

MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Introduction

Moral philosophy (ethics) is one branches of philosophy. But what is philosophy? There are four ways of getting in to the nature and meaning (definition) of philosophy;

- ❖ The word it self = love of wisdom
- ❖ Philosophy as a rational and critical enterprise
- ❖ Philosophy from speculative, analytical and existential approach
- ❖ Philosophy from different fields

There are, among other parts and branches of philosophy, the following major branches of philosophy:

- Metaphysics=theory of reality(being)
 - Epistemology =study of knowledge
 - Axiology (value theory) =study of value in general
 - Logic =principle of right reasoning
 - Aesthetics=study of beauty and art
 - Ethics =study of human conduct
-
- ❖ *Ethics (moral philosophy)*: the science which investigates the general principles for determining the true worth of the ultimate ends of human conduct.
 - ❖ *Ethics*: the word comes from the Greek Ethos –meaning, norm or standard of conduct. Ethics is a branch of philosophy which deals with how human beings ought to lead their lives. It sets criteria or norms of the evaluation of what is good and bad, right and wrong of human actions/ conduct.
 - ❖ *Positive morality*: is the body of laws (ethical code) accepted by one age or community as correct principles for determining the true worth of actions and expressed in the form of judgments of approval and disapproval. It is partly based on unreflecting tradition, convention and customs.
 - ❖ *Ultimate ends*: end desired for its own sake. Ethics deals with the ultimate human conduct and this brings ethics closer to metaphysics.
 - ❖ An action is objectively right: under a given circumstance, is one that truly realizes the best end.

- ❖ Subjectively right action: one that the agent believes will realize the best end.

What is ethics? What is philosophical ethics? What is morality?

- ❖ Ethics comes from the Greek word 'ethos' = custom, convention etc. Ethics is the study of human conduct.
- ❖ It refers to what is customary and conventional in this case, living in accordance with values accepted by the society (majority) or conventional values or obey the conventional rule or done typically in that tradition or religion etc in this case ethics is similar with ethos.
- ❖ The foundation of ethics may be authority, obedience, religion etc.
- ❖ Socrates is the father of moral philosophy: he brought Phil from the sky to earth "we are dealing with no small thing, but with how we ought to live".
- ❖ Philosophical ethics: is against the above view (ethics) because it denies that conformity and obedience are the basic guides to how we should live. Conformity and obedience can't be the base for ethics.

So, philosophical ethics rejected authority as a base of ethics. For philosophical ethics, reason is the foundation of ethics, it seeks a reasoned defense of how we ought to live. It tells us that what ought to be valued rather than what is valued. But ethos focused on what is valued,

- ❖ Morals: the conduct or rule of conduct by which people live, whereas ethics refers to the study of moral conduct.
- ❖ Ethics is an academic discipline and theoretical subject that studies what is morally right, moral, good and etc.
- ❖ Ethics is a branch of philosophy that studies what constitutes good and bad of human conduct or it is the study of moral value.
- ❖ Value: the worth of something or significance of something. Moral value is value related to matter of right, wrong, good, bad.

Immoral = what deviates

A moral = neutral

Among other value can be;

- ❖ Intrinsic value: when a thing is valued for its own sake.
- ❖ Instrumental value: when a thing serves as a means to other values.

- Non anthropocentrism believe in intrinsic value of trees, even in the absence of humans have intrinsic value.
- Anthropocentrism focuses on instrumental value.
- ❖ Extrinsic value: a kind of memorial value (if your dead grand mother gave you broken watch, you have it).

Moral philosophers raise various issues but two most important;

- 1) The relationship between right action that is the pursuit of goodness and the quality of life. Right action promotes pleasure; but is not the criterion for right action of humans.
- 2) The social nature of morality: is morality social by nature? Philosophical ethics is a critical reflection on customs, conventions etc.

Ethics: normative study of principles underlying human conduct humans are social beings and our actions affect those around us and even can affect general quality life of the society.

Moral philosophers view moral conduct; civility and socially right action are inseparable.

Central questions of ethics are like;

- ❖ Is ethical knowledge possible?
- ❖ What are the sources of such knowledge?
- ❖ What are the theoretical strategies for resolving conflict among these sources?
- ❖ Which are the most important values and how are they related to each other?

How ought we to live? This can be answered in two ways.

- ❖ Individually: about my life (personal ethics)
- ❖ Socially: are large scale or collective issues in ethics it is about social policies, communities (society's) responsible in a collective manner.

CHAPTER ONE

ASPECTS OF ETHICS

Most ethical issues have both personal and social dimension.

Moral philosophers divide ethical theories into 3 general subject areas.

- 1) Normative ethics
- 2) Applied ethics
- 3) Meta ethics

1.1 Normative ethics

The word normative comes from the Greek word '*norma*' means standard, rule. It is the formulation of moral rules by which we evaluate our actions as good or bad, right or wrong etc. It is a search for an ideal litmus test of proper behavior. It depends on some norms. The key assumption of N.E is that there is only one ultimate criterion for morally right action, despite the presence of a set of principles. Here three strategies can be noted (3 theories of N.E).

1.1.1 Virtue theories: emphasize the importance of developing good character like benevolence etc. or it emphasizes character, rather than rules or consequences as the key elements of ethical thinking.

The word virtue comