Socrates** is regarded as one of the best teachers of ethics. He is the one who noticed "the unexamined life is not worth living". Still, he did not preached his followers about how they should lead their lives, unlike many other philosophers. Socrates, to be exact, taught about the concept of inquiry. When the other thinkers boasted about their knowledge and understanding about the subjects of justice, law, temperance, piety, Socrates used to ask those thinkers to give an account, which then he would prove totally wrong. It was due to his way of inquiry, which proved to be threatening to the traditional beliefs, his enemies accused Socrates for corrupting the minds of youths in Athens and planned to have him put behind the bars and consequently he faced death.

According to the conventional standards, it was easy to point that Socrates was actually involved in turning the youths of the Athens corrupt, though he himself had a belief system that supports the obliteration of the beliefs that could not to stand up to the disapproval as primarily essential for the search of true knowledge. This way of thinking made him different from sophists. It was because, according to Socrates that one can acquire knowledge and sense about what virtue is and a person who is called a virtuous person have the proper knowledge of what virtue is. According to him, a person who knows what virtue will necessarily act virtuously. In today's world, this belief system may sound strange, largely because is now easy to differentiate between what a person should do and what he actually wants from life. After assuming this, it becomes easy to imagine situations in which an individual knows what he/she should do but move forward to do something entirely different. Picking his interest over the actions he is ought to do.

The distinction between virtue and self interest was not prevalent during the ancient Greek period. The Greeks supported that virtue is essential for an individual and the society. They also were of the opinion that living in a virtuous manner might not give us the desired results in the financial areas. But they did not assume that material richness is the main factor in an individual's life irrespective of their life being good or ill. As per the unity of virtue, it implies that an individual cannot have only one virtue. If that individual possesses one virtue he ought to possess all the other virtues. As all virtues are interdependent. Both Aristotle in *Nicomachean Ethics* and Plato, in the *Republic*, support to variations of this idea. (answer for Check your Progress 1, Q3.)

4. A stoic person is the one who stays unaffected by the sorrows that are a cause of suffering to the rest of the world. If a person is rational, he will choose logic over emotions. And therefore he will remain unbothered by the status of the fulfilment of his physical desires. According to stoicism all humans have the ability to logic and reasoning. They believe in equality. For Stoics, pain is something physical and it would not affect the reasoning of a person. Stoics might favour suicide to avoid an inevitable pain. Epicurus redefined the term pleasure. According to them its meaning is "pleasure of the mind" rather than "bodily pleasures". According to them the highest form of pleasure is the pleasure of achieving tranquillity, bliss, peace of mind; which can be achieved by removing unfulfilled desires. The way in which this could be achieved is by removing all but the simplest desires; these desires can be readily fulfilled even by those who are not rich. The Epicureans influenced the western thinkers by creating precursors to the ideas like a utilitarian ethics based on pleasure and the Stoics idea of equality also influenced many thinkers of the modern era. (answer for Check your Progress 1, Q4.)

5. Kant stressed upon the idea that actions that are a result of desire are not free. Only rational actions can result in achieving freedom. Therefore rational action cannot be dependent on an individual's personal desires but "must be action in accordance with something that he can will to be a universal law". This view is equivalent to the idea of "general will" that opposes an individual's will, a person shares with the entire community. (answer for Check your Progress 1, Q5.)

Notes

6. The history of Western ethics from the time of the Sophists towards the end of 19th century indicated three invariable themes. First one shows that, there is the in-discrepancy about whether ethical judgments are truths about the world or only contemplation of the desires of those who make those judgements. Secondly, there is the attempt to explain, that doing the right thing is a rational thing to do. And thirdly, there is the argument about the standard of right and wrong and essence of goodness. In the 20th century these themes are applied in solving practical moral issues. The history of ethics from 20th century to the present time will be divided into their main areas: Meta-ethics, Normative ethics and applied ethics. (answer for Check your Progress 1, Q6.)

7. The history of ethics from 20th century to the present time will be divided into their main areas: Meta-ethics, Normative ethics and applied ethics.

Meta-ethics works with the nature of moral judgements. It deals with the meaning of ethics and origin of ethics.

Normative ethics determines the standard of moral judgements and criteria for determining about right and wrong.

Applied ethics include the current and essential topics like animal rights, ethical issues in medical procedures (bioethics), ethical issues in research and development, war, capital punishment. (answer for Check your Progress 1, Q7.)

UNIT - 2:ETHICAL RELATIVISM AND ETHICAL OBJECTIVISM

STRUCTURE

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Herodotus and Custom
- 2.3 Objectivism
- 2.4 Ethical relativism
- 2.5 Moral relativism
- 2.6 Let Us Sum Up
- 2.7 Keywords
- 2.8 Questions for Review
- 2.9 Suggested Readings and References
- 2.10 Answers to Check Your Progress

2.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- learn about Ethical relativism and ethical objectivism
- understand what is moral relativism
- learn about various philosophers who contributed in understanding the concept of relativism.

2.1INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Relativism, in general is the outlook that reality and falsity, correct and wrong, principles of reasoning, and measures of justification are end products of contrasting of differing protocols and structure of evaluation and that their power is restricted to the background giving birth to them. More specifically, “relativism” includes the ideas which maintain that — at a elevated stage of concept — at least some group of entities have the properties they have (e.g., good, flawless, ethically just)

Notes

not *unconditionally*, but only if we compare it to a given frame of assessment and in that order, that the reality of claims contributing to these properties holds only once the applicable frame of estimation is specified or supplied. Ethical Relativism says that there are no objective, common moral ideology that can be applied on all the individuals. It is considered that ethical relativism have two forms: ethical subjectivism and cultural relativism. Basically, according to ethical relativists the morality is only a matter of societal code of conduct or personal conviction, and is not compulsory for others. Cultural Relativism means that all ethical principles are up to standard only if they are accepted by a particular and is not obligatory for other cultures.

Relativism has been, in its different forms, both one of the most famous and most hated philosophical principles of all time. Supporters of this idea perceive it as an indication of tolerance and the only moral and epistemic standpoint valuable of the unbiased and tolerant. Critics refuse it for its supposed confusing and uncritical intellectual liberalism.

Arguments about relativism infuse the whole range of philosophical sub - disciplines.

Ethical relativism is prominent too many social scientists and philosophers as it seems to give the best explanation of the changeability of moral belief. It also offers a reasonable way of elucidating how ethics fits into the world as it is described by modern science. Even if the innate world eventually consists of nothing but value-neutral facts, according to the relativists, ethics still has a base in social arrangements and people's feelings. At last, ethical relativism appears to be particularly suitable to clarify the virtue of patience. If, from an objective point of view, one's own values and the values of one's society have no special reputation, then an approach of "live and let live" towards other individual's values seems correct.

Herodotus the Greek historian of the 5th century BC, supported ethical relativism when he saw that different societies have different traditions and that each individual thinks his own society's customs are greatest. Along with him other philosophers that worked on ethical relativism are David Hume. From ethics to anthropology, science to belief, political conjecture to ontology, theories of meaning and even reasoning,

philosophy has felt the necessity to react to this thrilling and seemingly dissident idea. Debate on relativism also frequently call upon deliberations applicable to the very character and method of philosophy and to the separation between the so-called “analytic and continental” groups in philosophy. And thus far, in spite of an extensive history of discussion heading back to Plato and a progressively larger body of writing, it is still hard to arrive to a settled description of what, at its core, relativism is, and what philosophical importance it has. This chapter attempts to offer a wide description of the ways in which “relativism” has been defined, described, supported and criticized. Along with that, topics like objectivism, moral relativism are explained.

2.2 HERODOTUS AND CUSTOMS

Herodotus, the Greek historian of the 5th century BC, supported ethical relativism when he saw that different societies have different traditions and that each individual thinks his own society’s customs are greatest. But no array of social rules, according to Herodotus, is actually better or worse than any other. Morality is a social creation, flourish differently within different cultures. The people in a society create standards, which they refer to distinguish right from wrong every conclusion of right and wrong accepts one or another of these standards. Hence according to these scholars, if practices like infanticide are acceptable within a society, then they are right for that particular society. And same practices can be considered wrong in other societies and they would condemn such practices.

Do different cultures actually have different moral systems? According to some there is a Universal Grammar of ethics. ‘Thou shalt not steal’, “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour”, ‘Thou shalt do no murder’ etc.

There is no such thing as what is “actually” right, apart from these social laws, for there is no culture-neutral standard to which we can refer to establish which society’s view is accurate. The different social codes are all that exist.

As a society we should be able to criticize our own social conducts.

People of the society should look for moral reforms and advancements.

According to Herodotus, “everywhere custom is king”. The question is does that declare him as a cultural relativist? Not really, but it is a fair hypothesis to look into. Custom may be king, but there may however be natural restrictions or natural currents running through the customs of various individuals, for human nature may not be substantially plastic. Herodotus’ curiosity in Greeks and barbarians may even reflect a need to shed light on the unexamined assumptions of Greekness itself, since his original anthology would as expected to be Greek. His project of comparison may therefore have a non-parochial intention: to liberate the Greeks themselves (or certain of his Greek readers, at least) from the shackles of unreflective rules.

Happiness, Ethics, and Goodness

One of Herodotus’ concern is the character of happiness.. Early in the *Histories*, he writes: “For of those (cities) that were great in earlier times most have now become small, and those that were great in my time were small in the time before [for] ...man’s good fortune never abides in the place”

In Herodotus’ so-called Lydian *logos*, the Athenian Solon (one of seven wise men of ancient Greece) presents contemplation on happiness, good fortune and the god to the wealthy Lydian king Croesus. In that debate, Solon notably says: “Call no man happy until he is dead, until then he is not happy, he is merely lucky”. Some say that this is the Herodotean idea of human life itself, that one should look for happiness only towards the end of life, as fate or the almighty can always to bring the supposedly happy man to sorrow and wreck. Whether this is the Herodotean idea of happiness (or not) is a much-debated question, but the work is deliberately full of stories of hubris followed by reversal. Of course, this takes us to the query of whether the reversal is a divine response to misconduct, the likely outcome of purely human outreaching, or, indeed, purely chance.

To conclude, we can say that Herodotus is evidently more “scientific” than Homer in his assessment of causes and grievances, if possibly less so than his descendant, Thucydides. Herodotus is one of the first Western thinkers to believe intensely and carefully the broad range of human experience for good or bad, as well as the relationship between human

beings to the almighty. “This is the bitterest pain among men,” Herodotus says in one of his final thoughts, “to have much knowledge but no power”.

Check your Progress - 1

1. Discuss the viewpoints of Herodotus regarding relativism?

2. Discuss Herodotus views on happiness?

2.3 OBJECTIVISM

Objectivism says that there is no higher ethical ambition than attaining happiness. But one cannot attain happiness by desire or whim. Primarily, it requires reasonable respect for the truth of reality, together with the facts regarding the human nature and wants. Happiness needs that one lives by objective doctrine, together with ethical integrity and value for the rights of others. Politically, Objectivists support laissez-faire capitalism. Capitalism includes a firmly limited government that conserves each person's rights to liberty, property and life and prevents that anyone using force against anyone else. A person who truly follows objectivism are the successful people who create businesses, invent and develop technologies, make art and ideas, using their talents and business with other independent individuals to attain their goal.

Objectivism is positive, according to it the world is open to human happiness and development and each individual has that capability to live a fulfilling life, full of riches and independently. This optimistic idea permeate Rand's books, which continue to inspire the people.

Objectivism, classified with philosophy which was recognized with the idea of the Ayn Rand who got famous chiefly through her commercially flourishing novels like *The Fountainhead* (1943) and *Atlas*

Notes

Shrugged (1957). Its primary principles includes of various types of **epistemological realism** which means things in the universe are judged right away or instantaneously rather than judged according to the perceptual evidence, **metaphysical realism** which means that the nature of the things in the universe does not depend on how they are perceived, **individualism**, it is when a political system is right if it appropriately give regards to the rights and interests of the people, ethical egoism, it means that a deed is ethically correct if it allows the self-interest of the mediator, and **laissez-faire capitalism**.

Hence, in short we can say that there are four pillars of objectivism: reality, logic, self-centeredness, and capitalism

Reality:

Ayn Rand's philosophy, Objectivism, starts by accepting the fundamental truth that *existence exists*. Reality *is*, and in the pursuit to live we have to find out reality's character and find out how to act productively in it.

To exist is to be something, to own a definite *identity*. This is the rule of Identity: Facts are facts, not depending on any awareness. No quantity of obsessive hoping, desperate yearning or hopeful demanding can change the truth. Nor will ignoring or escaping the truth remove them: the facts remain, permanent.

In Rand's philosophy, reality is not something that one should run away from, but, sternly and proudly, faced. Reality — that which exists — has no replacement, no contenders, nothing surpassing it. To accept the concept existence is to decline all ideas of the mystical and the spiritual, including God.

Reason:

The crucial suggestion made by Rand's philosophy is: accept reason as an supreme. This means: decide to face the truth at all times, in all facets of life, like at work or at home in love or in business without fearing the outcome whether pleasant or unpleasant.

The point of epistemology is to aid us in learning the ways of how to reason: how to imagine conceptually, how to correctly describe our conditions, how to make and apply morality.

Reason doesn't function automatically. We have to choose to trigger our minds, to put them in motion, to lead them to the duty of accepting the facts, and to dynamically carry out the ways that such understanding needs. Our fundamental choice in life is "to think or not." To choose to pursue reason, Rand asserts, is to discard emotions, belief or any form of totalitarianism as guides in life.

Self - centeredness:

Why does an individual require morality?

The characteristic reply is that we have to learn to reject our own welfare and happiness so that one can serve God or other people — and ethics will educate us to do that.

Rand's reply is fundamentally unlike. The use of morality, she asserts, is to tell us what creates happiness and what is in our self - interest.

"Man has," she observes, "no automatic code of survival. . . . His senses do not tell him automatically what is good for him or evil, what will benefit his life or endanger it, what goals he should pursue and what means will achieve them, what *values* his life depends on, what course of action it requires."

"Man must choose his actions, values and goals," she summarizes, "by the standard of that which is proper to man — in order to achieve, maintain, fulfill and enjoy that ultimate value, that end in itself, which is his own life."

Capitalism:

The best social system, according to Rand, is laissez-faire capitalism. Economically, this means "a complete separation of state and economics, in the same way and for the same reasons as the separation of state and church."

Rand's support of laissez-faire capitalism is a consequence of her deeper philosophical ideas. A person who readily faces reality, who accepts his own logical mind as an absolute, and who creates his own life

Notes

his greatest ethical purpose will command his liberty. He will claim the freedom to speak and think, to earn property and carry out business and trade, and to follow his own happiness.

Laissez - faire capitalism, according to Rand, is the system of individual rights. In such a system the government has only one role, though a crucial one: to guard the rights of each person by placing the penalizing use of physical force underneath objective control. Objectivism also throws a light on matters including philosophy of love and love making and aesthetics. Probably the most famous and most-controversial facet of objectivism is its explanation of the moral merits, especially its unusual argument that self - centredness is an asset and altruism is secondary. According to Ayn Rand all individuals whether they understand or not are lead in their judgment and deeds by philosophical values and beliefs. Philosophy thus has huge practical significance and in fact consists of the right philosophy which is necessary to life a happy and content life.

Objectivist Ethics

Rand believes that a value is that which one performs to achieve or keep. All the living organisms function in order to conserve their lives and also that life s the only thing that organisms function to preserve it for their own selves instead for the sake of something else.

Hence life stands the ultimate holder of value for humans, not only for the reason that other principles are a way to conserve it but also because it creates a standard of assessment for all the smaller goals: that which helps in preserving life is a right thing and that which cause damage to life is bad.

Rand believed that these assertions shall apply to organisms in general as well as individually that which conserves the organism's life is right for that organism and which tends to harm that organism is bad for them. In this manner Rand asserted that she solved the years old "is - ought" problem i.e., the issue related to indicating how a proclamation about what ought to can be reasonably derived only from a statement what is.

Rand clarified that a virtue as "the patter of acting by which one gains and/or keeps" a value. Because logic is man's basic approach towards

survival, reasoning, the asset equivalent to the value of rationale, is the greatest human virtue. For that reason, the crucial value for each individual is not his life per se but his life as “a logical being,” which is thus his vital benchmark of assessment. What life as a logical being contains in for Rand is a subject of academic discussion, but it likely to involve devotion to the fundamental principles of rationale, intention (purposiveness), and self - worth and deed in harmony with the equivalent virtues of reason, usefulness, and pride. The outcome and accessory of this kind of life is happiness, the state of awareness which comes from the accomplishment of one’s morals.

Rational selfishness” is the creating of one’s own life as a logical being, or (equally) the pursuit of one’s own happiness. We see here that, self - interest is a basic virtue. Objectivist ethics is thus a type of ethical egoism. On the other hand, altruism, which according to Rand means keeping others above oneself as well as their welfare above oneself is specifically the opposite of righteous activity and is hence a primary vice.

Objectivist political philosophy:

The fundamental doctrine of Rand’s political philosophy is that “no man has the right to *initiate* the use of physical force against others.” Her interpretation was “nonaggression principle” to be ill - assorted with the redeployment of wealth or other societal goods or remuneration via social welfare programs and general public services, because such organisation depends on implied danger of the use of force by government against those from whom wealth is retrieved. The correct function of government, as Rand believes, is to conserve the individual’s unchallengeable rights to life, property and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. There is only one correct socioeconomic system, that is capitalism — “a full, pure, uncontrolled, unregulated laissez-faire” — because only it completely pays regards to the individual’s right to property and is fully steady with the nonaggression code.

Check your Progress - 2

3.What do you understand by objectivism?

4. What are the different pillars of objectivism?

2.4 ETHICAL RELATIVISM

Ethical Relativism holds that there are no objective, common moral principles that are applicable for all people. It is considered that ethical relativism have two forms: ethical subjectivism and cultural relativism. Basically, according to ethical relativists the morality is only a matter of societal code of conduct or personal belief, and is not obligatory for others. Cultural Relativism means that all ethical principles are up to standard only if they are accepted by a particular and is not obligatory for other cultures.

Ethical relativism, the principle that there are no supreme truths in ethics and that what is ethically right or wrong varies from individual to individual or from society to society. There an argument for ethical relativism by **David Hume** (1711 – 76), a Scottish philosopher. According to him the basis of moral beliefs are emotion or sentiments rather than logic. This proposal was created by the 20th-century school of logical positivism and by philosophers like) R.M. Hare (1919 – 2002), and Charles L. Stevenson (1908 – 79) who supposed that the most important function of moral language is not to declare facts but to convey feelings of agreement or disagreement towards some action or to persuade the attitudes and actions of others. This idea which known as emotivism, right and wrong are relative to a person's preferences rather than to social principles.

Ethical relativism is striking to many social scientists and philosophers as it seems to present the best description of the changeability of moral belief. It also offers a reasonable way of elucidating how ethics fits into the world as it is described by modern science. Even if the innate world eventually consists of nothing but value - neutral facts, according

to the relativists, ethics still has a base in social arrangements and people's feelings. At last, ethical relativism appears to be particularly suitable to clarify the virtue of patience. If, from an objective point of view, one's own values and the values of one's society have no special reputation, then an approach of "live and let live" towards other individual's values seems correct.

Ethical Relativism and Post - modernism:

In the period between 1960s and '70s, ethical relativism was linked with postmodernism, a multifarious philosophical movement that doubted the view of objectivity in ethics. Many postmodernists considered the very idea of objectivity as a questionable invention of the post - Enlightenment era or the modern era. From the period of the Enlightenment, many philosophers and scholars believed that there is a universal, objective, and static truth about everything including ethics, science, politics, religion — and that human logic is potent enough to find out this truth. The ultimate result of logical inquiry, therefore, was to be one science, one ethics, one religion, and one politics that would be applicable for all persons in all eras. According to postmodernism, nevertheless, the Enlightenment - inspired proposal of objective truth, which has influenced the thinking of nearly all modern researchers and philosophers, is a delusion that has now collapsed.

This progress, they assert, is largely due to the work of the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844 – 1900) and his supporters. Nietzsche discarded the immature faith that human values merely mirror reality. Instead, each of our beliefs is grounded in a "perspective" that is neither right nor wrong. In ethics, for that reason, there are no moral truths but only moral interpretations of phenomena, which give birth to different existing moral laws. We may attempt to appreciate these moralities by examining their histories and the psychology of the people who accept them, but there is no point of proving one or another of them to be "real." Nietzsche's argument says that those who believe the Judeo - Christian ethical system, which he calls a "slave morality," experience a weak and fearful personality. A different and stronger type of individual, according to him, would refuse these morals and make his own values.

Notes

According to Postmodernists, Western society has crossed beyond the modern intellectual period and is now in a postmodern period characterized partially by the realization that human life and thought is a mixture comprising many perspectives. “Truths,” counting the truths of science as well as ethics, should be documented as beliefs linked with specific traditions that provide particular purposes in particular times and places. The need for absolutes is seen as an injudicious pursuit for the impossible.

Criticisms of Ethical Relativism:

Ethical relativism, then, is a fundamental doctrine that is opposing to what many thoughtful people normally suppose. As such, it must not be confused with the uncontroversial idea that what is right depends on the situation. Everyone, relativists and absolutists alike, agrees that situations make a difference. Whether it is ethically allowed to go into a house, for example, depends on whether one is the owner, a guest, or a burglar. Nor is ethical relativism only the view that different people contain different viewpoint about ethics, which yet again no one would reject. It is, somewhat, a hypothesis regarding the position of moral codes, according to which not any of them is neutrally true. A result of the hypothesis is that there is no means to validate any moral principle as applicable for all people and all societies.

Critics have got a lot of issues regarding this doctrine. They indicate that if ethical relativism is accurate, it would denote that even the most disgraceful practices, such as the physical abuse of women and slavery, are “correct” if they are permitted by the principles of the relevant society. Relativism therefore does not give us of any way of raising moral objections against dreadful social conduct, provided that those behaviour are accepted by the codes of the societies in which they survive.

But should we not be understanding of other cultures? Critics respond by saying that it depends on what kind of societal differences are at concern. Tolerance may appear as a good strategy where small differences between cultures are concerned, but it does not seem so when, for

example, a society involves in formally permitted genocide, even within its own boundaries.

And in any case, the critics say, it would be wrong to believe that relativism implies that we should be tolerant, as tolerance is only another value about which people or societies may disagree. Only an absolutist could say that tolerance is objectively good.

Furthermore, the critics make another point, that sometimes an individual want to criticize their own society's values, and ethical relativism does not allow them of the ways of doing that. If ethical relativism is accurate, we could not make logic of recreating or improving our own society's values, for there would be no benchmark against which our society's active practices could be judged insufficient. Relinquishing slavery, for example, would not be moral growth; it would only be replacing one set of principles with another.

Critics also point out that differences regarding ethics does not mean that there can be no objective reality. After all, folks even reject issues about scientific matters. Some people consider that evil spirits are the cause of a disease whereas others believe that diseases are caused by microorganisms, but we do not because of this difference in opinion conclude that there is no real cause of the disease. The same might be true of ethics — difference in opinion might only indicate that some people have better knowledge and understanding than others.

But there is in fact far less differences than the relativists imply.

According to anthropologists, while there are some differences from culture to culture, there are also some standards that all societies have in common. Some morals are, in fact, essential for society to continue living. Without system of regulations requiring honesty, for example, there could be no communication, and without set of laws against murder and assault, people could not exist together. Lastly, to the declare that there is no acceptable way to judge a society's practices "from the outside," critics may respond that we can always enquire whether a particular cultural practice works to the benefit the people within the culture or not. If, for example, female genital mutilation creates more harm than good for the people of the society that follows it then that piece of evidence may be an objective reason for deciding whether the

practice is good or bad. Thus the call for what is useful or harmful appears to be a paradigm that surpass local disagreements and changes.

Check your Progress - 3

5.What is the meaning of ethical relativism?

6.Discuss the viewpoints of the critics of ethical relativism?

2.5 MORAL RELATIVISM

Moral relativism holds that moral decisions are right or wrong is only in relation to some specific point of view (for example, that of a culture or a historical era) and that no viewpoint is exclusively advantaged over all others. It has frequently been linked with other assertions about morality: particularly, the theory that unlike societies quiet a lot display drastically different ethical principles; the rejection to the theory that there are worldwide ethical principles mutual to every human culture; and the persistence that we should cease from giving ethical judgments on philosophy and practices typical of cultures other than our own.

Relativistic point of view of morals primarily originated the expression in 5th century B.C.E. Greece, but they remained mainly latent until the 19th and 20th centuries. During this period, a number of things connect to make moral relativism to be reasonable. These included a new approval of cultural diversity encouraged by anthropological discoveries; the failing significance of faith in modernized societies; a progressively more critical attitude toward colonialism and its supposition of ethical superiority over the colonized societies; and rising cynicism toward any form of moral objectivism, known the complexity of proving value judgments the way one proves factual claims.

For a few people, moral relativism, which compares the reality of moral claims, follows rationally from a wider concept of cognitive relativism that relativises facts in general. A lot of moral relativists, though, obtain the fact-value division to be essential. A widespread, although negative, basis for accepting moral relativism is merely the seeming unarguability of moral objectivism: every effort to create a single, objectively suitable and universally binding set of ethical principle runs up against dreadful objections. A more optimistic logic is given in support of moral relativism is that it promotes tolerance. It is because it help us to appreciate other cultures on their own terms.

Critics assert that relativists characteristically overstate the amount of variety among cultures since shallow differences frequently cover underlying mutual agreements. In actuality, some assert that there is a core set of universal principles that any individual culture must support if it is to thrive. Moral relativists are also accused of contradictorily claiming that there are no common ethical code of conduct while appealing to a rule of tolerance as a universal law. In the views of many critics, though, the most severe opposition to moral relativism is that it implies the destructive consequence that “anything goes”: slavery is right according to the laws of a slave society; sexist practices are just in accordance with the values of a sexist culture. Lacking some kind of non-relative criterion to appeal to, the critics say, we have no foundation for critical ethical appraisals of our own society’s conventions, or for judging one culture to be greater than another. As one would expect, most moral relativists normally refuse the theory that such decisions need a non-relativistic foundation.

Moral relativism is the idea that there is no common or absolute set of moral values. It’s a adaptation of morals that support the idea “to each her own,” and those who hold it say, “Who am I to judge?”

Moral relativism can be described in several ways.

Descriptive moral relativism, also called as cultural relativism, holds that ethical principles are culturally designed, which is normally right. In fact, there may be a few values that appear to be almost universal, such as respect and honesty, but a lot of differences come into view across cultures when people assess ethical standards around the world.

Meta - ethical moral relativism holds that there are no fixed grounds for following the moral values of one society over another. Cultures create their ethical decisions based on their exclusive values, traditions, and practices. And, actually individuals are likely to judge that the “correct” ethical standards are the standards that is present in their own culture.

Normative moral relativism holds that all cultures should recognize each other’s contradictory ethical values, since there are no universal moral standards. Most philosophers do not agree to this. For example, just because corruption is okay in some societies that will not mean that other societies cannot lawfully criticize it.

Moral relativism is on the contradictory end of the scale from moral totalitarianism, which holds that there is for all times one accurate answer to any moral question. In fact, individuals who stick on to moral relativism would say, “When in Rome, do as the Romans do.”

Moral relativism towards the end of 19th century:

Moral relativism became an increasingly famous towards the end of 19th century because of the following possible reasons:

(i) **The Fall of Religion:** Religion appeared to present the likelihood that morality was independent of individuals. With a moving away from religion there appears to have arrive a certain amount of uncertainty about the likelihood of objective morality. As Dostoevsky notably wrote "If God doesn't exist, everything is permissible". But is it right to say that without God there is no morality? Not actually. If we join Euthyphro in holding that God loves the things and He does *because* they are good, then we are implying that things are good (or bad) *independently* of God’s existence.

(ii) **Observing Social Diversity:** Most of us are conscious about the world that it contains a lot various cultures and that some of those societies are involved in practices very different from our own. Some people, particularly the anthropologist **Ruth Benedict (1887 - 1948)**, have asserted that if we consider all the diversity, we must reach to the conclusion that there is no single objective morality and that morality changes with society.

Check your Progress - 4

7. What does the term moral relativism mean?

8. Explain the different types of moral relativism?

2.6 LET US SUM UP

According to Postmodern scientists, western culture has gone away from the modern intellectual period and is now in a postmodern period characterized partly by the awareness regarding human life and thought is a mixture comprising many perspectives. “Truths,” counting the truths of science as well as ethics, should be documented as beliefs linked with specific traditions that provide particular purposes in particular times and places. The need for absolutes is seen as an injudicious pursuit for the impossible.

And in any case, the critics say, it would be wrong to believe that relativism implies that we should be tolerant, as tolerance is only another value about which people or societies may disagree. Only an absolutist could say that tolerance is objectively good.

Furthermore, the critics make another point, that sometimes an individual want to criticize their own society’s values, and ethical relativism does not allow them of the ways of doing that. If ethical relativism is accurate, we could not make logic of recreating or improving our own society’s values, for there would be no benchmark against which our society’s active practices could be judged insufficient. Relinquishing slavery, for example, would not be moral growth; it would only be replacing one set of principles with another.

Herodotus while talking about ethical relativism concluded that human experience for good or bad, as well as the relationship between human beings to the almighty is a very wide concept to understand and follow. “This is the bitterest pain among men,” Herodotus says in one of his final thoughts, “to have much knowledge but no power.

2.7 KEYWORDS

Epistemological realism: It means that things in the universe are judged right away or instantaneously rather than judged according to the perceptual evidence.

Metaphysical realism: This means that the nature of the things in the universe does not depend on how they are perceived.

Individualism: It is when a political system is right if it appropriately give regards to the rights and interests of the people.

Ethical egoism: It means that a deed is ethically correct if it allows the self-interest of the doer.

Objectivism: Objectivism says that there is no higher ethical ambition than attaining happiness.

Ethical relativism: It is the principle that there are no supreme truths in ethics and that what is ethically right or wrong varies from individual to individual or from society to society.

Moral relativism : Moral relativism holds that moral decisions are right or wrong is only in relation to some specific point of view (for example, that of a culture or a historical era) and that no viewpoint is exclusively advantaged over all others.

2.8 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What is the difference between Relativism and objectivism?
2. Describes the customs as explained by Herodotus?
3. Why did moral relativism flourished during late 19th century?
4. Describe ethical relativism in postmodern era?
5. Describe moral relativism.

2.9 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1. Olinder, Ragnar Francén (2012). Moral and Metaethical Pluralism: Unity in Variation. *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 50 (4):583-601.
2. Beddor, Bob (forthcoming). Relativism and Expressivism. In Martin Kusch (ed.), *Routledge Handbook to Relativism*. Routledge.
3. Robinson, Denis (2010). Reflections on Moral Disagreement, Relativism, and Skepticism about Rules. *Philosophical Topics* 38 (2):131-156.
4. Drefcinski, Shane D. (2008). The Superficial Sophistication of Moral Relativism. *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 11 (3):156-173.
5. Isidora, Stojanovic (2017). Metaethical Relativism. In David Plunkett & Tristram McPherson (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Metaethics*. Oxford: Routledge. pp. 119-134.

2.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Herodotus, the Greek historian of the 5th century BC, supported ethical relativism when he saw that different societies have different traditions and that each individual thinks his own society's customs are greatest. But no array of social rules, according to Herodotus, is actually better or worse than any other. Morality is a social creation, flourish differently within different cultures. The people in a society creates standards, which they refer to distinguish right from wrong every conclusion of right and wrong accepts one or another of these standards. Hence according to these scholars, if practises like infanticide are acceptable within a society, then they are right for that particular society. And same practises can be considered wrong in other societies and they would condemn such practices.
.....(answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 1)
2. Some say that this is the Herodotean idea of human life itself, that one should look for happiness only towards the end of life, as fate

or the almighty can always to bring the supposedly happy man to sorrow and wreck. Whether this is the Herodotean idea of happiness (or not) is a much-debated question, but the work is deliberately full of stories of hubris followed by reversal. Of course, this takes us to the query of whether the reversal is a divine response to misconduct, the likely outcome of purely human outreaching, or, indeed, purely chance.....(answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 2)

3. Objectivism says that there is no higher ethical ambition than attaining happiness. But one cannot attain happiness by desire or whim. Primarily, it requires reasonable respect for the truth of reality, together with the facts regarding the human nature and wants. Happiness needs that one lives by objective doctrine, together with ethical integrity and value for the rights of others. Politically, Objectivists support laissez-faire capitalism. Capitalism includes a firmly limited government that conserves each person's rights to liberty, property and life and prevents that anyone using force against anyone else. A person who truly follows objectivism are the successful people who create businesses, invent and develop technologies, make art and ideas, using their talents and business with other independent individuals to attain their goal.(answer for Check your Progress - 2 Q. 3)
4. There are four pillars of objectivism : reality, logic, self-centredness, and capitalism(answer for Check your Progress - 2 Q. 4)
5. Ethical Relativism holds that there are no objective, common moral principles that are applicable for all people. It is considered that ethical relativism have two forms: ethical subjectivism and cultural relativism. Basically, according to ethical relativists the morality is only a matter of societal code of conduct or personal belief, and is not obligatory for others. Cultural Relativism means that all ethical principles are up to standard only if they are accepted by a particular and is not obligatory for other cultures.....(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 5)

6. Critics have got a lot of issues regarding this doctrine. They indicate that if ethical relativism is accurate, it would denote that even the most disgraceful practices, such as the physical abuse of women and slavery, are “correct” if they are permitted by the principles of the relevant society. Relativism therefore does not give us of any way of raising moral objections against dreadful social conduct, provided that those behaviour are accepted by the codes of the societies in which they survive. But should we not be understanding of other cultures? Critics respond by saying that it depends on what kind of societal differences are at concern. Tolerance may appear as a good strategy where small differences between cultures are concerned, but it does not seem so when, for example, a society involves in formally permitted genocide, even within its own boundaries.(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 6)
7. Moral relativism holds that moral decisions are right or wrong is only in relation to some specific point of view (for example, that of a culture or a historical era) and that no viewpoint is exclusively advantaged over all others. It has frequently been linked with other assertions about morality: particularly, the theory that unlike societies quiet a lot display drastically different ethical principles; the rejection to the theory that there are worldwide ethical principles mutual to every human culture; and the persistence that we should cease from giving ethical judgments on philosophy and practices typical of cultures other than our own.(answer for Check your Progress - 4 Q. 7)
8. **Descriptive moral relativism**, also called as cultural relativism, holds that ethical principles are culturally designed, which is normally right. In fact, there may be a few values that appear to be almost universal, such as respect and honesty, but a lot of differences come into view across cultures when people assess ethical standards around the world. **Meta-ethical moral relativism** holds that there are no fixed grounds for following the moral values of one society over another. Cultures create their ethical decisions based on their exclusive values, traditions, and

Notes

practices. And, actually individuals are likely to judge that the “correct” ethical standards are the standards that is present in their own culture. **Normative moral relativism** holds that all cultures should recognize each other’s contradictory ethical values, since there are no universal moral standards. Most philosophers do not agree to this. For example, just because corruption is okay in some societies that will not mean that other societies cannot lawfully criticize it. **Moral relativism** is on the contradictory end of the scale from moral totalitarianism, which holds that there is for all times one accurate answer to any moral question. In fact, individuals who stick on to moral relativism would say, “When in Rome, do as the Romans do.”
.....(answer for Check your Progress - 4 Q. 8)

UNIT - 3: ETHICAL RELATIVISM AND ETHICAL OBJECTIVISM

STRUCTURE

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Psychological egoism
- 3.3 Ethical egoism and ultimate principles
- 3.4 Let Us Sum Up
- 3.5 Keywords
- 3.6 Questions for Review
- 3.8 Suggested Readings and References
- 3.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

3.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- learn about various types of egoism.
- understand the difference between about ethical egoism and psychological egoism.
- know about the relevance of these theories in terms of ethics.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Ethical egoism is the moral set of guidelines that every person ought to operate to uphold his or her own welfare exclusively. In contrast to psychological egoism, ethical egoism tells about the ways in which people should behave rather the way in which they actually behave. Possibly the most noteworthy supporters of ethical egoism were Max Stirner and Ayn Rand, both of them said that an individual's main goal should be to follow one own self-interest. Ethical egoism is the standardizing theory that the backing of one's own benefit is in harmony with morality. In other words, it is said that it is at all times ethical to support one's own good, and it is never ethical not to encourage it. In the

Notes

faded description, it is held that even though it is at all times ethical to encourage one's own benefit, it is not obligatory never ethical to not. This means that, there may be circumstances in which the prevention of an individual's interest may be an ethical deed.

The topic of egoism and philanthropy are subject even more than usually in philosophy to critical indistinctness, which must be cleared out before one can say anything useful. Egoism, to start with, has two variants - "psychological" and "ethical." The psychological egoism is a theory concerning human motivations: what makes us tick? According to egoism, people are motivated completely by self-interest, even though sometimes it appears to be otherwise. Altruism, of course, rejects this. On the other hand, ethical egoism is a normative theory, a theory about what we ought to do. It says that one should or must, operate only to meet his own selfish interests. How these two are connected is perhaps the main question for the subject. Psychological egoism portrays human nature as being completely self-oriented and self - centred. According to the critics psychological egoism converts ethics into unproductive thing. However, this allegation presumes that ethical actions are essentially other - regarding, which critics would first have to create. Detractors may also utilize baseless proof to condemn psychological egoism — surely, they assert, there is a crowd of facts supporting unselfish or duty bound deeds that cannot be said to engage the self - interest of the individual. Nevertheless, what meets the criteria to be considered as apparent baseless evidence by critics turns into a complicated and arguable issue. This is for the reason that, in response to their critics, psychological egoists may try to take the question away from external appearances to fundamental intentions of acting compassionately towards others. Psychological altruism maintains that all human behaviour is essentially other - centred, and other-encouraged. One's becoming a loner (an apparently selfish act) can again be explained through psychological altruism as an act of unadulterated dignified unselfishness: a hermit is not uncaringly hiding herself away, rather, what she is doing is not imposing her potentially inelegant deeds or offensive looks upon others. An equivalent study of psychological altruism thus results in contrasting inferences to psychological egoism. However, psychological altruism is

debatably just as closed as psychological egoism: with it one supposes that an individual's intrinsically private and subsequently unexamined intentions are altruistic. If both theories can be reasonably considered, and if the choice between them becomes the flip of a coin, then their reliability must be doubted.

3.2 PSYCHOLOGICAL EGOISM

The explanatory egoist's theory is known as "psychological egoism". Psychological egoism portrays human nature as being completely self-oriented and self-centred. Examples of this account of human nature precedes the creation of the theory, and, came into notice in of British Reformation political philosopher, Thomas Hobbes and British Victorian historian, Macaulay. To the question, "What proposition is there respecting human nature which is absolutely and universally true?", Macaulay, answers, "We know of only one... that men always act from self-interest." (Quoted in Garvin.) In *Leviathan*, Hobbes upholds that, "No man gives but with intention of good to himself; because gift is voluntary; and of all voluntary acts the object to every man is his own pleasure." In its better form, psychological egoism claims that people *always* operate in accordance with self-interests, and, cannot but act in their own interests, even if they may mask their inspiration with references to serving others or performing their duties.

The topic of egoism and philanthropy are subject even more than usually in philosophy to critical indistinctness, which must be cleared out before one can say anything useful. Egoism, to start with, has two variants - "psychological" and "ethical." The main differences between psychological and ethical egoism is explained. The psychological egoism is a theory concerning human motivations: what makes us tick? According to egoism, people are motivated completely by self-interest, even though sometimes it appears to be otherwise. Altruism, of course, rejects this. On the other hand, ethical egoism is a normative theory, a theory about what we ought to do. It says that one should or must, operate only to meet his own selfish interests. How these two are connected is perhaps the main question for the subject.

Critics claim that psychological egoism turns ethics into unproductive thing. However, this allegation presumes that ethical actions are essentially other - regarding, which critics would first have to create. Detractors may also utilize baseless proof to condemn psychological egoism — surely, they assert, there is a crowd of facts supporting unselfish or duty bound deeds that cannot be said to engage the self - interest of the individual. Nevertheless, what meets the criteria to be considered as apparent baseless evidence by critics turns into a complicated and arguable issue. This is for the reason that, in response to their critics, psychological egoists may try to take the question away from external appearances to fundamental intentions of acting compassionately towards others; for example, they may assert that apparently selfless actions essentially does have a self - interested constituent. For example, if the person was not to present help to a stranger, he or she may experience guilt or may appear awful in front of a peer group.

On this point, psychological egoism's strength turns on investigating and analyzing ethical motivation. But since inspiration is intrinsically private and unreachable to others (an agent could be lying to herself or to others about the original motive), the theory moves from a theoretical explanation of human nature - one that can undergo observational examination - to an hypothesis about the inner mechanisms of human behaviour: psychological egoism walks beyond the likelihood of experiential authentication and the likelihood of empirical denial (since motives are private), and hence it turns into what is termed a “closed theory”.

A closed theory is a theory that discards challenging theories on its own conditions and is non - verifiable and non - falsifiable. If psychological egoism is condensed to a supposition relating to human behaviour and its secreted intentions, then it follows that it is just as applicable to hold a rival theory of human inspiration such as psychological altruism.

Psychological altruism maintains that all human behaviour is essentially other-centred, and other-encouraged. One's becoming a loner (an apparently selfish act) can again be explained through psychological

altruism as an act of unadulterated dignified unselfishness: a hermit is not uncaringly hiding herself away, rather, what she is doing is not imposing her potentially inelegant deeds or offensive looks upon others. An equivalent study of psychological altruism thus results in contrasting inferences to psychological egoism. However, psychological altruism is debatably just as closed as psychological egoism: with it one supposes that an individual's intrinsically private and subsequently unexamined intentions are altruistic. If both theories can be reasonably considered, and if the choice between them becomes the flip of a coin, then their reliability must be doubted.

A weak form of psychological egoism agrees to the probability of altruistic or compassionate manners, but continues to hold that, at any time a preference is made by an individual to act, the deed is by description one that the *individuals* desires to do at that time. The deed is self-serving, and is hence adequately described by the theory of psychological egoism. Let one suppose that individual X wishes to aid the poor; therefore, X is acting egoistically by truly wishing to help; again, if X ran into a building, which is on fire, to save a puppy, it must be the case that X wished to save the puppy. However, telling all intentions as what an individual wants to do stay challenging: rationally, the theory becomes tautologous and therefore incapable to offer a helpful, vivid meaning of motivation because one is basically making an debatably philosophically boring argument that an individual is motivated to do what she is motivated to do.

In addition to this, if helping others is what X wants to do, then to what degree can X be continued to be called an egoist? X acts because that is what X does, and deliberation of the moral "ought" turns out be right away superfluous. Consequently, critics assert that psychological egoism is philosophically insufficient because it bypasses the grand degrees of motive. For example, one can assert that the psychological egoist's idea of motive bypasses the conflicts that her theory has with the concept of duty, and, connected social merits such as respect, esteem, and reputation, which fill the volumes of history and literature.

Notes

David Hume, in his *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* (Appendix II — Of Self Love), proposes six disproofs of what he calls the “selfish hypothesis,” an debatably ancient relative of psychological egoism. First, Hume asserts that self - interest is contradictory to moral emotions that may involve the one in concern for others, and, may inspire one’s deeds for others. These ethical sentiments include compassion, love, gratitude and friendship. Secondly, psychological egoism tries to decrease human inspiration to a sole reason, which is a ‘fruitless’ task — the "love of *simplicity*...has been the basis of much fake analysis in philosophy." Thirdly, it is simple that animals act benevolently with one another, and, if it is acknowledged that animals can operate altruistically, then how is it possible to be absent in humans? Fourthly, the theory we use to explain compassionate actions cannot be pointless; sometimes an individual clearly does not have his own interest in the riches of another, yet will wish for other individual’s wellbeing. Any effort to generate a made - up vested interest, as the psychological egoist will try, gives in unsuccessful results. Fifthly, David Hume claims that we have preceding motivations to self-interest; we may have, for example, an inclination in the direction of pride, reputation, or retribution that goes beyond any gain to the individual. Finally, David Hume says that even though the selfish theory were accurate, there are a adequate number of dispositions to create a extensive likelihood of ethical deeds, letting one individual to be called cruel and another humane; and he asserts that the latter is to be favoured over the previous.

Check your Progress - 1

1. What is meant by psychological egoism?

2. What are the views of critics on psychological egoism?

3. What were the views of the supporters of this theory?

4. What is meant by psychological altruism?

3.3 ETHICAL EGOISM AND ULTIMATE PRINCIPLES

Ethical egoism is the standardizing theory that the backing of one's own benefit is in harmony with morality. In other words, it is said that it is at all times ethical to support one's own good, and it is never ethical not to encourage it. In the faded description, it is held that even though it is at all times ethical to encourage one's own benefit, it is not obligatory never ethical to not. This means that, there may be circumstances in which the prevention of an individual's interest may be an ethical deed. In an made-up construction of a humankind occupied by only one being, it is likely that the in search of morality is the similar to the pursuit of one's own benefit in that what is beneficial for the individual is similar to that which is in that individual's interest. Debatably, there could by no means occur an instance when the individual must not to go after his own interest in favour of a different morality, except if that individual creates produces an substitute of ethical system in which he have to give up his principles in support of an desired self, or, other thing such as the world, or the individual's God. Critics of ethical egoism may assert, nevertheless, that even though it is likely for this Robinson Crusoe type person to grieve previous decisions as not favorable to his own benefit, the blunder is not a ethical blunder but a fault in recognizing self - interest. Apparently this lonesome person will start to understand the differences between short and long - term benefits, and, that short - term trouble can be compensated by long - term benefit. Along with that, the critics assert that although the world is occupied by one individual, they ought to perform their duties; duties are those activities that logic says ought to be practiced without considering to take out some benefit or loss to self or others. In addition, the deontologist emphasize the use of yet an additional ethical area which

Notes

must be practiced, to be precise, that of impartial duties. The difficulty with obscuring an individual's life with impartial duties, however, is in giving them a neutral job in a solely subjective world. Impartiality or neutrality, the ethical egoist may rejoin, could only survive where there are challenging selves: or else, the endeavor to be neutral in judging one's deeds is a superfluous work. (Nevertheless, the Cartesian rationalist could snap by saying that it need not be so, that a living being must work rationally, and logic will reveal what are the correct actions he should pursue.)

If we shift away from the made-up construct of a single individual's world, ethical egoism appear underneath fire from more relevant arguments. In conforming with ethical egoism, the person endeavor at her own utmost benefit. Paying no attention to a meaning of the good for now, it may fairly be argued that going after self interest might clash with another's pursuit, thus generating a condition of clash. In a typical example, a youthful individual may see his utmost benefit in murdering his wealthy uncle to succeed to his millions. It is the wealthy uncle's utmost benefit to go on with enjoying his wealth, as he sees fit.

According to critics, conflict is an intrinsic hitch of ethical egoism, and the representation seemingly does not own a disagreement resolution method. With the extra basis of living in society, ethical egoism has a lot to answer to: noticeably there are circumstances when two individual's supreme benefits – the personally supposed operating of their own self-interest – will clash, and, a resolution to these kinds of problems is an essential constituent of any theory trying to offer an ethical system.

The ethical egoist challenges that her assumption, in fact, has solutions to the clash. The first solution comes from a condition of nature inspection. If, in the wilderness, two individuals at the same time cross paths with the only means of drinkable water a possible problem may occur if both make a concurrent say to it. With no alternative to negotiation they will be required to either agree to an equivalent share of the water, which would fulfill the rational egoism. (This means that, it would be beneficial for both the parties to share, for both may benefit from the water and each other's presence, and, if the water is limitless, neither can benefit from dominating the source.) But a detractor may uphold that this

resolution is not essentially in obedience with ethical egoism.

Questionably, the detractor maintains that, the two have no potential solution, and must, therefore, fight for the water. This is time and again the taken against egoism usually: that is, the outcome is always an insoluble conflict that entails, or imposes an alternative to force by one or both of the individuals involved in it. For the detractor, the preferred solution is, therefore, a recognition of the ethical theory that “might is right;” that is, the opponent holds that the only solution available is a fight and the individual who is stronger will get the water and thus gain proprietary rights.

However, ethical egoism does not have to *reasonably* result in a Darwinian dilemma between the powerful and the fragile in which potency decides moral righteousness to possessions or values. In fact, the “practical person” position may strike one as philosophically insufficient as that of psychological egoism, even though commonly striking. For example, as an alternative of surrendering to unsolvable conflict, the two individuals could help each other (as rational egoism would need).

Through collaboration, both individuals would, thereby, jointly gain from conserving and sharing the entity. Against the opponent’s negative presupposition that conflict is unsolvable devoid of alternative to triumph, the ethical egoist can answer that reasoning people can identify that their supreme interests are taken care of more by helping each other rather than creating conflict. War is intrinsically pricey, and, even the combating beasts of the wild impulsively distinguish its possible expenses, and, have developed conflict - avoiding approach.

On the contrary, the ethical egoist can argue less generously, that in case one person get to the desired reserve first, he would then be able to take fair control and ownership of it – the second individual cannot own any right to it, except insofar as he might make a deal with its present holder. It is obvious that, altruistic deliberations may inspire the owner to save a share for the second comer, and financial thoughtfulness may motivate both to trade in those goods that each can better manufacture or obtain: the one may safeguard the water supply from animals while the other hunts. Such would be a standard tolerant evaluation of this condition,

Notes

which believes the advance of property rights to be the evident way out to apparently inflexible conflicts over possessions.

Another conflict - resolution branches out from detractor's doubts that ethical egoists could rationally follow their welfare at the price of others. Particularly, a detractor may challenge that individual's self gain rationally cannot be in one's best interest if it involves causing damage to another: causing damage to another would be to agree to the belief that doing harm to another is moral (that is, one would be associating "causing harm" with "one's own greatest interests"), whereas, sign indicate that belief to be irrational on universalistic criterion. However, an ethical egoist may counter that in the case of the wealthy uncle and ravenous nephew, for example, it is *not* the case that the nephew would be acting morally by murdering his uncle, and that for a detractor to argue otherwise is to disapprove of individual's benefit from the distinct ethical viewpoint that denounces murder. Along with this, the ethical egoist may react by saying that these meticulous doubts are based on a misunderstanding as a consequence of amalgamating ethics (that is, self - interest) with individual's own benefit; The ethical egoist may argue that if the nephew were to try to do damage for his own gain, that he would discover that his uncle or others would or may be allowed to cause harm in return.

The detractor's worry is based on a misapprehension of ethical egoism, and is an effort to cleverly reinsert the "might is right" assertion. As a result, the ethical egoist is unjustly chastised on the grounds of a straw - man argument. Eventually, though, one comes to the result which we got in the debate of the first solution; that is, one should either agree to the belief that might is right (which in most scenarios would obviously be opposing to one's best interest), or acknowledge that teamwork with others is a more flourishing strategy to improving one's interests.

Although interaction can either be brutal or peaceful, an ethical egoist discards violence as deterioration the pursuit of self - interest.

A third conflict - resolution involves the introduction of human rights as a benchmark. This solution integrates the conclusions of the first two solutions by saying that there is a moral framework that can rationally be understood from ethical egoism. However, the logical understanding is

philosophically difficult (and, hence, interesting) because ethical egoism is the hypothesis that the backing of one's own self-interest is in harmony with ethics whereas rights integrate borders to actions that logic or experience has shown to be opposing the pursuit of self-interest.

Although it is superficial to argue that the insatiable nephew does not have a right to declare his uncle's money as his own because it is not his but his uncle's, and to assert that it is incorrect to act violently against the person of another because that person has a lawful right to live in harmony (thus providing the matter of conflict-resolution for ethical egoism), the problem of illustrating this theory for the ethical egoist lies in the academic debates essential for verifying the claims for the existence of rights and then, once verified, linking them to the pursuit of a person's greatest benefit.

Ethical egoism is frequently associated with self-centeredness, the disregard of others' needs in favor of one's own needs. However, ethical egoism cannot be articulately associated with selfishness because it is often in one's self-interest to aid others or to abstain from harming them. For example, Rand argues that it would be bizarre to state that a husband who gives away a lot of money to treat his wife of an illness does so entirely on her behalf. For an ethical egoist, the inspiration to assist friends and family is one's personal relationship with them and the pain that would occur due to their bad luck or suffering.

The manner in which we perform our actions for our loved ones and friends, cannot be done for everybody. Rand defines such deeds as "a reward which men have to earn by means of their virtues and which one cannot grant to mere acquaintances or strangers." Absolute strangers are not worthy of this extraordinary treatment. And yet, Rand does support the idea of showing all people a "generalized respect and good will" which leads to non-involvement; we should circumvent randomly causing harm to others, but our duties to help them are also least.

Although ethical egoism has various applications (particularly in its ability to effortlessly resolve morality and self-interest), the theory has been almost commonly discarded as a satisfactory ethical theory. One of the most fundamental criticisms is that ethical egoists characteristically misrepresent altruism, the principle that is contrary to ethical egoism and

Notes

has a foundation morality on a concern for others' welfare. If one supports altruism, Rand argues that the person should also accept low self-esteem, an impolite manner toward others, and a "nightmare view of existence." Stirner says an analogous mischaracterization of altruism in his explanation of benevolent actions: "You love men, therefore you torture the individual man, the egoist; your philanthropy (love of men) is the tormenting of men." Rand and Stirner do not take in account the benefits of serving others; they identify altruism only as an obstruction to one's individual goals. The glitch in their idea is that morality concerns all the persons, and the common wellbeing of others, even if it is not the limited focus of morality, is a crucial component of any complete ethical theory.

Arguments taking sides of ethical egoism, particularly Rand's, also liable to depend on a false dilemma. Altruism is taken as the only substitute to idea of ethical egoism, and once it is rejected, ethical egoism is approved. This study is inadequate because it leaves out debate and denial of a range of other ethical theories. Setting up that intense altruism is an unwelcomed ethical theory does not offer an adequate foundation for approving ethical egoism over all other substitutes.

These issues might be solved with extra argumentation, but unluckily, they are not the only problems with ethical egoism. Another problem is that an ethical egoist would not like ethical egoism to be generalized. If it were generalized, others would be discouraged from operating in an altruistic manner towards the egoist, which would be in opposition to the egoist's self-interests. Hence, it appears to be in one's interests to support the theory in one's opinion but not publicly, which results in an interesting conceptual difficulty: how can ethical egoism be taken as ethically binding if its supporters do not desire it to be universally functional?

Another obvious dilemma is that ethical egoism suggests no way of solving conflicts of interest. If ethical egoism were more extensively followed, sooner or later, one person's interests would conflict with that of another's interests. In such a condition, it would be impracticable for both to follow their own goals at the same time, but how does one choose

whose interests will be the main concern? Ethical egoism does not offer any answer.

A final and possibly crucial criticism to ethical egoism is given by James Rachels. He associates ethical racism with egoism in ways of its conceptual construction. Racists separate all individuals into groups and behave differently with those people on the basis of the traits that that race have, but carry no explanation for concluding that their own race is superior than others, portraying racism an illogical principles. Likewise, ethical egoists claim that we “divide the world into two categories of people — ourselves and all the rest — and that we regard the interests of those in the first group as more important than the interests of those in the second group.” The egoist can give no explanation for the difference between the two groups. Therefore, Rachels reaches to the conclusion that ethical egoism is an illogical policy and that others should be presented with the same moral consideration as us because their qualities and wishes are similar to our own.

Check your Progress - 2

5. What do you understand by ethical egoism?

6. What are the differences between psychological and ethical egoism?

7. What are the views of critics about ethical egoism?

8. What were the views of Ayn Rand on ethical egoism?

3.4 LET US SUM UP

Ethical egoism is frequently associated with self - centeredness, the disregard of others' needs in favor of one's own needs. However, ethical egoism cannot be articulately associated with selfishness because it is often in one's self - interest to aid others or to abstain from harming them. For example, Rand argues that it would be bizarre to state that a husband who gives away a lot of money to treat his wife of an illness does so entirely on her behalf. For an ethical egoist, the inspiration to assist friends and family is one's personal relationship with them and the pain that would occur due to their bad luck or suffering.

The manner, in which we perform our actions for our loved ones and friends, cannot be done for everybody. Rand defines such deeds as “a reward which men have to earn by means of their virtues and which one cannot grant to mere acquaintances or strangers.” Absolute strangers are not worthy of this extraordinary treatment. And yet, Rand does support the idea of showing all people a “generalized respect and good will” which leads to non - involvement; we should circumvent randomly causing harm to others, but our duties to help them are also least.

Another obvious dilemma is that ethical egoism suggests no way of solving conflicts of interest. If ethical egoism were more extensively followed, sooner or later, one person's interests would conflict with that of another's interests. In such a condition, it would be impracticable for both to follow their own goals at the same time, but how does one choose whose interests will be the main concern? Ethical egoism does not offer any answer.

On this point, psychological egoism's strength turns on investigating and analyzing ethical motivation. But since inspiration is intrinsically private and unreachable to others (an agent could be lying to herself or to others about the original motive), the theory moves from a theoretical explanation of human nature -- one that can undergo observational examination--to an hypothesis about the inner mechanisms of human behaviour: psychological egoism walks beyond the likelihood of experiential authentication and the likelihood of empirical denial (since motives are private), and hence it turns into what is termed a “closed theory.”

In general, ethical egoism is a widely-rejected ethical theory with very less classical philosophers as its support. Developing ethical egoism into a rational, practical ethical theory would have involved enormous amendment to the original principle.

3.5 KEYWORDS

1. **Ethical egoism:** It means that a deed is ethically correct if it allows the self-interest of the doer.
2. **Altruism:** It is the unselfish concern for others welfare and wellbeing.
3. **Psychological egoism:** Psychological egoism portrays human nature as being completely self-oriented and self-centered.
4. **Closed theory:** A closed theory is a theory that discards challenging theories on its own conditions and is non - verifiable and non - falsifiable.

3.6 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

6. What is the difference between Altruism and ethical egoism?
7. Why ethical egoism has been rejected as a theory under psychology?
8. What is the relation between ethical egoism and psychological egoism?
9. What is an altruistic behaviour? How is it different from psychological egoism?

3.7 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

6. Smith, Tara (2008). Ayn Rand's Normative Ethics: The Virtuous Egoist. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 18 (1):117-126. Beddor, Bob (forthcoming). Relativism and Expressivism. In Martin Kusch (ed.), *Routledge Handbook to Relativism*. Routledge.

7. Chang, Ruth (2001). Two Conceptions of Reasons for Action. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 62 (2):447-453.
- Drefcinski, Shane D. (2008). The Superficial Sophistication of Moral Relativism. *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 11 (3):156-173.
8. Frankena, William K. (2000). The Methods of Ethics, Edition 7, Page 92, Note 1: William K. Frankena. *Utilitas* 12 (3):278-290.
9. Ashmore Jr, Robert B. (1977). Ewing on "Higher" Egoism. *New Scholasticism* 51 (4):513-523.
10. Sterba, James P. (2011). Hills, Alison. The Beloved Self: Morality and the Challenge from Egoism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. Pp. xii+266. \$55.00 (cloth). *Ethics* 121 (3):661-664.
11. Regis Jr, Edward (1980). What is Ethical Egoism? *Ethics* 91 (1):50-62.
12. Maurer, Christian (2019). *Self-love, Egoism and the Selfish Hypothesis: Key Debates from Eighteenth-Century British Moral Philosophy*. Edinburgh, Vereinigtes Königreich: Edinburgh University Press.
13. Long, Roderick (2003). Review of Review of Leland Yeager, Ethics as Social Science. *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics* 6:89-98.

3.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

9. The explanatory egoist's theory is known as "psychological egoism". Psychological egoism portrays human nature as being completely self-oriented and self-centered. Examples of this account of human nature precedes the creation of the theory, and came into notice in of British Reformation political philosopher, Thomas Hobbes and British Victorian historian, Macaulay. To the question, "What proposition is there respecting human nature which is absolutely and universally true?", Macaulay, answers, "We know of only one . . . that men always act from self-interest." (Quoted in Garvin.)

In *Leviathan*, Hobbes upholds that, "No man giveth but with intention of good to himself; because gift is voluntary; and of all voluntary acts the object to every man is his own pleasure." In its better form, psychological egoism claims that people *always* operate in accordance with self-interests, and, cannot but act in their own interests, even if they may mask their inspiration with references to serving others or performing their duties.

10. Critics claim that psychological egoism turns ethics into unproductive thing. However, this allegation presumes that ethical actions are essentially other-regarding, which critics would first have to create. Detractors may also utilize baseless proof to condemn psychological egoism — surely, they assert, there is a crowd of facts supporting unselfish or duty bound deeds that cannot be said to engage the self-interest of the individual. Nevertheless, what meets the criteria to be considered as apparent baseless evidence by critics turns into a complicated and arguable issue. This is for the reason that, in response to their critics, psychological egoists may try to take the question away from external appearances to fundamental intentions of acting compassionately towards others; for example, they may assert that apparently selfless actions essentially does have a self-interested constituent. For example, if the person was not to present help to a stranger, he or she may experience guilt or may appear awful in front of a peer group.

11. British Reformation political philosopher, Thomas Hobbes and British Victorian historian, Macaulay. To the question, "What proposition is there respecting human nature which is absolutely and universally true?", Macaulay, answers, "We know of only one . . . that men always act from self-interest." (Quoted in Garvin.)

In *Leviathan*, Hobbes upholds that, "No man giveth but with intention of good to himself; because gift is voluntary; and of all voluntary acts the object to every man is his own pleasure." In its better form, psychological egoism claims that people *always* operate in accordance with self-interests, and, cannot but act in

- their own interests, even if they may mask their inspiration with references to serving others or performing their duties.
12. Psychological altruism maintains that all human behaviour is essentially other - centred, and other-encouraged. One's becoming a loner (an apparently selfish act) can again be explained through psychological altruism as an act of unadulterated dignified unselfishness: a hermit is not uncaringly hiding herself away, rather, what she is doing is not imposing her potentially inelegant deeds or offensive looks upon others. An equivalent study of psychological altruism thus results in contrasting inferences to psychological egoism. However, psychological altruism is debatably just as closed as psychological egoism: with it one supposes that an individual's intrinsically private and subsequently unexamined intentions are altruistic. If both theories can be reasonably considered, and if the choice between them becomes the flip of a coin, then their reliability must be doubted.
 13. Ethical egoism is the standardizing theory that the backing of one's own benefit is in harmony with morality. In other words, it is said that it is at all times ethical to support one's own good, and it is never ethical not to encourage it. In the faded description, it is held that even though it is at all times ethical to encourage one's own benefit, it is not obligatory never ethical to not. This means that, there may be circumstances in which the prevention of an individual's interest may be a ethical deed.
 14. The psychological egoism is a theory concerning human motivations: what makes us tick? According to egoism, people are motivated completely by self-interest, even though sometimes it appears to be otherwise. Altruism, of course, rejects this. On the other hand, ethical egoism is a normative theory, a theory about what we ought to do. It says that one should or must, operate only to meet his own selfish interests. How these two are connected is perhaps the main question for the subject. Psychological egoism portrays human nature as being completely self-oriented and self - centred. According to the critics

psychological egoism converts ethics into unproductive thing. However, this allegation presumes that ethical actions is essentially other-regarding, which critics would first have to create.

15. Ethical egoism is frequently associated with self - centredness, the disregard of others' needs in favor of one's own needs. However, ethical egoism cannot be articulately associated with selfishness because it is often in one's self - interest to aid others or to abstain from harming them. For example, Rand argues that it would be bizarre to state that a husband who gives away a lot of money to treat his wife of an illness does so entirely on her behalf. For an ethical egoist, the inspiration to assist friends and family is one's personal relationship with them and the pain that would occur due to their bad luck or suffering. Another obvious dilemma is that ethical egoism suggests no way of solving conflicts of interest. If ethical egoism were more extensively followed, sooner or later, one person's interests would conflict with that of another's interests. In such a condition, it would be impracticable for both to follow their own goals at the same time, but how does one choose whose interests will be the main concern? Ethical egoism does not offer any answer.
16. Rand defines such deeds as "a reward which men have to earn by means of their virtues and which one cannot grant to mere acquaintances or strangers." Absolute strangers are not worthy of this extraordinary treatment. And yet, Rand does supports the idea of showing all people a "generalized respect and good will" which leads to non - involvement; we should circumvent randomly causing harm to others, but our duties to help them are also least. Rand argues that it would be bizarre to state that a husband who gives away a lot of money to treat his wife of an illness does so entirely on her behalf. For an ethical egoist, the inspiration to assist friends and family is one's personal relationship with them and the pain that would occur due to their bad luck or suffering.

UNIT - 4: VALUE

STRUCTURE

- 4.0 Objectives
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Meaning of Value
- 4.3 Concept of right and wrong
- 4.4 Transvaluation of values
- 4.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 4.6 Keywords
- 4.7 Questions for Review
- 4.8 Suggested Readings and References
- 4.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

4.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Learn about the meaning of value. And also about the various distinctions under the concept of values.
- Understand the concept of right and wrong, i.e., the basis on which actions are categorized or judged as right or wrong or ethical or unethical.
- Understand the concept of transvaluation of values. And knowing the reason behind the requirement of transvaluation.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Values are fundamental and essential viewpoint that direct or inspire attitudes or actions. They aid in determining what is vital for us. Values explain the personal qualities we choose to represent to guide our actions; the kind of human being we desire to be; the way in which we treat ourselves and others, and our interaction with the people around us. They provide the common guiding principle for our behaviour. Values

gives us a sense of what is right, just, good and worthwhile. Not just the kind of actions, but the intentions behind those actions are determined by what values are there in a person. There are common / general values, which are seen common among various societies; there are cultural values, which are accepted only by specific societies or religious groups. Personal values, depicts the idea of right and wrong on individual basis. Values are essential to ethics. Ethics is concerned with the morality of an action and decisions one make based on the values. It helps in determining which values should be given importance and which not.

4.2 MEANING OF VALUE

Values systematize our lives and direct our behavior. Generally speaking, we compare objects of a various categories like probable future activities, guidelines, states of affairs, supplies, and even individuals on the basis of morals. One often the attempts to find out whether one object is superior to another or try to choose what one believe is the best or most appropriate item from a number of options. The decision guiding character of our analyzing practices is a vital feature of morals that relates them to logical investigation. Except that it is not adequate to differentiate values from connected ideas like emotions, inclination, and wishes. Instead of trying to discover a specific description of ‘value’, many scholars assume that there is an instinctive, pre-theoretic understanding of what we think is important or valuable in one way or another and create taxonomies based on an existing jargons of the term value, such as ‘virtuous’, ‘good’, ‘nice’, ‘healthy’, ‘beautiful’ and ‘brave’. Values are studied in the fields of psychology, philosophy, sociology, theology, and economics.

In the field of philosophy, values are mainly studied under the subject of **axiology**. **Axiology** comes under the division of **metaethics**. It deals with the evaluating which actions are “better”, standardized definitions of ‘good’ and the nature of righteousness, the detection of positive and negative values and additionally, differentiations like extrinsic against intrinsic value, the link between values and logical reasoning and, more largely conceived, our analyzing practices. Value is a broad term which

Notes

is further differentiated into value and disvalue or into positive and negative value. A lot of the philosophical studies done on values also deals with their mystical and mythological status.

If an object carries value, then it is said that it is good in some respect related to that specific value. Similarly, if an object has disvalue, then it is said that it is bad in respect to that value. For example, a beefsteak might be good for someone from the perspective of it being fleshy because it provides delight and might be bad for the same person from the perspective of medical concerns because it increases the chances of heart diseases. The objects can also be **neutral** in relation to a specific value. For instance, there can be an argument that some deeds can neither be entirely good nor entirely bad.

For example, one may argue that some actions may be neither overall good nor overall bad. The degree to which neutral cases are legitimate for different kinds of values and overall goodness is disputable and hangs around supposed metaethical theory. A utilitarian may reject the neutrality of actions. On the contrary, a political philosopher in the custom of traditional liberalism might consider an individual's action be neutral with respect to overall betterness, as long as it does not affect the resources and freedom of others.

Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic Value:

An object possesses an intrinsic value if its assessment only depends on the 'intrinsic nature' (Moore 1903) of the object one is evaluating. For example, according to Scanlon (1998) friendship has intrinsic value to people independently of any supplementary helpful effects that having friends might have. People value friendship for "itself" and not because it makes them happy or because they get to achieve some other goals by making friends. This is obvious, in the viewpoint of Scanlon, that people would not readily abandon one friend for another twenty new friends; an individual who makes friends for their benefits are not real friends. On the contrary, money is a classic example of an entity that we want for its extrinsic value. While acquiring money might feel good, it only does so because it grants us to acquire other things that a person gives value to; it gets its value only because of its utility as an exchange medium, and not

for its intrinsic nature. Additional example of extrinsic value is the value we generally give to the entities like antiques or ancient coins because they are rare, and being rare does not count under intrinsic value.

Final Value and Value of Means (Non-final Value):

A connected difference is that between final value and the conditional value is of a means to an end (ultimate goal). For example, a hedonist would believe that eating nutritious food and staying healthy has no value in itself but carries value only because being healthy results in more pleasure and deteriorating health would lead to suffering and pain. From a hedonist's standpoint, pleasure and suffering are end means, whereas being healthy only play a role in achieving the end (i.e. in this example, pleasure).

According to Kant, benevolence and compassionate behaviour has value of its own self. It is valuable because it acts as the end itself and not because it is a means to an end. On the contrary, he believes that happiness carries value only when it is attributed to compassionate person.

Instrumental value:

Instrumental value can be described as value of means, also known as technical value. Its meaning overlaps with the concept of intrinsic and extrinsic values. For example, Money has instrumental value. It has value as a means to acquiring something else, like a car, house, clothing, etc. It is clear that money does not carry intrinsic value, because it carries no value once it is no longer a means to meet our needs (or our ends). Certain food items for example, beef carries instrumental value for hedonist. These food items provide nutrition and pleasure to taste buds of hedonists. But it is not widely found that beef have intrinsic value. Hence beef is a means to achieve an end (i.e. pleasure in the case of hedonist) and is not an end in itself. However, the difference between value of means and final value is taken in terms of means - end relation, which means, functional facet of the assessment relative to practical goals, whereas the difference between intrinsic vs. extrinsic value is seen in terms of metaphysical aspects of the objects under consideration and the

way in which they are evaluated. Hence, these distinctions do not overlap.

Realism and Anti-Realism about Value:

Issue about value realism and anti-realism concern the authenticity of values and how realistic they are. Questions like, are values are the result of social constructions? Are values imaginary? Is their existence depends on them being practiced by a group of people or do they carry importance independent of human beings?

According to Value realists, there are certain values that are real or in other words, absolute in nature (they can be true or false), and the people of a society may be wrong about values or approve values that are nonexistent. Value realism is about matter of degree. According to the anti-realists, value consists of various other customs like **social constructivism, expressivism, alethic value relativism, moral contextualism and prescriptivism**. It is likely to be a realist about relative value, for example, one could say that one form of joy or pleasure is good for one person but not for another.

Thin and Thick Values:

Value predicates like 'good' are put under the category of thin values because they are entirely evaluative. On the other hand, thick value predicates such as 'courageous', 'cruel', and 'brave' express two components: a descriptive and evaluative part. Showing courageous behaviour is considered as good and being cruel as bad, but these value judgments for themselves do not represent courage and cruelty. In its place, an individual must be able to fulfill a few of the descriptive criteria to be called courageous. These criteria might include, taking risks, selfless attitude and ability to sacrifice one's pleasure to help others. Hence, the concept of multidimensionality comes in, which means that there is a certain set of criteria, to which a predicate (like, 'good') is compared to, or reasons that are combined for an overall evaluation. This combining of the criteria is known as value aggregation.

When it is said that a policy is good for the wellbeing of a society it generally denote that it is good for society in certain aspects and that the

goodness or badness of the policy is an outcome of measuring or grading various criteria for and against the policy.

Value Monism and Value Pluralism:

Bentham believes that, all values including happiness or being healthy carry value only if they contribute in pleasure or pain.

An example of Value monism shows that humans struggle to increase the amount of pleasure and reduce pain. Pleasure and pain are used as a standard to evaluate all other values according to Bentham’s utilitarian views. And according to a monist all other methods of evaluating objects are secondary and primary way of evaluation is by comparing that item’s contribution in attaining happiness.

Mill supports Value pluralism. He distinguishes pleasure into higher pleasure and lower pleasure. He supports the idea of superiority of higher value over lower value. This raises question whether Mill is a genuine pluralist or not. According to modern pluralists, like, Sartre, who asserts that a person may be torn between two equally grave situations, like an army soldier who is torn between serving his country and looking after his sick mom. Hence pluralism may consist of ethical dilemmas and serious value conflicts that might occur when comparisons on the basis of overall betterness is done.

Check your Progress - 1

1. What is the importance of values in our lives?

2. What do you mean by instrumental value?

3. Differentiate between Intrinsic and Extrinsic Value

4. Differentiate between Final value and Value of means.

4.3 CONCEPT OF RIGHT AND WRONG

There are a lot of ways in which one can judge the nature of the actions from the ethical point of view. Many moral philosophers distinguish the difference between what is morally right or wrong. Whether an action is morally good or bad can be determined not only from the intentions of the doer or its character. David Ross believes that clarity between wrong and right actions 'will do much to remove some of the perplexities of our moral thought.'

The study of right and wrong is seen to be dominated by distinctions between deontology and teleology. Teleologists assert that we can judge the nature of an action by judging its consequences. Whereas deontologists claim that an action can be wrong or right in itself.

Despite the difference in opinions of a teleologist and deontologist, they would agree that if the doctor told the truth only to make the patient sink in despair, then it would be wrong. And if the doctor told the truth out of compassion, that it would give the patient some time to be with his family and prepare for what is coming, in this condition both (teleologist and deontologist) would agree that the act was right.

It is obvious that merely actions are not judged but also the intentions, emotions, and character. In this topic, the focus is on the actions.

It is seen that many philosophers consider motive of an individual as factors that make the action right or wrong. It appears that, a few of them consider intentions behind an action as the only relevant criteria to judge the righteousness of an action. But others regard intentions to be an important factor but not the only factor. It is clear that intention behind an action tells a lot about the morality of the action. For example, if a person spends his money to help the orphans, his intentions make his action morally good. But his actions may be judged as practically right, but not morally praise-worthy. And if someone turns his music volume up only to disturb his fellow neighbors, he will be correctly held responsible, but if he does this only because he likes loud music, his action will be less

blameworthy, even though not completely ethically flawless. Hence, actions can be ethically bad (to a certain degree) even if their intentions are good.

According to G. E. Moore, morality acts as a universal dimension. All actions are placed in this moral dimension from their degree of extremely good to extremely bad and in the middle, neutral.

When one witness a murder, and judge that action as wrong, he / she is not pointing to the physical entity of “wrongness”. In its place, he/she is stressing upon a value that is inherent in the action of murder. The moral dimension plays a role by guiding us in such a way that we can recognize the moral properties.

But still, all these concepts are not universally accepted. Because it will not be enough to just say that “killing someone is wrong”. Saying that killing is absolutely wrong would be incorrect, since someone can rightly kill a person to prevent the suicide bomber from blowing up a school.

Actions have a range of various intentions and background reality.

Hence, in order to simply a complex problem of morality, we need to keep n mind the type of action, intentions behind the actions and the consequence of the action.

Moral wisdom can be attained by learning how to better interpret our moral intuitions. Ignorance never leads to a correct decision. Acquiring the skill to predict the outcome of our actions is another way.

According to some, one must consider respecting the sanctity of even a murderer’s life. But in other’s opinion, belief of sanctity of life has been abandoned by murderers. Unfortunately legitimate and relevant moral values often clash, and we may have to come to a decision, which one we should pursue of two equally relevant states.

Utilitarian approach may assert that the most significant purpose is mainly the one that bring most good into the world; but it is not always true. One can have a greater responsibility towards one thing than the other, which is to save a thousand lives rather than few hundreds. But one might save their own child rather than saving ten strangers. An addition to this there must be some values which are inherently of more importance than others. Maybe saving a life is not as important as refusing to kill. So, should one refuse to kill one to save two? What if the

Notes

conditions changed to killing one to save fifty? This denotes the relative and varying nature of morality. Hence morality varies with situations and is not absolute. And this shows how utilitarian's viewpoint, which to an extent, is correct.

Also some principles may be intrinsically more important than others. Perhaps it is more important not to take life than to save it, so I should refuse to kill one to save two. But what if I can save fifty by killing one? Morality can be relative to circumstances, not absolute, and at some point the utilitarian principle wins. Analyzing analogous situations where the answer is clear is useful; seeing how they differ from the current situation clarifies thinking. And always discuss problems both with those you respect and with those who disagree with you. When you get it wrong, forgive yourself, and try to do better next time.

“Do unto others as you would have them do unto you”

According to some philosophers, motivation behind moral actions comes from the sense of responsibility and not from usual tendency of a good behaviour.

As Kant would believe, some of his followers say that people should not be treated as “means to an end” but rather as “ends on their own”.

However, inflexible application of moral rules may have apparently had immoral conclusions. For example, it is generally believed that lying is wrong, yet in it is right to lie in order to save a life. Secondly, highlighting the importance of responsibility can confer the notion that ethics is demanding and counter-intuitive, which is not completely true. Although generally people would have the same opinion towards respecting other people, but one may agree with the practice of treating as a means, if the end is likely to have a considerably more favorable consequences. For example, a lot of persons would be in agreement with righteousness of sacrificing the life of one person if it saves many lives, and in fact incorrect not to do so. Hence it appears that even though people often have clear sentiments which let them know if behaviour is good or bad. But along with this, they also admit that there are instances when firm adherence to the similar values is problematic and/or immoral, making ethics as uncertain. This means absolute ethical decision about right and wrong is complicated, so chief ethical debates stay unresolved.

Mental disorders also are related to the ethical goodness and badness of actions. For example, individuals who suffer from obsessive compulsions are not only a load on themselves but their actions can also be very annoying to other people. If an individual is constantly controlling whether everything in his house is placed perfectly, this can cause disturbance to other family members. But if it comes to the knowledge of other members that a person is suffering obsessive compulsive disorder, it would change our moral assessment. If his disorder is very severe, it may even be unsuitable to judge his behaviour morally at all. In both cases, individual's mental illness influences our moral judgment.

Check your Progress - 2

5. What are Utilitarian views on right and wrong?

6. What are the complexities in deciding what is morally right and wrong?

4.4 TRANSVALUATION OF VALUES

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844 – 1900) criticized Judeo - Christian tradition. According to him Jewish ethics were “slave morality” based on jealousy. In his opinion, Christian were even worse, it makes a virtue out of humility, patience poverty and do not inspire to struggle for what they want. This faith does not support strength. Such an ethics, Nietzsche declared, weaken the human drives that have led to the greatest human

Notes

achievements. Nietzsche thought that the period of traditional religion was has come to an end.

Notable passion towards self - interest defines the contemporary era.

Under its surface of action, our age is keenly curved inwards and looks for a steady code of conduct that will provide some definitive meaning to life. This self - analysis is not the result of one individual or even one cohort. The far - away roots were shaped in the Renaissance when the what was believed to be hurdle of medieval thought were devastated and the vision of theologian, philosopher and poet steadily moved away from the study of a creation taking them towards Divinity. The fresh idea was of a material world that should be ruled by a new idol, Man. This turnaround of idea sustained through following centuries and was made stronger by reinterpretation in the systems of various philosophers until the failing figure of God ultimately vanished. In this short composition is outlined the efforts to put up a suitable ethical system upon the trashes of divinely recognized absolute moral standards by a nineteenth century victor of man's absolute self-sufficiency.

The earliest determining influences on his thinking were received from the vision of Wagner, from Schopenhauer, and from his work on traditional antiquity. His first significant work, *The Birth of Tragedy*, was an analysis of history as a clash between the ideologies of Apollo and Dionysius. Apollo represented the stability, repose, eternalness, and synchronization of rational form; Dionysius shows the blind, but rich, changeable and unlimited forces of physical life. Although, Nietzsche changes his viewpoint throughout the different periods of his life, he was basically the followers of a New Culture, a virile culture. In the view of Nietzsche, virtue is there in accepting that chance is the destiny which gives shape our ends. The importance of the Greeks was to be established from the fact that they were potent enough to face the universe head-on and the destiny it had forced on man, to identify and think without dreading the dangers and misery of the human circumstances, and to unlock their minds and hearts to subsistence as it is. They were powerful; they did not weaken reality in order to deal with it. The motivation of the self, as Nietzsche affirms, is to "create beyond

itself. "The Will to Creation, therefore, is virtue, and there is no other. A pleasant precision of the whole man, the attempt after an ideal, was the aim of Nietzsche. To reach this end, he began as an innovator against the morality of his period. Nietzsche is thus a critical genius of the first order: "God-God is dead." According to him God is the "oldest lie". In pronouncing war on the moral criterion of his time, Nietzsche thought that he had shattered the silence from the lips of truth in the end. And hence, "nothing is true, everything is allowed." This is free will. Nietzsche had finally declared man, the supreme ruler, from the principles of tradition and had liberated the world of Gods, of even "the shadows of God." Now it is "Dionysius against the Crucified." Nietzsche has started the criticism; now he creates his own rules of morality. Man is no longer an observer in this world but a performer. "Man himself becomes the determiner of morals; he does not need to be approved of; he passes the decision: What is harmful to me is harmful in itself; he knows that it is only himself who bestows credit on things; he is an inventor of values." This independent "supermoral" character, which has grown to autonomy, i.e., to agree to responsibility, this lord of the freedom, is essentially given the mastery over situations, over nature, over all creatures with fragile and short-term wills. "The 'free man,' the possessor of an extensive indestructible will, finds in this control his paradigm of values." Further study, his thought, shows that the motivation to live is an display and consumption of power: to be powerful, tough enough to survive, to exist, to claim, to assert, to embrace one's own and go one's way. The motivation to be alive is basically a "will to Power." Nietzsche disintegrated the Will to Power into an array of "quantities of force" in a situation of clash with one another. The role of forces, of which the world is made of, is not mechanical. Nothing is entirely predefined. Nor are the quantities of authority are eternal. They grow out of nothing, they are continuously threatened by breakdown and obliteration, and they come back to nothing when their course has been run.

According to Nietzsche, there are two kinds of moralities. These are **master - morality** and **slave - morality**, the former is seen in the ruling class whereas the ruled comes under the latter. Master - morality is where

Notes

the master is the evaluator and maker of values – the set of principles that contains self - glorification. Slave - morality filters the morals of the masters with a filter of doubt while any qualities that eliminate or lessen the trouble of life are appreciated. Slave - morality is basically the morality of usefulness. These two kinds of morality have led to the "famous antithesis of good and evil" where supremacy and dangerousness are supposed to live in evil. Slave - morality considers that the evil person stimulates fear while master-morality considers that it is the good person who gives rise to fear, and vigorously does so. Slave - morality takes into account at good v/s Evil whereas Master - morality take into account at good vs. bad. In slave - morality anger has a role in the formation of its principles, giving rise to resentment altering the master's thought of bad into evil.

According to Nietzsche the more barbarous the man is, the more dignified, is the basis for superior vision and intelligence, even if they make the weaker and civilized people as their victims. The barbarian (dignified) supremacy is not just about their bodily strength, but their psychical strength, making a more whole man (and beasts). Slave-moralism gives importance to criticizing creative egoism that is the centre of master-moralism. This is visible in the way they value altruism, which undervalues the individual for the wellbeing of another, presenting the insignificance of the first person.

Nietzsche then asserts that the restraining of violence, common pain, and abuse is a Will to the denunciation of life. Nietzsche asserts that this is the attitude, of rejection of life, leads towards "decay and dissolution."

According to Nietzsche the meaning of life is: burglary, wound, the powerful hurting the powerless, repression, awful experiences, inclusion, and misuse. Those that stay alive develop into stronger individual and grow up from the Will of Power - the core of what life actually is.

In viewpoint of Nietzsche, Christianity is the deadliest and captivating lie ever formed. He thinks that Christianity gives rise to the "morality of

paltry people." Paltry or miserable individuals destroy life. And in his views Judaism is no better. Both these faiths facilitate individuals to further deteriorate themselves. Nature is separated from morality when individuals are advised to "love your enemies." God eliminates usefulness from morals. The basis of morality (nature) is eliminated by faith - the annihilation of an innate morality.

Because of the annihilation of the Will of Power and self-centeredness by these faiths, they wipe out the evolutionary strength of individuals.

Nietzsche accepts that the ideas of ethical philosophers also lead to annihilation of life. According to him, philosophers who say that people are trying to find happiness are reluctant to answer the truth, power, because that answer would be morally wrong. According to moral philosophers cultivating virtues can lead a person to true happiness.

Nietzsche asserts that pleasure is a feeling of power - and if passions are removed, you stop the greatest sensations of power and hence pleasure.

And because of this Nietzsche asserts that consciousness is not the chief state highest state of mind, but the reverse is.

Nietzsche encourages unkindness, which according to him is well-established in our "high culture." His thoughts oppose the modern ideology.

Nietzsche thinks that the future philosophers will be able to understand better that pleasing other people is not required and that all forms of human pain should be promoted. "Common Good" will not be wanted, as common things carry less value. Nietzsche wishes that there will be a transvaluation of values, so that the Will of Power will obtain importance.

Check your Progress - 3

7. Does Nietzsche actually mean "psychical power" or does he actually mean intellectual power?

—

—

8. Explain Nietzsche's use of the term "Will"?

—

—

9. What are the two types of moralities described by Nietzsche?

—

—

4.5 LETS SUM UP

Value is a broad term which is further differentiated into value and disvalue or into positive and negative value. A lot of the philosophical studies done on values also deal with their mystical and mythological status. It is seen that many philosophers consider motive of an individual as factors that make the action right or wrong. It appears that, a few of them consider intentions behind an action as the only relevant criteria to judge the righteousness of an action. But others regard intentions to be an important factor but not the only factor. It's clear that intention behind an action tell a lot about the morality of the action. According to Kant, benevolence and compassionate behaviour has value of its own self. It is valuable because it acts as the end itself and not because it is a means to an end. On the contrary, he believes that happiness carries value only when it is attributed to compassionate person. The motivation of the self, as Nietzsche affirms, is to "create beyond itself". The Will to Creation, therefore, is virtue, and there is no other. A pleasant precision of the whole man, the attempt after an ideal, was the aim of Nietzsche. To reach this end, he began as an innovator against the morality of his period. Nietzsche is thus a critical genius of the first order: "God - God is dead." According to him God is the "oldest lie." Nothing is true, everything is allowed. "This is free will. Nietzsche had finally declared man, the supreme ruler, from the principles of tradition and had liberated the

world of Gods, of even "the shadows of God." Now it is "Dionysius against the Crucified." Nietzsche has started the criticism; now he creates his own rules of morality. Man is no longer a observer in this world but a performer. "Man himself becomes the determiner of morals; he does not need to be approved of; he passes the decision: what is harmful to me is harmful in itself; he knows that it is only himself who bestows credit on things; he is an inventor of values." Nietzsche desires that there will be a transvaluation of values, so that the Will of Power might obtain importance.

4.6 KEYWORDS

1. **Axiology:** Axiology is the study of the nature of value and evaluation, and of the type of things that are valuable.
2. **Metaethics:** Metaethics is a division of analytic philosophy that investigates the significance, foundations, and scope of moral values, assets, and words.
3. **Social constructivism:** Social constructivism is a social learning theory created by Lev Vygotsky, a Russian psychologist, who asserts that people are active participants in the formation of their own knowledge.
4. **Expressivism:** The set of guidelines that says that ethical statements such as "this is wrong" express an ethical assessment rather than a declaration of fact.
5. **Alethic value relativism:** it's relativism about truth and more accurately about the truth of an individual's beliefs and perceptions.
6. **Moral contextualism:** It refers to the moral obligations that one need to attend to according to the circumstances at that point of time. It evaluates an action with respect to a particular context of that action rather than assessing it based on absolute moral values.

4.7 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. How values act as a guiding force?

2. On what basis can we determine if an action is right or wrong?
3. What was the stand of Nietzsche on Christianity?
4. Why Nietzsche felt the requirement of transvaluation of values?

4.8 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1. Lengbeyer, Lawrence (2005). Altering Artworks: Creators' Moral Rights vs. The Public Good. *Philosophy in the Contemporary World* 12 (2):53-61.
2. Colonnello, Pio (2009). The transvaluation of values in Heidegger, Jaspers and Sartre : Finitude homelessness and guilt. In Jinfen Yan & David E. Schrader (eds.), *Creating a Global Dialogue on Value Inquiry: Papers From the Xxii Congress of Philosophy (Rethinking Philosophy Today)*. Edwin Mellen Press.
3. Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm (1910). *The Will to Power: An Attempted Transvaluation of All Values*. Gordon Press.
4. McBurney, Blaine (1985). The Post-Modern Transvaluation of Modernist Values. *Thesis Eleven* 12 (1):94-109.

4.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Values systematize our lives and direct our behavior. Generally speaking, we compare objects of a various categories like probable future activities, guidelines, states of affairs, supplies, and even individuals on the basis of morals. One often the attempts to find out whether one object is superior to another or try to choose what one believe is the best or most appropriate item from a number of options. The decision guiding character of our analyzing practices is a vital feature of morals that relates them to logical investigation. (answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 1)

2. Instrumental value can be described as value of means, also known as technical value. For example, Money has instrumental value. It has value as a means to acquiring something else, like a car, house, clothing, etc. It is clear that money does not carry intrinsic value, because it carries no value once it is no longer a means to meet our needs (or our ends). Certain food items for example, beef carries instrumental value for hedonist. These food items provide nutrition and pleasure to taste buds of hedonists. But it is not widely found that beef have intrinsic value. Hence beef is a means to achieve an end (i.e. pleasure in the case of hedonist) and is not an end in itself. (answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 2)
3. **Intrinsic v/s Extrinsic Value:** An object posses an intrinsic value if its assessment only depend on the ‘intrinsic nature’ of the object one is evaluating. Friendship has intrinsic value to people independently of any supplementary helpful effects that having friends might have. People value friendship for “itself” and not because it makes them happy or because they get to achieve some other goals by making friends. On the contrary, money is a classic example of an entity that we want for its extrinsic value. While acquiring money might feel good, it only does so because it grants us to acquire other things that a person give value to; it gets its value only because of its utility as an exchange medium, and not for its intrinsic nature. (answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 3)
4. **Final value and Value of means:** A connected difference is that between final value and the conditional value is of a means to an end (ultimate goal). For example, a hedonist would believe that eating nutritious food and staying healthy has no value in itself but carries value only because being healthy results in more pleasure and deteriorating health would lead to suffering and pain. From a hedonist’s standpoint, pleasure and suffering are end means, whereas being healthy only plays a role in achieving the end (i.e. in this example, pleasure). According to Kant, benevolence and compassionate behaviour has value of its own self. It is valuable because it acts as the end itself and not because

Notes

it is a means to an end. On the contrary, he believes that happiness carries value only when it is attributed to a compassionate person.(answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 4)

5. Utilitarian approach may assert that the most significant purpose is mainly the one that brings most good into the world; but it is not always true. One can have a greater responsibility towards one thing than the other, which is to save a thousand lives rather than a few hundreds. But one might save their own child rather than saving ten strangers. Hence, morality varies with situations and is not absolute. And this shows how utilitarian's viewpoint, which to an extent, is correct..... (answer for Check your Progress - 2 Q. 5)
6. According to some philosophers, motivation behind moral actions comes from the sense of responsibility and not from usual tendency of a good behavior. As Kant would believe, and hence some of his followers would say that people should not be treated as "means to an end" but rather as "ends in themselves". However, inflexible application of moral rules may have apparently had immoral conclusions. For example, it is generally believed that lying is wrong, yet in it is right to lie in order to save a life..... (answer for Check your Progress - 2 Q. 6)
7. According to Nietzsche the more barbarous the man is, the more dignified, is the basis for superior vision and intelligence, even if they make the weaker and civilized people as their victims. The barbarian (dignified) supremacy is not just about their bodily strength, but their psychological strength, making a more whole man (and beasts). Slave - moralism gives importance to criticizing creative egoism that is the centre of master - moralism. This is visible in the way they value altruism, which undervalues the individual for the wellbeing of another, presenting the insignificance of the first person.
Nietzsche then asserts that the restraining of violence, common pain, and abuse is a Will to the denunciation of life. Nietzsche asserts that this is the attitude, of rejection of life, leads towards

"decay and dissolution."..... (answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 7)

8. Nietzsche disintegrated the Will to Power into an array of "quantities of force" in a situation of clash with one another. The role of forces, of which the world is made of, is not mechanical. Nothing is entirely predefined. Nor are the quantities of authority are eternal. They grow out of nothing, they are continuously threatened by breakdown and obliteration, and they come back to nothing when their course has been run.....(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 8)
9. According to Nietzsche that there are two kinds of moralities. These are **master - morality** and **slave - morality**, the former is seen in the ruling class whereas the ruled comes under the latter. Master - morality is where the master is the evaluator and maker of values – the set of principles that contains self - glorification. Slave-morality filters the morals of the masters with a filter of doubt while any qualities that eliminate or lessen the trouble of life are appreciated. Slave - morality is basically the morality of usefulness.....(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 9)

UNIT - 5: UTILITARIANISM

STRUCTURE

- 5.0 Objectives
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Utilitarianism
 - 5.2.1 Basic concepts
 - 5.2.2 Methodologies
 - 5.2.3 Criticisms:
- 5.3 Restricted Utilitarianism and Extreme Utilitarianism
- 5.4 Virtues and Utilitarianism
- 5.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 5.6 Keywords
- 5.7 Questions for Review
- 5.8 Suggested Readings and References
- 5.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

5.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Learn about the basic concept of utilitarianism, types of utilitarianism, methodologies involved in utilitarianism and its criticism.
- Understand the differences between Restricted and Extreme utilitarianism.
- Understand the contrasting features of Virtues and Utilitarianism.
-

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Utilitarianism is one of the most influential and convincing approaches to normative ethics in the narration of philosophy. Although not entirely expressed until the 19th century, proto-utilitarian evidence in the form of theories can be seen throughout the history of ethical theory.

Though there are many viewpoints regarding what exactly is utilitarianism, it by and large depicts the idea that the ethically correct action is the action that produces the most good. One thing to understand is that the theory is a variety of consequentialism: the right action is judged entirely on the basis of consequences produced. The difference between utilitarianism and egoism is that relevant consequences are the basis of deciding the righteousness of an act. According to a utilitarian, one ought to maximize the all-round wellbeing — that is, give importance to the good of others as well as one's own good.

The Classical Utilitarians were Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. They held that an individual must maximize the good, that is, bring about 'the greatest amount of good for the greatest number'. Mill and Bentham were considered as hedonists, which means that they gave utmost importance to seeking pleasure in life. They evaluate happiness by comparing the amount of pleasure over pain.

Henry Sidgwick was a Cambridge philosopher was one of the top utilitarians of the later 19th century. He rejected Mill's and Bentham's theory of motivation and alternative meanings to moral terms. Sidgwick believed in the morality of common sense.

There are two categories of utilitarian theory. These are act utilitarianism and rule utilitarianism. Act utilitarianism wants the answer to – “whether that specific action contributes to maximizing happiness?” Rule utilitarianism would ask two questions: “What universal rule should one follow if one is engaged in a particular action?” and “Would this rule, if universally followed, maximize happiness?”

Utilitarianism is also characterized by impartiality and agent-neutrality. Happiness of all counts the same. The reason one has to encourage the overall good is the same reason anybody else has to so promote the good. It is not specific to that individual.

5.2 UTILITARIANISM

Utilitarianism is an attempt to present an answer to the real question “What ought a man to do?” The answer to this question is that he ought to function in such a way which has the best possible consequences. The goal of utilitarianism is to make judgments on the basis of a calculation

of the consequences.

5.2.1 Basic Concepts

In the concept of consequences, the Utilitarian takes in all of the good and bad resulted from the act, whether occurring during the act or after it. In evaluating the outcome of the actions, Utilitarianism depends upon the theory which gives importance to intrinsic value. According to intrinsic value theory, some entities are good in themselves apart from its utility. This entity does not provide means to an end but is an end in itself.

Mill and Bentham were considered as a hedonist, which means that they gave utmost importance to seeking pleasure in life. They evaluate happiness by comparing the amount of pleasure over pain. To them, only these feelings have intrinsic value or disvalue. Utilitarians also assume that it is possible to compare the intrinsic values produced by two alternative actions and to estimate which would have better consequences. Bentham thought that a hedonic calculus is hypothetically possible. According to him, a utilitarian could sum up the amount of pleasure and the amount of pain for every person liable to be affected, instantaneously as well as in the future, and can acquire the balance as a measure of the overall goodness or immorality an action. Such clear-cut measurement as Bentham believes is not that necessary, but it is, however, essential for the Utilitarian to formulate some interpersonal assessment of the values and also of the effects of alternative courses of action.

Types of Utilitarianism:

There are two categories of utilitarian theory. These are act utilitarianism and rule utilitarianism.

Act - utilitarianism

In act - utilitarianism, we are expected to encourage those actions which will have consequence in the “greatest good for the greatest number of individuals” in that particular situation. Act-utilitarianism would consider the act of giving money to charity as right. It is because the act of charity is benefiting many people, rather than only the one possessing wealth. Act utilitarianism wants the answer to – “whether that specific action contribute to maximize happiness?”

In nearly every part of the world, there is moral opprobrium stuck to the idea of a surgeon ending a patient's life, even if the patient genuinely wishes it because he has an incurable, unbearable, and painful illness. Efforts to alleviate such patients' sufferings are generally considered as benevolent, but active euthanasia is broadly condemned both ethically and legally. Presume that, in spite of these criticisms, a surgeon gives a toxic injection to such a patient. Depending on the conditions, the surgeon might face criticism, the cancellation of his license, and even legal action could be taken against him. But has he done anything immoral? Morality is eventually a matter of overall welfare.

Act utilitarianism, like other types of utilitarianism deals with questions of this type by implying that morality is at last a matter of overall happiness and wellbeing.

Rule - utilitarianism

Rule-utilitarianism is a response to that opposition. The theory of utility in rule - utilitarianism is to pursue those set of rules which will have the consequences in the greatest good for the greatest number of individuals. In the case presented above, the common rule should be: 'share your wealth'. One opposition to rule - utilitarianism is that in some circumstances the benefit from violating a rule could be greater than following it. For example, there could be a situation, where a utilitarian would be forced to lie in order to achieve overall gain. To this criticism, John Smart asserts that it would be irrational in the eyes of a utilitarian to refuse to break some rule that would lead to greater utility.

5.2.2 Methodologies

As a prescriptive system providing a benchmark by which a person ought to take action and by which the prevailing customs of society, including its ethical code, ought to be assessed and improved.

Mill and Bentham both assumed that human deeds are inspired entirely by pleasure and pain. Mill believed that happiness is the only end of an individual's actions, and human actions can be judged by evaluating whether the action is promoting happiness or not. Henry Sidgwick was a Cambridge philosopher was one of the top utilitarians of the later 19th century. He rejected Mill's and Bentham's theory of motivation and

alternative meanings to moral terms. Sidgwick believed in the morality of common sense.

Sidgwick debates that common-sense morality is not a storehouse of intuitively apparent moral values, as a few of his colleagues believed. Common sense system cannot offer definite reasons for actions, because they all carry exceptions and leave some matters unsettled. It should not be just guided by intuition. It should, first, give reasonably warranted assurance that a particular decision is valid. So common sense judgments rely on their own legitimacy on the principles that don't have any exceptions to them and are entirely universal in nature. Secondly, the principle or principles providing this declaration should allow us to organize and complete our moral viewpoints. When the two arguments, the dependence, and systematization, are joined together they provide a base for utilitarianism. Unfortunately, they too allow egoism. Practical motive thus appears to be at odds with itself.

"There is a runaway trolley barreling down the railway tracks. Ahead, on the tracks, there are five people tied up and unable to move. The trolley is headed straight for them. You are standing some distance off in the train yard, next to a lever. If you pull this lever, the trolley will switch to a different set of tracks. However, you notice that there is one person on the sidetrack. What would you do?"

Likely, the selection made would be based on common sense. This is our intuitive method of dealing with information: quick, involuntary, easy, and emotional assessment processes. There is no time for systematize thinking, which is not as quick, conscious, effortful, precise, and a more logical assessment process.

Following intuitions and instincts is consistent with common - sense ethics. We might promptly measure the problems and benefits of the alternative decision, but not in an organized way. We are out of time in order to do so.

Common sense ethics are guided by the values that an individual has learned in his/her life. Everyone is taught never to kill so one might decide to let the trolley run over those people without getting involved in that. Yet, it's not an easy choice to make because, in ethics, it is taught that one should respect the rights of others. The question is who has a bigger claim to live: the five - individuals tied on the tracks or the one

who dies if we pull the lever. One may promptly figure out that it's five people. Five is bigger than one. But, what if the one person is a world-renowned doctor and researcher who is on the brink of finding the cure to Alzheimer's disease while the other five are runaway criminals? Most of the critics of Utilitarianism have asserted that it has propositions contrary to their moral insight — that following the idea of utility might sometimes permit the breaking of a promise.

Utilitarianism is an ethical theory, yet it attracts a lot of critics. These critics vary on the basis of what they are targeting. As utilitarianism isn't an independent theory but a collection of related theories that have evolved with time.

5.2.3 Criticisms:

One such criticism is that although the extensive practice of dishonesty and thieving would incur bad consequences, not sure that occasional lying to evade humiliation or an occasional following a loss of dependability and security. However, it is stealing from a wealthy man would not have good results and thus be allowable or even mandatory for Utilitarianism. But the Utilitarian willingly answers that if such activities are widespread and become extensive then it would lead to loss of security and trustworthiness.

John Stuart Mill, however, saw pleasures in two categories – higher and lower pleasures. Criticism of John Stuart Mill's utilitarianism, and is his classification of greater and lesser pleasures. The dissimilarity between these pleasures is established on the type and not a degree, which makes it difficult to compare the consequences of the action. According to the critics, greater and lesser should not be the criteria for categorization, as it would not be helpful in judging the consequences when higher and lower pleasure are both involved.

In Mill's view, it is better to be a discontented Socrates than a contented fool. His argument is that humans have the capability to enjoy intellectual pleasure (which are a higher pleasure) as well as physical pleasures that are lower pleasures. And intellectual pleasure should be given the importance and not the physical ones that are short-lived and won't have any purpose in the future. Another criticism points out the

possible biasness of Mill. Being an intellectual, he would have preferred intellectual pleasure as a higher pleasure.

Bentham is also well recognized for his claim of utilitarianism as the 'greatest happiness for the greatest number'. This can afterward be interpreted as "utilitarianism sacrifices the unfortunate few to save the powerful many".

Therefore, as argued by some critics that, slavery would be favored by utilitarians, as there is huge financial benefit outweighing the cruelty tolerated by the slaves. On the contrary, Bentham argues that that "the greatest happiness for the greater number" should be used towards benefiting the powerless many rather than saving the interests of the powerful few.

Another essential criticism of utilitarianism is that it pays no heed to justice. A distinctive example of this criticism was given by H. J. McCloskey. He says if framing a guiltless man for an offense that would decrease the further mutiny and pain that finding the actual criminal would incur, the utilitarian theory would propose that this would be the most favorable choice. Even though an innocent person would bear the punishment, for a greater quantity of people less pain will be caused, leading to more pleasure overall. Hence, it's inferred that utilitarians would ignore justice and, in the view of Bentham, he called it a serious misinterpretation to believe that utilitarians ignore justice, and would support the practice of sacrificing an innocent man for achieving the overall happiness of large groups of people. Bentham however argues that it is a serious misrepresentation to say that utilitarian's would be willing to ignore justice and punish an innocent man in the name of the greater good.

Yet another issue related to the theory of utilitarianism is the non - practical nature of calculating the utility of actions in reality. The problem is with the time taken in calculating the best utilitarian course of action. It is because by the time the course of action is decided, the chance to perform those actions will be gone. Practically it is not calculated to calculate every feasible action to maximize the most happiness on the whole and for everybody. What if a situation arises where it is required to decide fast and act quickly? In high - pressure circumstances, generally, there is not much time to devote it to

calculating the action that would contribute to maximum happiness and for maximum numbers with minimal pain. Mill asserted that in situations like these a person should rely on the past experiences and wisdom gained by that. This learning would help the individual to take decisions quickly and act accordingly. Precise calculations in this type of circumstance would prove to be impractical.

Mill answer back to such criticism by saying: “In such circumstances, one should follow common - sense moral rules, which summarize lots of human experience, and tend to guide us toward actions that promote general happiness and away from actions that tend to dampen it. Also, one can cultivate habits and train individual character, so that people become disposed to act in ways that are happiness - promoting.”

Check your Progress - 1

1. What do you mean by utilitarianism?

2. Differentiate between act and rule utilitarianism?

3. Give detailed account of the views of the critics regarding utilitarianism.

5.3 RESTRICTED UTILITARIANISM AND EXTREME UTILITARIANISM

Utilitarianism is the principles that whether an action is correct would be determined by the consequences of that action.

What does the word “action” actually mean? Does that refer to one particular action or does that mean classes of actions? There are two theories which could explain the actual interpretation of the word “actions” in terms of Utilitarianism.

1. If the 'actions' refer to the action of one particular person, we can categorize it under the principles given by Sidgwick, More and Bentham. Here the actions of an individual are judged by the outcome of that action and the common rules, for example "keep promises". These rules are used to evade the necessity of calculating the feasible consequences of the actions in each step. Whether the rule of keeping promises prove to be right or wrong on a particular situation relies on the goodness or badness of the consequences of keeping or violating the promises on that particular situation. In this case, if the consequences of not keeping the promise provide greater benefit than keeping it, then it is required to break the rule, without considering the goodness of the consequences of everybody's abiding by the rule is or is not greater than the consequences of everybody's violating it. To be precise, it can be said that rules do not matter, which the utilitarian has to consider while assessing consequences. This doctrine is called as '**extreme utilitarianism**'.
2. A more humble type of utilitarianism has recently become the latest thing. Part of its appeal is that it seems to resolve the clash in moral philosophy between utilitarians and intuitionists in a very precise manner. The above philosophers maintain, or appear to maintain, that moral rules are more than rules of thumb. Generally the rightness of an action should not be judged by calculating its consequences but only by considering whether or not it comes under a particular rule. Whether the rule is to be considered an up to standard moral rule, is, however, to be determined by taking in account the consequences of implementing the rule. Largely, then, actions are to be judged by rules and rules by consequences. The only instances in which one must judge a particular action directly by its outcomes are
 - (a) when the action comes under two unlike rules, one of which allows it and one of which prevents it, and

(b) when there is no rule whatever that directs the given instance. This doctrine is called as '**restricted utilitarianism**'

Moore was an extreme ideal utilitarian and Bentham an extreme hedonistic utilitarian whereas Toulmin could be put under restricted ideal utilitarian. A hedonistic utilitarian maintains that the righteousness of the consequences of a deed is a depends only on whether hat deed leads to pleasure ideal utilitarian, like Moore, maintains that pleasurable does not come under essential conditions of goodness.

Mill seems, if we are to take his observations about higher and lower pleasures sincerely, to be neither a pure hedonistic nor a pure ideal utilitarian. He appears to say that pleasurable is an essential condition for goodness, but that goodness depends on other qualities of mind as well. Perhaps we can describe him a quasi - ideal utilitarian.

When state of mind is good, it is considered as an expression of some kind of rational preference. When something is considered pleasurable, it can be taken as something that is enjoyable and when we say that something is a higher pleasure, it can be taken as something that is more truly, or more deeply, enjoyable.

The matter between extreme and restricted utilitarianism can be demonstrated by considering the statement 'But suppose everyone did the same'. Stout discriminates two forms of the universalization principle, the causal form and the hypothetical form. To state that one ought not to do an action X because of the bad outcomes if everyone (or many people) did action X may be simply to indicate that while the action X would otherwise be producing the maximum good consequences, nevertheless when you take into account that doing X will probably cause other people to do X too, you can see that X is not really optimistic. If this causal influence could be avoided then we would ignore the **universalisation** principle. This is the causal form of the principle. An individual who approves of the universalisation principle in its hypothetical form would be one who was bothered only with what would happen if everyone did the action X: he would be not at all be bothered with the issue of whether in fact everyone would do the action X. That is, he might state that it would be incorrect not to participate in voting because everybody starts to do this, it would have bad result. And also he

Notes

would adamant even if you say that you refusing to vote have no effect on other people's tendency to vote. With the help of Stout's distinction, we can say that an extreme utilitarian would relate to the universalisation principle in the causal form, while a restricted utilitarian would relate to the hypothetical form.

1) What I call the "cognitive dissonance" argument: not abiding by the a rule once, whether or not you've enhanced the outcome by doing so, builds a propensity in you to not follow that rule, or any rule, and thus leads to an chaotic view, where one can decide to abide by certain rules or not. This is cognitive dissonance in the sense that you argue to follow certain rules while breaking them in secret, which, as the opposition states, is both terrible for society and awful for your personal character.

2) "Not enough time or information" argument: Restricted utilitarians assert that if a rule works 99% of the time, we should follow it 100% of the time because it is exceptionally likely that the circumstances we are in falls into the 99%. An extreme utilitarian claim that those with the required mental competency and rationality to break the rule that 1% of the time should do so. Restricted utilitarians react by saying you could be wrong about your mental capacity and rationality

3) Based on the restricted amount of time or information that at any moment in any given situation where a choice needs to be made, you are likely to wrongly conclude that it is fitting to break or drift from the rules in this given context.

4) The last objection is the "too high a risk" argument: The following hypothetical is taken from Smart. Imagine you live in a city where there are several 4 way intersections with no stop signs. Smart asserts that, by evaluating the situation through an extreme utilitarian views, the rule that "One should almost always stop at the intersections" will be derived. However, restricted utilitarians will point out that this rule is derived from probability based on empirical observations (induction). Because of this, and because the rule is not merely being followed (as hypothetical utilitarians would have it), then there is a chance that two extreme utilitarians, believing that no one else in the city will merely run the intersection, will take the risk and run it themselves. Should they run the same intersection at the same time, CRASH. Thus, the risks are too high

to allow people to base their action relative to other's people's following or not following of certain rules.

Check your Progress-2

4.What are differences between extreme and restricted utilitarianism?

5.Explain what do you mean by universalization of principle?

5.4 VIRTUES AND UTILITARIANISM

Since the commencement of documentation of human history, people have been infatuated with personal fulfillment. Almost as obsessive has been the debate about how to attain satisfaction and what its effects will be personally and on society. In the midst of this argument rise two contrasting views: virtue ethics and utilitarianism. Both views have positive and negative components and persist to be debated even today. Virtue ethics or virtue theory was formerly proposed by Aristotle (384 - 322 BCE) to provide answers to the questions of how people can find and sustain happiness. Aristotle was eventually interested in the final result of doings or an individual's whole life as a gauge for happiness. For example, if you spend your whole life being a fine person even in the condition of oppression, and you're praised and honored for your decency and good works, in Aristotle's view, you have led a satisfying life and achieved happiness. Aristotle also accepts the idea that the most satisfying way of living is by involving oneself intellectual speculation. Virtue ethics is at present is one of three main approaches in normative ethics. It may, originally, be recognized as the one that stresses upon the virtues, or moral quality, in contrast to the approach that stresses upon the goodness actions and their consequences that would maximize all - round wellbeing (utilitarianism). Consequentialism focuses on consequences of actions. Suppose it is apparent that a person is in need

Notes

must be helped. A utilitarian will signify that the consequences of helping would maximize well - being; a deontologist would focus on the act being in accordance with an ethical rule such as “Do unto others as you would be done by”. On the other hand, a virtue ethicist will focus on the act of helping to be charitable or benevolent.

Utilitarianism is, on the whole, the contradictory view. Instead of giving importance to the final consequences, utilitarianism is about creating oneself as constructive and helpful as possible over the years of one's existence. This idea was developed by John Stewart Mill (1806 - 1873 CE). According to Mill, happiness is seen in how much a person performs; thereby adding up the achievements builds a person and as a result, brings about additionally developed humanity as a whole.

Whether the end of the job is accepted or ignored is not the subject, what matters is the journey through a life of helpfulness.

While both virtue ethics and utilitarianism look as if they are reasonable philosophies, supporters argue endlessly in an attempt to persuade people to select one or the other. What are the ways of reaching true and lasting fulfillment? The differences between these two theories are sharp and raise more than a little disagreement.

“the sole evidence it is possible to produce that anything is desirable, is that people do actually desire it....No reason can be given why the general happiness is desirable, except that each person, so far as he believes it to be attainable, desires his own happiness...that each person's happiness is a good to that person, and the general happiness, therefore, a good to the aggregate of all persons.”

Virtue may assure fidelity to ethical rules, or deals with the ends, or both. Virtue refers to the nature of character which guides a person to act according to some rules. There is a lot of potential set of rules. For each rule or alternative of a rule, there is an additional set of probable system, consisting of all the other potential codes with this rule included.

Utilitarians say that whether an act or policy is correct or not relies wholly on its consequences for all concerned. Virtue ethicists state: eventually what is the right is to be a certain type of individual, a person with the virtues of character – kindness, for instance, and justice, and

compassion – which convey themselves not only in emotions and motivation but also in action.

There is a difference between consequentialist thinking and thinking about the consequences.

The two are different. What I mean by consequentialist is the standpoint that whether a personal activity or public policy is correct depends on the outcome of that act or policy, and on nothing else.

In other words, it is the kind of moral thinking that characterizes “consequentialism” as a distinguishing philosophical approach in normative ethics, of which utilitarianism is the main variety. Thinking about results, on the other hand, is merely that: it is to recognize that our activities have consequences that we should think in order to choose our actions sensibly.

The basis of virtue ethics is the standpoint of eudaimonia, which means “the good life” or “lived fulfilling life” or “happiness” or “flourishing”. Aristotle makes distinctions between entities that are valuable in themselves, things that are carried worth for some other reason, and things that are both. Finally, there is only one thing which is only precious in itself: happiness and rest; other things are wanted because they guide us to living well/happiness. What is necessary to be a brilliant teacher is different than what is necessary to be an exceptional soldier, because teachers and soldiers have dissimilar functions to perform. A virtue is a feature which permits one to accomplish one’s purpose well. Thus, there are dissimilar qualities for teachers, for soldiers. Leading a meaningful life, eudaimonia, involves fulfilling one’s purpose brilliantly. Therefore, one’s happiness relies on their function/character. To sum up, its rule is: “do what the virtuous person would do.” This solution is not useful specifically because virtue ethics is not so much concerned with providing answers as it is in developing people. “Exactitude is impossible in treating of particular ethical cases. They do not fall under any art or law, but the actors themselves have always to take account of circumstances, as much as in medicine or in navigation.” – Aristotle

Finally, virtue ethics highlights the character of the individual, his way of life and focuses on being. Utilitarianism gives importance to consequences of action and maximizing all-round wellbeing.

Check your Progress - 3

6. Define virtue ethics?

7. What differentiates utilitarianism from virtue ethics?

8. Write your views on consequentialism?

5.5 LETS SUM UP

Since the near, the beginning of 20th Century utilitarianism has experienced a variety of chances. After mid of the twentieth century, it has to turn out to be more general to classify as a ‘Consequentialist’ since very few philosophers have the same opinion entirely with the view proposed by the Classical Utilitarians, chiefly with respect to the hedonistic value theory. But the impact of the Classical Utilitarians has been intense — not only within ethical philosophy but within political philosophy and social policy. The issue that Bentham raised, “What use is it?” is a foundation of policy formation. It is an entirely secular, progressive question. The credit for the expression and orderly growth of this approach to policy formation is given to the Classical Utilitarians.

5.6 KEYWORDS

Hedonist: an individual who considers pursuit of pleasure as the most essential thing in life; a pleasure - seeker.

Universalization: An action is morally acceptable if it can be universalized (i.e., everyone could do it).

Cognitive dissonance: The term cognitive dissonance is used to explain the thoughts of discomfort that result when your way of life run opposite to your behaviors and/or new information that is presented to you.

Consequentialism: Consequentialism focuses on consequences of actions to categorize the action into being good or bad.

Eudaimonia: It refers to individual's wellbeing.

5.7 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

5. How utilitarianism acts as a guiding force?
6. Explain key feature of utilitarianism.
7. Do you agree or disagree with rule-utilitarianism?
8. What is the relationship between Utilitarianism and ethical behaviour?
9. What is the basic difference between concepts of Utilitarianism and Universalism?

5.8 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1. Turner, Piers Norris (forthcoming). The Rise of Liberal Utilitarianism: Bentham and Mill. In J. A. Shand (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to 19th Century Philosophy*.
2. Eggleston, Ben (2014). Act Utilitarianism. In Ben Eggleston & Dale E. Miller (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Utilitarianism*. Cambridge University Press. pp. 125-145.
3. Mill, John Stuart (2009). Utilitarianism. In Steven M. Cahn (ed.), *Exploring Philosophy: An Introductory Anthology*. Oxford University Press.
4. Smart, J. J. C. & Williams, Bernard (1973). *Utilitarianism For and Against*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Skelton, Anthony (2013). Ideal Utilitarianism. In James Crimmins (ed.), *Bloomsbury Encyclopedia of Utilitarianism*. Bloomsbury Academic.
6. Feldman, Fred (1997). *Utilitarianism, Hedonism, and Desert: Essays in Moral Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.

5.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

10. Utilitarianism is an attempt to present an answer to the realistic question “What ought a man to do?” The answer to this question is that he ought to function in such way which has the best possible consequences. The goal of utilitarianism is to make judgments on the basis of a calculation of the consequences. One thing to understand is that the theory is a variety of consequentialism: the right action is judged entirely on the basis of consequences produced. The difference between utilitarianism and egoism is that relevant consequences are the basis of deciding the righteousness of an act. According to an utilitarian, one ought to maximize the all-round wellbeing — that is, give importance the good of others as well as one's own good.....(answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 1)
11. The difference between act utilitarian and rule utilitarian is as follows:
- Act utilitarianism: In act - utilitarianism, we are expected to encourage those actions which will have consequence in the “greatest good for the greatest number of individuals” in that particular situation. Act - utilitarianism would consider the act of giving money to charity as right. It is because the act of charity is benefiting many people, rather than only the one possessing the wealth. Act utilitarianism wants the answer to – “whether that specific action contribute to maximize happiness?” In nearly every part of the world, there is moral opprobrium stuck to the idea of a surgeon ending a patient’s life, even if the patient genuinely wishes it because he has an incurable, unbearable, and painful illness. Efforts to alleviate such patients’ sufferings are generally considered as benevolent, but active euthanasia is broadly condemned both ethically and legally. Presume that, in spite of these criticisms, a surgeon gives a toxic injection to such a patient. Depending on the conditions, the surgeon might face criticism, the cancellation of his license, and even legal action could be taken against him. But has he done anything immoral? Morality is eventually a matter of overall welfare. Act utilitarianism, like other types of utilitarianism, deals with questions of this type by implying that morality is at last a matter of overall happiness and wellbeing.

Rule - utilitarianism: Rule - utilitarianism is a response to that opposition. The theory of utility in rule - utilitarianism is to pursue those **set of rules** which will have the consequences in the greatest good for the greatest number of individuals. In the case presented above, the common rule should be: 'share your wealth'. One opposition to rule-utilitarianism is that in some circumstances the benefit from violating a rule could be greater than following it. For example, there could be a situation, where a utilitarian would be forced to lie in order to achieve overall gain. To this criticism, John Smart asserts that it would be irrational in the eyes of a utilitarian to refuse to break some rule that would lead to greater utility.....(answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 2)

12. One such criticism is that, although the extensive practice of dishonesty and thieving would incur bad consequences, not sure that occasional lying to evade humiliation or an occasional following a loss of dependability and security. However, it is stealing from a wealthy man would not have good results, and thus be allowable or even mandatory for Utilitarianism. But the Utilitarian willingly answers that if such activities are widespread and become extensive then it would lead to loss of security and trustworthiness. John Stuart Mill however saw pleasures in two categories – higher and lower pleasures. A criticism of John Stuart Mill's utilitarianism, and is his classification of greater and lesser pleasures. The dissimilarity between these pleasures is established on type and not degree, which makes it difficult to compare the consequences of the action. According to the critics, greater and lesser should not be the criteria for categorization, as it would not be helpful in judging the consequences when higher and lower pleasure are both involved. In Mill's view, it is better to be a discontented Socrates than a contented fool. His argument is that humans have the capability to enjoy intellectual pleasure (which are higher pleasure) as well as physical pleasures that are lower pleasures. And intellectual pleasure should be given the importance and not the physical ones that are short-lived and won't have any purpose in future. Another criticism points out the possible biasness of Mill. Being an intellectual, he would have

preferred intellectual pleasure as a higher pleasure.(answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 3)

13. If the 'actions' refer to the action of one particular person, we can categorize it under the principles given by Sidgwick, More and Bentham. Here the actions of an individual re judged by the outcome of that action and the common rules, for example "keep promises". These rules are used to evade the necessity of calculation the feasible consequences of the actions in each step. Whether the rule of keeping promises prove to be right or wrong on a particular situation relies on the goodness or badness of the consequences of keeping or violating the promises on that particular situation. In this case, if the consequences of not keeping the promise provide greater benefit than keeping it, then it is required to break the rule, without considering the goodness of the consequences of everybody's abiding by the rule is or is not greater than the consequences of everybody's violating it. To be precise, it can be said that rules do not matter, which the utilitarian has to consider while assessing consequences. This doctrine is called as 'extreme utilitarianism '. A more humble type of utilitarianism has recently become the latest thing. Part of its appeal is that it seems to resolve the clash in moral philosophy between utilitarians and intuitionists in a very precise manner. The above philosophers maintain, or appear to maintain, that moral rules are more than rules of thumb. Generally the rightness of an action should not be judged by calculating its consequences but only by considering whether or not it comes under a particular rule. Whether the rule is to be considered an up to standard moral rule, is, however, to be determined by taking in account the consequences of implementing the rule. Largely, then, actions are to be judged by rules and rules by consequences. The only instances in which one must judge an particular action directly by its outcomes are (a) when the action comes under two unlike rules, one of which allows it and one of which prevents it, and (b) when there is no rule whatever that directs the given instance. This doctrine is called as 'restricted utilitarianism '(answer for Check your Progress - 2 Q. 4)

- 14. Universalization:** An action is morally acceptable if it can be universalized (i.e., everyone could do it). The matter between extreme and restricted utilitarianism can be demonstrated by considering the statement 'But suppose everyone did the same'. Stout discriminates two forms of the universalization principle, the causal form and the hypothetical form.....(answer for Check your Progress - 2 Q. 5)
- 15. Virtue ethics or virtue theory** was formerly proposed by Aristotle (384 - 322 BCE) to provide answers to the questions of how people can find and sustain happiness. Aristotle was eventually interested in the final result of doings or an individual's whole life as a gauge for happiness. For example, if you spend your whole life being a fine person even in the condition of oppression, and you're praised and honoured for your decency and good works, in Aristotle's view, you have led a satisfying life and achieved happiness. Aristotle also accepts the idea that the most satisfying way of living is by involving oneself intellectual speculation.....(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 6)
- 16. Virtue ethics** is at present is one of three main approaches in normative ethics. It may, originally, be recognized as the one that stresses upon the virtues, or moral quality, in contrast to the approach that stresses upon the goodness actions and their consequences that would maximize all round wellbeing (utilitarianism). Consequentialism focuses on consequences of actions. Suppose it is apparent that a person in need must be helped. A utilitarian will signify that the consequences of helping would maximize well-being; a deontologist would focus on act being in accordance with an ethical rule such as "Do unto others as you would be done by". On the other hand, a virtue ethicist will focus on the act of helping being charitable or benevolent. Utilitarianism is on the whole the contradictory view. Instead of giving importance to the final consequences, utilitarianism is about creating oneself as constructive and helpful as possible over the years of one's existence. This idea was developed by John Stewart Mill (1806 - 1873 CE). According to Mill, happiness is seen in how much a person performs, thereby adding up the achievements builds a person and as a result, bring

Notes

about an additional developed humanity as a whole. Whether the end of the job is accepted or ignored is not the subject, what matters is the journey through a life of helpfulness.....(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 7)

17. Consequentialism focuses on consequences of actions. There is a difference between consequentialist thinking and thinking about the consequences. The two are different. What I mean by consequentialist is the standpoint that whether a personal activity or public policy is correct depends on the outcome of that act or policy, and on nothing else. In other words, it is the kind of moral thinking that characterizes “consequentialism” as a distinguishing philosophical approach in normative ethics, of which utilitarianism is the main variety. Thinking about results, on the other hand, is merely that: it is to recognize that our activities have consequences that we should think in order to choose our actions sensibly.
.....(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 8)

UNIT - 6: KANTIAN AND DEONTOLOGICAL SYSTEMS

STRUCTURE

- 6.0 Objectives
- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 Metaphysic of Morals
- 6.3 Kantian formula
- 6.4 Moral luck
- 6.5 Doctrine of double effect
- 6.6 Intentions, actions and consequences: Doctrine of double effect
- 6.7 Let Us Sum Up
- 6.8 Keywords
- 6.9 Questions for Review
- 6.10 Suggested Readings and References
- 6.11 Answers to Check Your Progress

6.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Learn about the theory of metaphysic of morals.
- Understand the Kantian formula.
- Understand the concept and relevance of moral luck
- Understand how intentions also play role in defining the actions to be moral under the heading of ‘intentions, actions and consequences: doctrine of double effect’.

6.2 INTRODUCTION

Intentions have been a vital theme of study since modern philosophy of action arose in the mid of the twentieth century. For nearly that whole period, the approach has been to see the study of intentions as distinct from the study of morality. This chapter offers a brief overview

of doctrine of double effect that include study of the link between intentions, actions and consequences, Kantian formula of humanity, metaphysic of morals as well as moral luck.

To acquire the proper understanding of the human activity, it is required to understand intentions. For, at least in the typical instances of action, intentions are the psychological conditions that yield and guide action. In particular, in the most general view, intentions are the effectual reasons of intended actions, are what rationalize actions. Actions are those physical activities that are produced and rationalized by a couple of psychological states: a desire for some end, where ends can be assumed of as ways the all God's creatures could be, and a belief that something the human can just do, namely, move their body in the way to be explained, has some appropriate chance of making the world a better place to live. To understand consequences, philosophers relies on the concept of consequentialism. Consequentialism focuses on outcome of actions to categorize the action into being good or bad.

6.3 METAPHYSIC OF MORAL

The Metaphysics of Morals is Kant's chief work in practical moral philosophy in which he discusses about the fundamental principles of rights and of virtues. It contains two parts: the "Doctrine of Right," which explain the human rights that they have or can obtain, and the "Doctrine of Virtue," which deals with the virtues they ought to acquire. The one thing in the humankind that is explicitly good is the "good will." Virtues of character (intelligence, wit, courage, etc.) or merits of good fortune (good health, wealth, status) may be utilized in doing either good or bad actions. By contrast, a good will is intrinsically good -- even if its efforts do not succeed in bringing about constructive results.

It is a theory proposes that the chief purposes of every human are most likely is self-preservation and the accomplishment of happiness. Motive does not appear to be as well appropriate as instinct for these purposes. In reality, individuals with an advanced capacity for rationale are often less happy as compared to the masses. As a result, developed people often get jealous of the masses, while ordinary people see reason with

dislike. The fact is that explanation serves purposes that are superior to individual survival and personal happiness. Reason's purpose is to show a will that is good in itself rather than good for some specific reason, such as getting happiness. The explicit compulsions of a good will are called "duties." We may explain duty in three ways: First, actions are actually good when they are carried out for the sake of duty only. Individuals may act in conventionality with duty out of some personal interest or urge other than duty. For example, a grocer has a responsibility to present a reasonable price to all customers, yet grocers put up with by this duty not only because he has a sense of duty, but rather because the rivalry of other grocers force them to present the least possible cost. The second proposal is that behaviour is evaluated not according to the purpose they were supposed to carry about, but rather by the "maxim" or policy that served as their inspiration. This policy is like the first one. When someone takes on an action with no other inspiration than a sense of duty, they are acting in this way because they have acknowledged a moral principle that is suitable a priori. By contrast, if they take on an activity because they expecting some particular outcome from it they have inspiration is something else than just duty. The third scheme, also linked to the first two, is that duties should be performed because of "reverence" for "the law." Any living being can act out of impulse, and might get positive results by chance. But only a sensible person would distinguish a universal moral law and therefore act out of respect for it. The "reverence" for law that such a human being displays is not an emotional feeling of respect for the prominence of the law. Rather, it is the moral inspiration of a being that identifies that the law is a vital of reason that goes beyond all other interests and concerns. Since there are a few conditions and motivations that cannot be brought into the consideration of moral principles, the moral "law" cannot be a precise requirement to do or not do this or that particular action. Rather, the moral law must be valid in all circumstances. Thus the law of morality is that one needs to behave in such a way that he/she could want the maxim (the motivating principle) of our act to turn into a universal law. Giving a fake promise is an example of a deed that infringes this moral law. Some individuals may reason that they should be allowed to

lie in order to get away from hard situation. On the other hand, some individuals might reason that they should not lie because if they do so, they might produce still larger problems for themselves in the future. In both cases, fear of consequences is the motivation behind the actions and not pure respect for duty.

Another argument of Kant was that he believed that an action is held as moral only if it is intrinsically good or good "in itself".

First is that impure intentions cannot be a basis of the actions.

Otherwise, some secondary motivation would be the reason behind the action, and was not done because of the intrinsic goodness of the action. Secondly, the basis of moral actions should not give importance to possible outcomes. Otherwise, the deed would not be considered good in itself, but would, in its place, be good in that it brought about a particular result.

Check your Progress - 1

1. What do you understand by metaphysics of moral?

6.4 KANTIAN FORMULA

Kant developed principal formulas so - called "formula of universal law." Another formula is the "formula of humanity."

Means, ends and transitivity. The term "means" refers to that entity whose value depends upon its utility. The worth of its utility depends upon the value of what can bring about and hence the worth of an "end." Except that an end might serve as means to some further end. X can act as a means to Y, which might be a means to Z, and Z could be a means to W, and so on. An "end in itself," often identified as "final end," is the termination of such a series. It is not a means to something more; there is nothing where it could be of use. Happiness is usually considered as an end in itself. Just about everything valuable is valuable finally for happiness; but happiness, regardless of its value, is useless. The worth of use is transitive. In the series of uses above, Y's value depends on Z's,

which depends in turn on W's. So it would be foolish mistake to use W as a means of bringing about Y, or to trade W for Y. This would mean that means have more value than the end.

The value of humanity. What Kant desires to communicate with the formula of humanity, likewise, is that it is at least as stupid to treat humanity as a means for achieving some other end, including happiness. According to Kant's moral realism, humanity should not be seen as a means. "So act that you use humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means".

The four examples, again. Following that statement of the new version of the categorical imperative, known as the "formula of humanity" (or of "humanity as an end"), Kant revisiting to the four examples of perfect and imperfect duties towards ourselves and others, showing how these alike duties can be derived from the thought of considering humanity as an end.

(1) Here the suicide example seen as follows: a person who decided to commit a suicide would be taking his humanity simply as a means. This would be, basically, an act of trading/sacrificing his humanity for happiness.

(2) The example of the lying promise shows that to cheat someone is to consider his humanity only as a means, since "he whom I want to use for my purposes by such a promise cannot possibly agree to my way of behaving toward him". The promise is misusing promisee's belief only as a means.

(3) Kant's example of ignoring innate talents represents a person whose action would not, according to Kant, "harmonize" with the system of humanity as an end in itself. To decide not to cultivate these talents, for the cause of personal happiness, is a method of utilizing one's own humanity simply as a means.

(4) Another end of all humans is his or her own contentment and happiness. To harmonize one's behaviour with this end of humankind is to add toward recognising the happiness of others: "the ends of a subject who is an end in itself must as far as possible be also my ends" (Kant 1997). However, this is not a ruling to stay fully occupied for others'

happiness. It would be incorrect to consider humanity in oneself simply as a means to the ends of others. But the question here arises that how much one has to put in order to serve others and look after other's happiness too. Kant's views in *The Metaphysics of Morals* depicts that according to him moral laws cannot determine how much one should put in to help others or what personal sacrifices one must do for the happiness of others. This is a consideration of virtue.

Derivation of the formula of humanity. The issue that made Kant to derive the formula of humanity has fascinated many scholars. Some maintain that he supports that formula with reasoning along the following lines: in order to value anything at all, it is necessary to regard oneself, or humanity in oneself, as the source of all value, and so as absolutely good. That is why the value of humanity ought to always be valued — because it is the foundation for the value of everything. This understanding of Kant's argument has not thought of well to criticism, however. One smart opposition is that, by following that line of argument, in order to look upon anything at all as immoral it must be essential to look upon oneself as immoral. Another criticism is that even if it may be essential for us to value our own humanity in order to value anything else, it does not mean that we must value humanity in some other individual. Kant's maintains that: (1) Individually, every human being takes himself or herself as an end in itself; (2) All other logical being does so as well, and for the same reason; (3) Therefore, independently, rational beings live as ends in themselves, and are not to be used simply as means to any other ends. This explanation, admittedly, is not very enlightening. It is not particularly clear how the move from (2) to (3) is supposed to be understood.

The formulas of humanity and of universal law. Although Kant maintained that all variants of the definite imperative he derived are equivalent some philosophers may doubt that they are. Korsgaard points at a number of dissimilarities between the formula of universal law and the formula of humanity, together with that, as she claims, the argument of the suicide example does not succeed under the formula of universal law, but succeeds under the formula of humanity. But she may not be right in this, due to the way she understands the “contradiction” accepted

for maxims failing the universalization test. Wood, on the contrary, asserts that the two formulas may often seem to produce different results because the formula of universal law is merely an uneven introduction to the formula of humanity. He asserts that “Kant’s formula of choice for applying the moral law is not the formula of universal law but the formula of humanity” .But this claim is tough to consider, taking in account what Kant wrote in the Groundwork: “one does better always to proceed in moral appraisal by the strict method and put at its basis the universal [law] formula of the categorical imperative”.

Check your Progress - 2

2.Describe Kant’s views on value of humanity.

3.Explain derivation of formula of humanity.

6.5 MORAL LUCK

Kant assumed that good or bad luck should not influence moral judgment of an individual and his actions, and should also not influence his / her moral evaluation of himself.

The good will can be called good merely because of its willing, in other words, it is good in itself and carries importance for itself; it carries value incomparably more than the means that it might contribute in or the sum total of all the means. Good will is independent of what can it accomplish or its adequacy to attain some anticipated end.

He would most probably have held the same about a bad will: whether it achieves its evil intention is morally irrelevant. And a course of action that would be predestined if it had a bad result cannot be justified if by luck it turns out fine. There cannot be moral threat. This outlook appears to be incorrect, but it takes place in reply to a primary issue related to

Notes

moral responsibility to which we own no suitable solution. The problem grows out of the usual conditions of moral judgment. Prior to consideration it is naturally credible that people cannot be morally judged for what is not their mistake, or for what is due to issues beyond their control.

An apparent absence of control resulted from an involuntary action, physical force, or ignorance of the situations, is not considered to be assessed under moral judgment. Actions that are under our control matter more than the actions that we don't have any control over, according to Kant. Hence, there is a role of external factors along with the actions that are under our control which shapes the consequences. There is a morally important difference between saving someone from a building on fire and dropping him from a twentieth - story window while attempting to save him. Similarly, there is a morally significant dissimilarity between careless driving and manslaughter. But whether a reckless driver hits a walker relies on the presence of the walker at the point where he carelessly passes a red light. What actions we perform is also restricted by the opportunities and choices with which we are faced, and these are mainly determined by causes beyond our control.

We undoubtedly appear to be faithful to the reality of moral luck. For example, we appear to accuse those who have killed more than we blame those who have only attempted murder, even though the cause for the absence of success in the second case is that the intended victim suddenly tripped and fell to the floor just as the bullet arrived at head - height. Since whether the intended victim tripped or not is not something in control of either would-be murderer, we appear to violate the Control Principle and its corollary.

It might be alluring to react at this point that what people are actually responsible for are their "willings" or their intentions and therefore it is wrong to suggest different moral judgments in this couple of cases.

There are four ways in which the natural objects of moral assessment that depend on luck:

1. **Constitutive Luck** : the luck involved in one's having the "inclinations, capacities and temperament" that one does.

2. **Resultant Luck** : "luck in the way one's actions and projects turn out."
3. **Circumstantial Luck** : the luck involved in "the kind of problems and situations one faces"
4. **Causal Luck** : "luck in how one is determined by antecedent circumstances."

An instance moral luck arises whenever luck makes a moral judgment. The setback of moral luck arises from a conflict between the apparently broadly held intuition that instances of moral luck should not take place with the fact that it is questionably unfeasible to avoid such cases from happening.

The narrative on moral luck started with the work of Thomas Nagel and Bernard Williams. The issues related to moral luck had been discussed before Nagel's and Williams' writings, although not specifically denoted under the heading of "moral luck." Despite the fact that Nagel's article was written as a commentary on Williams', they emphasize on fairly different issues. Still, both the authors are trying to find answers to: can luck ever make a moral difference?

The trouble is that the idea of luck making a moral judgment is extremely counterintuitive. We know that luck come into our lives in numerous ways. It has an influence on our success and our happiness. We may well assume, however, that morality is the one field in which luck has no control. For example, what we may call a person's "moral standing" — a phrase we can use to stand for all the kinds of moral judgment luck might be thought to make. Luck, we might assume, cannot change one's moral standing at all. The difficulty with moral luck is extremely disturbing. Naturally, there is a broad range of responses to it. On the one end there are those who do not believe in any kind of moral luck, and on the other hand there are those who agree to different types of moral luck. Most scholars who study this theory are somewhere in between, mixed approach toward moral luck.

Check your Progress - 3

4. What were Kant's views on moral luck?

5. Name the four ways in which the natural objects of moral assessment that depend on luck.

6.6 DOCTRINE OF DOUBLE EFFECT

According to the doctrine if our actions are morally good has a morally bad side - effect it's ethically OK to proceed with it provided the bad side-effect was not incurred intentionally? This is applied even though you foresaw that the terrible things that might happen.

The principle is used to defend the situation where a surgeon gives drugs to a patient to reduce painful symptoms even though he is well aware that this might prove to be harmful to the patient in future and might lead to patient's death. This is because the surgeon's intention is not to kill the patient. But indirectly it is causing a side-effect as patient's death for relieving him from pain. Many doctors and surgeons apply this principle to substantiate the use of high doses of drugs for the reason of relieving pain in terminally - ill patients even if they had the fatal side effects on the patient.

Factors involved in the doctrine of double effect can be described as following:

- The good effect must be attained independently of the evil one: For the doctrine to be relevant, the bad outcome should not be the means of attaining the good one. So if the only way left is to give the patient the painkiller even if in future it might prove to be fatal, the doctrine of double effect doesn't apply.

- The deed must be proportional to the cause: If the patient is given a high dose of drug that will certainly kill him, in this case, this principle won't apply.
- The action must be suitable (a): A correct dose of medicine should be giving for the illness. The dose also has to be accurate for the present condition. If the patient is given a fatal dose of analgesic drugs, it's no use asserting that the doctor's intention was to relieve their symptoms of vomiting if the drug doesn't have any effect on vomiting.
- The patient must be in an incurable condition: If I give the patient a deadly dose of pain - killers and they would have improved from their illness if the patient wasn't provided with the drugs, it's no use implying that the doctor's intention was to alleviate their pain. And that applies even if there was no other method of relieving their pain.

Problems with the doctrine of double effect

- We are accountable for all the predictable consequences of our actions : If we can predict the two effects of our action we have to take the moral accountability for both effects - we can't get out of problem by deciding to aim only the effect that good for us.
- Intention is not relevant : Some individuals take the stand that it's poor morality to choose the rightness or wrongness of a deed by seeing at the intention of the surgeon. They believe that some actions are impartially right or wrong, and that the purpose of the person who does them is irrelevant. But most law systems consider the intention of an individual as an essential constituent in judging whether they have the action is a crime, and how grave a crime, in cases of causalities.
- Death is not always bad and hence double effect is not relevant : Other philosophers assert that the Doctrine of Double Effect assumes that it is a common thinking that death is always bad. It is said that when ongoing life carries nothing for the patient but the negative things of pain and suffering, then dying is a good thing, and there is no need to apply the doctrine of double effect.
- Double effect can lead to an unexpected moral product : If you do consider that a faster death is better than a slower one then the Doctrine

of Double Effect shows that a doctor who intended to kill the patient is morally superior to a doctor who merely intended to relieve pain.

Check your Progress - 4

6.Explain the factors involved in doctrine of double effect.

7.Explain the problems related to doctrine of double effect.

6.7 INTENTIONS, ACTIONS, AND CONSEQUENCES: DOCTRINE OF DOUBLE EFFECT

There is a moral principle that maintains the assessment of actions by the intentions behind those actions. This thought is well-matched with any standard of value. It is the assertion that the results of a deed are not significant morally.

If goodness is a guiding light to way of living, it can only be so if the consequence of action morally is in one's interest. By appealing that only intentions are important, ethics converts useless. It is left strictly as a technique of assessing the actions of others.

The Ethics of Intentions is derivative of the consideration that people whose motives are to hurt will ultimately succeed. It is a way of assessing them as bad by the fact that they want to cause harm people, not that they do. But this is defective. It is the approaching actions that are wicked. The fact that the individual is malicious suggests they might take the actions. But it is the actions that are damaging.

Different moral intuitions give different importance on the significance of intentions vs. consequences in assessing our actions. One might reason that consequentialists would support the consequences-based approach, and certainly, assessment built on result of the actions is sometimes the

best method to optimize performance. However, in other situations – e.g., when you have solid previous familiarity or when you can't give chances to multiple trial-and-error rounds – ethical evaluation must be built on whether an individual took the choice that had the greatest ex-ante expected value as compared to whether it really brought about the best outcomes. Comparisons of moral assessment with employee reviews can be illuminating.

There are times when we might not be able to help one person without hurting another person. There could be a substantial harm done to another person, might prove to be deadly. This raises the questions: would the benefit justify the harm? Some moralists would reply this question by balancing the good against the evil.

But others reject that outcome of the actions are the only things of ethical importance. To them it also is a matter of concern that whether the cause of damage is due to action, for example, from murdering someone, or due to lack of any crucial action, for example, from not saving someone. They maintain that for some good results we might correctly permit a certain evil to befall someone, even if we could not vigorously bring that evil about. Some individuals also view ethical importance in the distinction between what we aim as a means or an end and what we simply predict will result incidentally from our decision.

Take the generally known example of an adult who on purpose lets a child drown to fulfil the motive of inheriting a family fortune. This act of letting the child drown seems so bad that we recognize the idea of saying that it is no better than drowning the child. And if we have to assess this situation, how can we explain that difference between letting someone die and killing concerns with morality? This opposition seems to assume that if permitting somebody to die is always more acceptable, *ceteris paribus*, than murdering someone, it must be because some intrinsic moral disvalue attaches to killing but not to letting die. And if so, this basic difference must be expressed in all such cases. The essential thing is not that murdering is basically worse than letting die, or more commonly that hurting is worse than failing to protect someone from harm, but that these dissimilar selections run up against various kinds of rights - one of which is stronger than the other by the logic that

Notes

it is less effortlessly defeated. But its larger strength in this sense does not involve that its violation need be strikingly worse.

In another example, police should not enter anybody's home without any warrant or permission comes under right to privacy of the citizens

Your right of privacy that the police not enter your home without permission, for example, is more easily defeated than your right that, an ordinary citizen, not do so. But it give the impression that morally, it is not better, and conceivably even worse, for the police official to violate this right than for an ordinary citizen to do so. So there is nothing strange in implying that the adult acts as poorly when he allow the child to sink and die as when he drowns the child, while maintaining that there are settings in which the child would hold the right not to be killed but not the right to be saved.

Therefore, it will be suitable to begin with two of the examples used to demonstrate the instinctive force of the doctrine actions, intentions and consequences. In case 1, we can save either six individuals in risk of drowning at one place or one individual in risk of drowning somewhere else. We cannot save all seven. In case 2, we can save the six only by driving over and thus killing someone who (for a reason not mentioned) is stuck on the street. If we do not carry out the rescue, the stuck individual can later be rescued. In case 1, we seem seamlessly defensible in proceeding to save the six even though we in so doing do not succeed in saving one person. In case 2, however, it is far from obvious that we may continue. The principle is intended to capture and clarify pairs of cases like these in which consequential deliberations are seemingly held constant but in which we are persuaded to sharply different moral judgments.

Check your Progress - 5

8.What is the importance of understanding the role of intentions while judging an action as good or bad?

9.Define the term 'actions'.

6.8 LET'S SUM UP

The theory of metaphysic of moral proposes that the chief purposes of every human are most likely is self-preservation and the accomplishment of happiness. Motive does not appear to be as well appropriate as instinct for these purposes. In reality, individuals with an advanced capacity for rationale are often less happy as compared to the masses. Another concept of moral luck explains that the good will can be called good merely because of its willing, in other words, it is good in itself and carries importance for itself; it carries value incomparably more than the means that it might contribute in or the sum total of all the means. Good will is independent of what can it accomplish or its adequacy to attain some anticipated end. The doctrine of double effect gives the understanding about how morally important it is to have good intentions behind the actions irrespective of the consequences.

6.9 KEYWORDS

Intention: intentions are the psychological conditions that yield and guide action. In particular, in the most general view, intentions are the effectual reasons of intended actions, are what rationalize actions.

Actions: Actions are those physical activities that are produced and rationalized by a couple of psychological states: a desire for some end, where ends can be assumed of as ways the world could be.

Consequentialism: Consequentialism focuses on outcome of actions to categorize the action into being good or bad.

Moral luck: Moral luck explains situations whereby a moral agent is given moral blame or approval for an action or its outcome even if it is clear that said agent did not have complete control over both the action and its results.

6.10 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Explain in detail about doctrine of double effect.
2. What were the views of Thomas Nagel and Bernard Williams about moral luck?
3. Describe the key points of Kantian formula?
4. What are the main features of the theory of metaphysics of moral?

6.11 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1. Klagge, James Carl (1983). *Moral Properties: Foundation of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles
2. Kerstein, Samuel J. (1999). The Kantian Moral Worth of Actions Contrary to Duty. *Zeitschrift für Philosophische Forschung* 53 (4):530 - 552.
3. Campbell, Joseph Keim (2008). New Essays on the Metaphysics of Moral Responsibility. *The Journal of Ethics* 12 (3-4):193 - 201.
4. Fogal, Daniel & Risberg, Olle (forthcoming). *The Metaphysics of Moral Explanations*. Oxford Studies in Metaethics.
5. Klagge, James Carl (1983). *Moral Properties: Foundation of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles

6.12 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

18. The *Metaphysics of Morals* is Kant's chief work in practical moral philosophy in which he discusses about the fundamental principles of rights and of virtues. It contains two parts: the "Doctrine of Right," which explain the human rights that they have or can obtain, and the "Doctrine of Virtue," which deals with the virtues they ought to acquire. The one thing in the

humankind that is explicitly good is the "good will." Virtues of character (intelligence, wit, courage, etc.) or merits of good fortune (good health, wealth, status) may be utilized in doing either good or bad actions. By contrast, a good will is intrinsically good -- even if its efforts do not succeed in bringing about constructive results.....(answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 1)

19. What Kant desires to communicate with the formula of humanity, likewise, is that it is at least as stupid to treat humanity as a means for achieving some other end, including happiness. According to Kant's moral realism, humanity should not be seen as a means. "So act that you use humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means".
..... (Answer for Check your Progress - 2 Q. 2)

20. The issue that made Kant to derive the formula of humanity has fascinated many scholars. Some maintain that he supports that formula with reasoning along the following lines: in order to value anything at all, it is necessary to regard oneself, or humanity in oneself, as the source of all value, and so as absolutely good. That is why the value of humanity ought to always be valued—because it is the foundation for the value of everything. This understanding of Kant's argument has not thought of well to criticism, however. One smart opposition is that, by following that line of argument, in order to look upon anything at all as immoral it must be essential to look upon oneself as immoral(answer for Check your Progress - 2 Q. 3)

21. Kant assumed that good or bad luck should not influence moral judgment of an individual and his actions, and should also not influence his/her moral evaluation of himself. The good will can be called good merely because of its willing, in other words, it is good in itself and carries importance for itself; it carries value incomparably more than the means that it might contribute in or the sum total of all the means. Good will is independent of what

Notes

- can it accomplish or its adequacy to attain some anticipated end. He would most probably have held the same about a bad will: whether it achieves its evil intention is morally irrelevant. And a course of action that would be predestined if it had a bad result cannot be justified if by luck it turns out fine.(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 4)
22. There are four ways in which the natural objects of moral assessment that depend on luck are constitutive luck, resultant luck, circumstantial luck, casual luck.....(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 5)
23. Factors involved in the doctrine of double effect can be described as following:
- The good effect must be attained independently of the evil one
 - The deed must be proportional to the cause
 - The action must be suitable
 - The patient must be in an incurable condition
-(answer for Check your Progress - 4 Q. 6)
24. Problems with DDE:
- We are accountable for all the predictable consequences of our actions
 - Intention is not relevant
 - Death is not always bad and hence double effect is not relevant
 - Double effect can lead to an unexpected moral product.
-(answer for Check your Progress - 4 Q. 7)
25. To acquire the proper understanding of the human activity, it is required to understand intentions. For, at least in the typical instances of action, intentions are the psychological conditions that yield and guide action. In particular, in the most general view, intentions are the effectual reasons of intended actions, are what rationalize actions..(answer for Check your Progress - 5 Q. 8)
26. Actions are those physical activities that are produced and rationalized by a couple of psychological states: a desire for some

end, where ends can be assumed of as ways the all God's creatures could be, and a belief that something the human can just do, namely, move their body in the way to be explained, has some appropriate chance of making the world a better place to live.(answer for Check your Progress - 5 Q. 9)

UNIT - 7: ETHICAL SYSTEM BASED ON VIRTUES

STRUCTURE

- 7.0 Objectives
- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 Ethics of Virtue
- 7.3 Moral life and virtue
- 7.4 The nature of virtues
- 7.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 7.6 Keywords
- 7.7 Questions for Review
- 7.8 Suggested Readings and References
- 7.10 Answers to Check Your Progress

7.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Learn about the meaning of virtue. And also about the various distinctions under the concept of ethics of virtue
- Understand the concept of moral life and virtue. Determining the factors that would tell who is a virtuous individual in real sense.
- Understand the nature of virtue and what scholars think about the importance of practicing virtues in life.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Ancient Greek philosopher, Socrates believed that one can acquire knowledge and sense about what virtue is and a person who is called a virtuous person have the proper knowledge of what virtue is. According to him, a person who knows what virtue will necessarily act virtuously. In today's world, this belief system may sound strange, largely because it is now easy to differentiate between what a person should do and what he actually wants from life. After assuming this, it becomes easy to

imagine situations in which an individual knows what he/she should do but move forward to do something entirely different. Picking his interest over the actions he is ought to do.

The distinction between virtue and self-interest was not prevalent during the ancient Greek period. The Greeks supported that virtue is essential for an individual and the society. They also were of the opinion that living in a virtuous manner might not give us the desired results in the financial areas. But they did not assume that material richness is the main factor in an individual's life irrespective of their life being good or ill. As per the unity of virtue, it implies that an individual cannot have only one virtue. If that individual possess one virtue he ought to possess all the other virtues. Plato believed that justice prevails in a person when the three essentials of the soul i.e., emotion, desire and intellect act in peace with each other.

An individual who is unjust lives a life of unsatisfactory state of mind and experiences internal conflicts. This person never overcomes his anxiety of unquenched thirst to achieve but actually all he gets is the mere absence of desire. Aristotle supports the views of Plato in which he (Plato) tells that leading a virtuous life is rewarding for that individual and for the community as well. Aristotle also accepts the idea that the most satisfying way of living is by involving oneself intellectual speculation. But Aristotle disagreed to Plato's ideas of The Forms. According to him it is not essential to have the awareness about The Form of Good, in order to act in a good manner.

7.2 ETHICS OF VIRTUE

Virtue ethics or virtue theory was formerly proposed by Aristotle (384 - 322 BCE) to provide answers to the questions of how people can find and sustain happiness. Aristotle was eventually interested in the final result of doings or an individual's whole life as a gauge for happiness. For example, if you spend your whole life being a fine person even in the condition of oppression, and you're praised and honored for your decency and good works, in Aristotle's vision, you have led a satisfying

Notes

life and achieved happiness. Aristotle also accepts the idea that the most satisfying way of living is by involving oneself in intellectual speculation. Virtue ethics is at present one of the main approaches in normative ethics. A virtue is an outstanding attribute of character. To own a virtue is to be a definite kind of individual with a certain complex attitude. An important facet of this state of mind is the sincere recognition of a unique range of considerations as basis for action. An honest individual cannot be recognized merely as one who, for example, exercises honesty and does not deceive. If such behaviour is simply because the individual believes that honesty is the best policy, or due to the fear of being caught out, rather than through recognising "To do otherwise would be dishonest" as the appropriate reason, such actions would not be considered of an honest person. An honest person cannot be recognized merely as one who, for example, speaks the truth because it is the truth, because one can have the quality of honesty without being indiscreet or injudicious. An honest individual's attitude depicts "That would be a lie" as a strong explanation for not making certain statements in certain situations, and gives due, but not dominant, weight to "That would be the truth" as a cause for making them.

It is seen that virtue carries a multi-track character, it would obviously be irresponsible to point one to an individual on the basis of a sole observed action or even a series of alike actions, especially if you don't know the person's reasons for doing what he/she did.

Virtue ethics is based on the character/nature of an individual rather than the actions carried out by that person. Basically it gives importance to the virtues a man possesses or the morality he possesses instead of moral duties and rules or even the end result of an action. Other than dealing with the righteousness or wrongness of particular actions, ethics of virtue proves to be a guiding force for what characteristics a morally and virtually good man should acquire or seek to achieve. In that way, virtue ethics deals with the person's entire life, rather than specific episodes or actions. A fine person is someone who lives righteously - who possesses and lives by the virtues. It's a helpful theory because human beings are often more concerned with evaluating the character of another person than they are in evaluating the goodness or badness of a specific action. This

proposes that the manner to construct a good civilization is to help its people to be good humans, instead to using laws and punishments to stop or discourage bad actions.

But it wouldn't prove to be useful if an individual had to be a saint to be considered as virtuous. According to the virtue theory to be really helpful it needs to propose only a minimum set of characteristics that a person has to possess in order to be recognized as virtuous. Being virtuous is more than having a particular habit of acting, e.g. generosity. Rather, it means having a fundamental set of related virtues that enable a person to live and act morally well.

Many of the virtue theorists would like to assert that the virtuous person is one who behaves in a virtuous way as the result of logical and realistic thought (rather than, say, instinct).

The three questions

The modern philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre proposed three questions as being at the heart of moral thinking:

- Who am I?
- Who ought I to become?
- How ought I to get there?

There are four different forms virtue ethics:

- a) Eudaimonist virtue ethics
- b) Target-centered virtue ethics
- c) Agent-based and exemplarist virtue ethic
- d) Platonistic virtue ethics.

a) **Eudaimonist virtue ethics** : Eudaimonia is, allegedly, an ethicized or value- laden idea of happiness, something like “true” or “actual” happiness or “the kind of happiness worth looking for or possessing.” It is therefore the type of theory about which there can be considerable amount of disagreement between individuals with dissimilar thoughts about human existence that cannot be determined by appeal to some external criterion on which, regardless of their different ideas and viewpoints, the parties to the disagreement harmonize. Most adaptations of virtue ethics concur that living a life according to the virtues is essential for eudaimonia. According to virtue ethicists, a human life dedicated to physical pleasure or the attainment of wealth is not

Notes

eudemon, but a wasted life. In the views of Aristotle, virtue is essential but not enough — what is also necessary are external goods which are a subject of luck. On the other hand according to Plato and the Stoics, virtue is essential and enough for eudaimonia.

b) Target-centered virtue ethics : Christine Swanton developed the idea of target centered virtue. A virtue, on a target-centered account, “is a disposition to respond to, or acknowledge, items within its field or fields in an excellent or good enough way” - Swanton. There are three ways in which one can understand target - centered virtue ethics. A perfectionist target - centered explanation would specify, “An act is right, if and only if it is overall virtuous, and that entails that it is the, or a, best action possible in the circumstances”. A minimalist target - centered explanation would not even need an act to be good in order to be right. On such a thought, “An act is right, if and only if it is not overall vicious”. A more permissive target - centered description would not categorize ‘right’ with ‘best’, but would permit an action to be considered as right on the basis of : “it is good enough even if not the best action”.

c) Agent-based and exemplarist virtue ethics : According to agent - based and exemplarist virtue ethics rightness is judged in the terms of good intentions and wrongness in terms of evil intentions. Zagzebski similarly describe right and wrong actions with respect to the emotions, intentions, motives, and temperament/nature of virtuous and vicious agents. For example, “A wrong action = an action that the phronimos typically would not do, and he would suffer from feeling of guilty if he did = an act such that it is not the case that he might do it = an act that expresses a vice = an act that is against a requirement of virtue (the virtuous self)”.

d) Platonistic virtue ethics: The fourth kind a virtue ethic takes its inspiration from Plato. The Socrates of Plato’s dialogues dedicate a immense quantity of time to asking his member Athenians to describe the nature of virtues like justice, piety, courage, and wisdom. So it is apparent that Plato can be called as a virtue theorist. “Anything which alters consciousness in the direction of unselfishness, objectivity, and realism is to be connected with virtue”. Another Platonistic alternative of

virtue ethic describes virtue in terms of metaphysics of goodness. God is both the representative and the origin of all goodness. Other things are good, Adam proposes, to the extent that they resemble God.

Check your Progress - 1

1. What is the basis of virtue ethics?

2. Why theory of virtue is helpful in leading a good life?

3. Explain the four forms of virtue ethics

7.3 MORAL LIFE AND VIRTUE

The vision of moral character held by Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, and the Stoics are the preliminary point for the majority of other philosophical talks on character. Although, these early moralists differed on a few issues concerning virtue. But there were some similarities among these moralists. These points of similarities will show why the Greek philosophers thought it was vital to discuss character.

A number of dialogues of Plato's (especially the early or so - called "Socratic" dialogues) study the nature of virtue and the character of a moral person. They often start by showing Socrates ask his fellow people to describe what a virtue is. In reply, the fellow scholars generally offer behavioral accounts of the virtues. The problem one face in trying to give a simply behavioural explanation of virtue explains why the Greek ethicist turn to character to give explanation about what virtue is. It may be true that most of us can identify that it would be silly to jeopardize our lives and the lives of others to secure a trivial benefit, and that many of us can observe that it is unfair to hurt others to acquire power and wealth for our own ease. We don't need to be virtuous to

Notes

identify these things. But the Greek ethicist think it takes someone of good moral character to determine with reliability and consistency what actions are suitable and sensible in frightful situations and that it takes someone of good moral character to determine with regularity and reliability how and when to secure goods and resources for himself and others. This is why Aristotle states in *Nicomachean Ethics* that it is not simple to classify in rules which behaviour deserve moral praise and blame, and that these issues need the decision of the virtuous person. Aristotle agrees with Plato's separation of the soul into two fundamental parts (rational and non - rational) and concurs that both parts add to moral character. Of all the Greek ethicist, Aristotle gives the most psychologically and spiritually insightful account of virtuous character. Because many contemporary philosophical treatments of character are grateful to Aristotle's examination.

Aristotle describes virtuous character as :

Excellence [of character], then, is a situation concerned with alternatives, lying in a mean relative to us, this being determined by reason and in the way in which the individual of practical understanding (*phronimos*) would conclude it. Now it is a mean between two vices, that which relies upon surplus and that which depends on deficiency.

By calling excellence of character a state, Aristotle means that it is neither a feeling nor a capacity nor a mere tendency to behave in specific ways. Rather it is the settled condition we are in when we are well off in relation to feelings and actions. We are fine in relation to our emotions and actions when we are in intermediate state in regard to them. If, on the other hand, we have a cruel character, we are poorly off in relation to emotions and actions, and we fail to hit the mean in regard to them. So it is not easy to hit the mean. "Anyone can get angry – that is easy – or give or spend money; but to do this to the right person, to the right extent, at the right time, with the right aim, and in the right way, that is not for everyone, nor is it easy." That is why goodness is commendable (*epaineton*) and fine (*kalon*).

Mean state is not an arithmetic mean, as explained by Aristotle, but one relative to the circumstances. Each virtue is concerned with precise

emotions or actions. The virtue of gentleness or good temper, for example, is concerned with anger. Aristotle believes that a gentle/calm individual ought to be aggravated about some things (e.g., injustice) and should be eager to stand up for himself and those he cares about. And if he does not react even in the situations which are grave, then according to Aristotle that person lack proper moral character. On the contrary if a person gets angry for not a very serious issue, then according to Aristotle morally excessive character of the irritable person.

Moral education and the human function

Since Aristotle believes that virtue is a combined, uncomplicated condition where emotional responses and logical evaluations have same weightage, he, like Plato, thinks that the teaching of our emotional responses is critical for the development of moral character. If our emotional responses are cultured correctly, we will learn to take pleasure or pain in the accurate things. Like Plato, Aristotle believes we can judge a person by the things that give them pleasure or pain.

To describe what the moral person's pleasures are like, Aristotle proceeds to the thought that virtue is an excellent state of the person.

Virtue is the condition that makes a human being good and makes him do his function well.

His job is to act wisely, so when we implement our fully developed practical knowledge well, when we understand our nature as logical beings, we are virtuous human beings and live a happy life.

Aristotle believes that, human beings can logical beings and have mental capabilities in manner that non-human animals cannot. They can be conscious about how to behave, how to act, what ways are the best ways to live their lives, about what virtues and morals to be inculcated in their character and day to day life.

They can logically reach to the conclusions about various ways in which they would perform to live a good life. In other words, humans are rational beings and have the ability of practical reasoning. Humans can imagine the possible ways in which the world is existing and why it appears to behave as it does. They can identify the spiritual or metaphysical aspects as well as the scientific facts of the universe. This directs towards contemplation. These kinds of reasoning are not

Notes

specifically distinguished by the philosophers and scholars. But in accordance with the beliefs of Aristotle, contemplation and practical reasoning are connected and belong to the rational activities. Here the individual practices their ability to form ideas as well as pursue truths and facts that one has figured out.

Aristotle elucidates the motives and calculation of righteous people by contrasting real self-love with a faulty type that is reproachable.

Individuals with reproachable self-love desire for the most to have the major share of wealth, respect and physical pleasures. This is because one individual cannot have a large share without disallowing these things to others, these are the things that have competed and fought over.

This competitive advancement to these materialistic things takes us towards all kinds of morally inhuman behaviour, for example, vanity, overreaching (*pleonexia*), boastfulness, aggression, intemperance and extravagant luxury. On contrary to the reproachable self-lovers, real self-lovers will take enjoyment in the things that are good and moral that is, they would enjoy the acquiring knowledge and wisdom and work on their decision making powers rather than accumulating money and power. As a result, they will stay away from many of the actions, and will be unattached to many of the pleasures, of the ordinary vices.

Because they have the right attitude toward materialistic things, they will be prepared to give up such things if by doing so they attain what is fine. They become aware of the process where everyone focuses on doing what is fine so that their actions encourage the overall well being. The virtuous person's way of thinking reflects his accurate conception of how to live and his concern for the fine: he sees that his own good is included in the good of the community.

The virtuous person's emotional responses are suitable to the circumstances point towards that her emotional responses are in concord with her accurate analysis about what to do. Aristotle states that the non-rational element of a virtuous person's heart "speaks with the same voice" as their mind. That the virtuous person's soul is integrated and not worn out by clash of beliefs that differentiates the state of being virtuous from various non-virtuous conditions such as continence (*enkrateia*), incontinence (*akrasia*), and vice (*kakia*) in general.

Aristotle appears to believe that, at base, any non – virtuous person is weighed down by internal disbelief or conflict, even if on the outside he seems to be as mentally and emotionally unified as virtuous people. Even though a bad person may come out as a single-minded person with respect to her disregard for justice and her quest for material happiness and power, she must seek out others' companion to overlook or forget her own actions. Aristotle likely to have this point in mind when he says of nasty people that they are at war with themselves and do not exercise self love. Virtuous persons, on the contrary, take pleasure in who they are and are happy and content in behaving virtuously.

Like the morally vicious person, the continent and incontinent persons have internal conflicts, but they are more conscious of their internal chaos than the ethically vicious person. Continence is fundamentally a type of self-mastery: the continent person identifies what she should do and does it, but to do so she must fight against the pull of obstinate feelings. The incontinent individual also in some way knows what she must do, but she fails to do it because of obstinate feelings.

Aristotle's point on incontinence appears to include both Socratic and Platonic essentials. Socrates in his works had explained apparently incontinent actions as the result of unawareness of what takes one towards the good. Since, he believed that everyone wishes the good and aims at it in his actions, no one would deliberately prefer a course of action supposed to result in less good overall. Plato, on the contrary, asserted that incontinence can take place when a person's non - rational wishes makes him act in a way the his practical and rational side for the greater good. Aristotle look as if he concurs with Socrates that the rational state of the incontinent person is faulty at the moment of incontinent behaviour, but he also concurs with Plato that an individual's non-rational wishes cause the incontinent action. This could be what Aristotle wants to express when he says that “the position that Socrates sought to establish actually seems to result; for it is not what is thought to be knowledge proper that the passion overcomes ... but perceptual knowledge”.

Check your Progress-2

4. What are Aristotle's views on virtues?

5. Why moral education is essential?

7.4 THE NATURE OF VIRTUE

Virtuous action proposes that virtuous or moral character does not only include the cognitive element, but also some emotional element. Both Plato and Aristotle assert that virtuous nature call for a characteristic blend of practical and emotional elements. In the *Republic*, Plato split the soul into three branches and gives to each a different kind of desire (logical, appetitive, or spirited). As types of non-rational desire, appetitive and spirited desires can clash with our logical desires about what give to our in general good, and they will from time to time move us to behave in manners we identify to be opposite to the actions which may lead to greater good. When this type of situation arrives, we are incontinent. To be righteous, then, we have to together recognize what adds to our overall wellbeing and have our spirited and appetitive desires cultured correctly, so that they concur with the guidance given by the practical part of the soul. A person who has the potential to become virtuous learn when young to be devoted to and enjoy the virtuous behaviour and actions, but should wait until late in life to expand the understanding that makes him understand the reason why what he adores is good. Once he has educated what the good is, his knowledgeable love of the good tells why he acts as he does and why his behavior is virtuous. The Catechism of the Catholic Church defines virtue as "a habitual and firm disposition to do the good. It allows a person not only to perform good acts, but to give the best of himself. "In simpler words, virtue is the ability and the want to act well.

Now, this ability and desire to act well is a trait of a person's character, it is a merit in the individual which perfects action. Another way to state it is that a virtuous individual is willing to act well. A virtue lets one to quickly and effortlessly do the right thing. It is both a proficiency and an tendency to make use of that talent correctly.

Nature of virtue and the main characteristics of a virtuous man:

Virtue signifies the excellence of an individual's personality and inner character which may be visible in external conduct. We have previously supposed that we consider of 'virtuous character' as well as 'virtuous activity', goodness and rightness respectively, and both of these are undividable. It is apparent that virtues may be spoken in the terms of activities. What, then, are the chief characteristics of a virtuous individual? It can be stated that a person who is really virtuous is a diligent man. Not only his character is good, but his activities too are good. This deliberation will significantly help us in understanding the precise significance of the moral maxim 'there are no holidays for virtue'. This phrase means that there are no days of break from virtuous thinking and activity. A really virtuous man do not ever retires from the life of righteous activity. His life is a nonstop, constant sequence of virtuous deeds. It is an existence of perpetual virtuous action. It is, in fact, a life devoted entirely and totally to the cause of morality. Virtue is not like a costume to be put on or put off when one pleases to. One cannot get rid off these virtuous way of life whenever one wants to. It is not something to be exercised on whenever one feels like or on or on special occasions. One cannot be an opportunist, infringing the laws of ethicality, whenever one thinks it suitable or wise to do so. Undivided, unwavering, constant faithfulness towards morality typify a really virtuous individual. Some individual work under the misunderstanding that old age is the correct occasion for acting virtuously. When we are young, we must enjoy life and experiences worldly pleasure and engage ourselves in materialistic lives. Young people must not be bothered with things related to morality, virtue, value, religion, etc., instead should be allowed to take pleasure in the materialist life. But the above vision seems to be faulty and therefore, it must not be followed. The evils of overindulgence are well known. In early stages of life of a person, the

Notes

cravings and passions become very strong, and if youthful men and women are allowed to pursue their cravings and passions, needs and inclinations without any control or if they do not build up the habit of self - discipline and self control, they will destroy themselves and bring disgrace to their societies. In fact, an individual, can barely be expected to be moral in old age, unless one starts to practise virtues from their young age. Individuals crossing their early life cheerfully in sensuality cannot generally turn moral abruptly. This does not signify that a moral individual has to give up social life. He enjoys, with justifiable boundaries, those pleasures that are accepted of by sense of right and wrong. He rejects all kinds of excess. He accepts restraint and moderation as the guiding standard for his life.

The Greeks supported that virtue is essential for an individual and the society. They also were of the opinion that living in a virtuous manner might not give us the desired results in the financial areas. But they did not assume that material richness is the main factor in an individual's life irrespective of their life being good or ill.

As per the unity of virtue, it implies that an individual cannot have only one virtue. If that individual possesses one virtue he ought to possess all the other virtues. As all virtues are interdependent. Both Aristotle in *Nicomachean Ethics* and Plato, in the *Republic*, support variations of this idea. The purpose of this challenge is that according to Sophists which is still prevailing, the only reason for behaving in a just manner is that the person would not be able to get away with it (unjust behaviour). Plato's reaction to this challenge is a lengthy argument in which he develops a position that seems to go ahead of anything that the Great Socrates asserted. Plato believed that true knowledge is not knowing some specific things but having the general knowledge about specific subjects, a common idea that covers all the particular subjects.

This idea, as is known, is taken from the Socrates' idea of stressing upon his opponents to move beyond the idea of only describing a specific act that are just and good and instead describe a general account of justice and goodness. This implies that one should have general account of what is just and right, only then he can be considered to have a correct knowledge about goodness. Plato believed that justice prevails in a

person when the three essentials of the soul i.e., emotion, desire and intellect act in peace with each other.

An individual who is unjust lives a life of unsatisfactory state of mind and experiences internal conflicts. This person never overcomes his anxiety of unquenched thirst to achieve but actually all he gets is the mere absence of desire. On the other hand a just person experiences peace and harmony as he is a rationally thinking person and a genuinely satisfied individual enjoy the pursuits of true knowledge. He also believed that the soul of the human is not immortal. And hence even if a good and just person suffers from many unfortunate events like illness, poverty, the Gods will give that person the greatest rewards in his next life.

Sphere of emotions or actions	Excess (Vice)	Mean (virtue)	Deficiency (vice)
Pleasure and Pain	Shamelessness	Temperance	Insensibility
Anger	Irascibility	patience	Lack of spirit
Social conduct	Sycophancy	Friendliness	bad-temperedness
Indignation	Jealousy	Righteous indignation	Malicious enjoyment
Self - expression	Bragging	Truthfulness	Understatement
Confidence and fear	Recklessness	Courage	Cowardice

Check your Progress - 3

6.What are the main characteristics of a virtues man?

7.What is the nature of virtue?

8.According to Greeks why virtues are important in life?

7.5 LETS SUM UP

Virtuous action proposes that virtuous or moral character does not only include the cognitive element, but also some emotional element. Both Plato and Aristotle assert that virtuous nature call for a characteristic blend of practical and emotional elements. In the *Republic*, Plato split the soul into three branches and gives to each a different kind of desire (logical, appetitive, or spirited). As types of non-rational desire, appetitive and spirited desires can clash with our logical desires about what give to our in general good, and they will from time to time move us to behave in manners we identify to be opposite to the actions which may lead to greater good. When this type of situation arrives, we are incontinent. To be righteous, then, we have to together recognize what adds to our overall wellbeing and have our spirited and appetitive desires cultured correctly, so that they concur with the guidance given by the practical part of the soul. A person who has the potential to become virtuous learn when young to be devoted to and enjoy the virtuous behaviour and actions, but should wait until late in life to expand the understanding that makes him understand the reason why what he adores is good. Once he has educated what the good is, his knowledgeable love of the good tells why he acts as he does and why his behaviour is virtuous. The Greeks supported that virtue is essential for an individual and the society. They also were of the opinion that living in a virtuous manner might not give us the desired results in the financial areas. But they did not assume that material richness is the main factor in an individual's life irrespective of their life being good or ill.

7.6 KEYWORDS

- 1 **Phronimos** : It means practicality or rational.
- 2 **Pleonexia** : It means to be overreaching
- 3 **Enkrateia** : It means to be continent.

- 4 **Akrasia** : It means to be incontinence.
- 5 **Kakia** : the Greek goddess of vice

7.7 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

10. How virtues acts as a guiding principle?
11. On what basis can we determine if a person is virtuous or not?
12. What are the thoughts of Plato on role of virtues in our lives?
13. Why is it important to be a virtuous person?

7.8 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1. Banks, Sarah (2009). *Ethics in Professional Life: Virtues for Health and Social Care*. Palgrave-Macmillan.
2. Palanski, Michael E. ; Kahai, Surinder S. & Yammarino, Francis J. (2011). Team Virtues and Performance: An Examination of Transparency, Behavioral Integrity, and Trust. *Journal of Business Ethics* 99 (2):201 - 216.
3. Keas, Michael N. (2017). Systematizing the theoretical virtues. *Synthese*:1-33.
4. Wells, Thomas & Graafland, Johan (2012). Adam Smith's Bourgeois Virtues in Competition. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 22 (2):319-350.
5. Bastons, Miquel (2008). The Role of Virtues in the Framing of Decisions. *Journal of Business Ethics* 78 (3):389-400.

7.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

27. Virtue ethics is at present is one of the main approaches in normative ethics. A virtue is an outstanding attribute of character. To own a virtue is to be a definite kind of individual with a certain complex attitude. An important facet of this state of mind

is the sincere recognition of a unique range of considerations as basis for action.....(answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 1)

28. According to the virtue theory to be really helpful it needs to propose only a minimum set of characteristics that a person has to possess in order to be recognized as virtuous. Being virtuous is more than having a particular habit of acting, e.g. generosity. Rather, it means having a fundamental set of related virtues that enable a person to live and act morally well.....(answer for Check your Progress - 1 Q. 2)

29. a) **Eudaimonist virtue ethics:** Eudaimonia is, allegedly, an ethicized or value - laden idea of happiness, something like “true” or “actual” happiness or “the kind of happiness worth looking for or possessing

b) Target-centered virtue ethics: Christine Swanton developed the idea of target centered virtue. A virtue, on a target-centered account, “is a disposition to respond to, or acknowledge, items within its field or fields in an excellent or good enough way”- Swanton. There are three ways in which one can understand target-centered virtue ethics. A perfectionist target-centered explanation would specify, “An act is right if and only if it is overall virtuous, and that entails that it is the, or a, best action possible in the circumstances”. A minimalist target-centered explanation would not even need an act to be good in order to be right.

c) Agent-based and exemplarist virtue ethics : According to agent -based and exemplarist virtue ethics rightness is judged in the terms of good intentions and wrongness in terms of evil intentions. Zagzebski similarly describe right and wrong actions with respect to the emotions, intentions, motives, and temperament/nature of virtuous and vicious agents. For example, “A wrong action = an action that the phronimos typically would not do, and he would suffer from feeling of guilty if he did = an act such that it is not the case that he might do it = an act that

expresses a vice = an act that is against a requirement of virtue (the virtuous self)’.

d) Platonistic virtue ethics: The fourth kind a virtue ethic takes its inspiration from Plato. The Socrates of Plato’s dialogues dedicate a immense quantity of time to asking his member Athenians to describe the nature of virtues like justice, piety, courage, and wisdom.answer for Check your Progress - 2 Q. 3)

30. Aristotle describes virtuous character as : Excellence [of character], then, is a situation concerned with alternatives, lying in a mean relative to us, this being determined by reason and in the way in which the individual of practical understanding (*phronimos*) would conclude it. Now it is a mean between two vices, that which relies upon surplus and that which depends on deficiency. By calling excellence of character a state, Aristotle means that it is neither a feeling nor a capacity nor a mere tendency to behave in specific ways. Rather it is the settled condition we are in when we are well off in relation to feelings and actions. We are fine in relation to our emotions and actions when we are in intermediate state in regard to them. If, on the other hand, we have a cruel character, we are poorly off in relation to emotions and actions, and we fail to hit the mean in regard to them.....(answer for Check your Progress - 2 Q. 4)

31. Since Aristotle believes that virtue is a combined, uncomplicated condition where emotional responses and logical evaluations have same weightage, he, like Plato, thinks that the teaching of our emotional responses is critical for the development of moral character. If our emotional responses are cultured correctly, we will learn to take pleasure or pain in the accurate things. Like Plato, Aristotle believes we can judge a person by the things that give them pleasure or pain. To describe what the moral person’s pleasures are like, Aristotle proceeds to the thought that virtue is an excellent state of the person. Virtue is the condition that makes a human being good and makes him do his function well. His job

is to act wisely, so when we implement our fully developed practical knowledge well, when we understand our nature as logical beings, we are virtuous human beings and live a happy life.(answer for Check your Progress - 2 Q. 5)

32. Virtue signifies the excellence of an individual's personality and inner character which may be visible in external conduct. We have previously supposed that we consider of 'virtuous character' as well as 'virtuous activity', goodness and rightness respectively, and both of these are undividable. It is apparent that virtues may be spoken in the terms of activities. What, then, are the chief characteristics of a virtuous individual? It can be stated that a person who is really virtuous is a diligent man. Not only his character is good, but his activities too are good. This deliberation will significantly help us in understanding the precise significance of the moral maxim 'there are no holidays for virtue'. This phrase means that there are no days of break from virtuous thinking and activity. A really virtuous man do not ever retires from the life of righteous activity. His life is a nonstop, constant sequence of virtuous deeds. It is an existence of perpetual virtuous action. It is, in fact, a life devoted entirely and totally to the cause of morality. Virtue is not like a costume to be put on or put off when one pleases to. One cannot get rid off these virtuous way of life whenever one wants to. It is not something to be exercised on whenever one feels like or on or on special occasions. One cannot be an opportunist, infringing the laws of ethicality, whenever one thinks it suitable or wise to do so. Undivided, unwavering, constant faithfulness towards morality typify a really virtuous individual.....(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 6)

33. Virtuous action proposes that virtuous or moral character does not only include the cognitive element, but also some emotional element. Both Plato and Aristotle assert that virtuous nature call for a characteristic blend of practical and emotional elements. In the *Republic*, Plato split the soul into three branches and gives to each a different kind of desire (logical, appetitive, or spirited). As

types of non-rational desire, appetitive and spirited desires can clash with our logical desires about what give to our in general good, and they will from time to time move us to behave in manners we identify to be opposite to the actions which may lead to greater good. When this type of situation arrives, we are incontinent. To be righteous, then, we have to together recognize what adds to our overall well being and have our spirited and appetitive desires cultured correctly, so that they concur with the guidance given by the practical part of the soul. A person who has the potential to become virtuous learn when young to be devoted to and enjoy the virtuous behaviour and actions, but should wait until late in life to expand the understanding that makes him understand the reason why what he adores is good. Once he has educated what the good is, his knowledgeable love of the good tells why he acts as he does and why his behaviour is virtuous. The Catechism of the Catholic Church defines virtue as "a habitual and firm disposition to do the good. It allows a person not only to perform good acts, but to give the best of himself. "In simpler words, virtue is the ability and the want to act well.....(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 7)

34. The Greeks supported that virtue is essential for an individual and the society. They also were of the opinion that living in a virtuous manner might not give us the desired results in the financial areas. But they did not assume that material richness is the main factor in an individual's life irrespective of their life being good or ill. As per the unity of virtue, it implies that an individual cannot have only one virtue. If that individual posses one virtue he ought to posses all the other virtues. As all virtues are interdependent. Both Aristotle in *Nicomachean Ethics* and Plato, in the *Republic*, support to variations of this idea. The purpose of this challenge is that according to Sophists which is still prevailing, the only reason for behaving in a just manner is that the person would not be able to get away with it (unjust behaviour).
.....(answer for Check your Progress - 3 Q. 8)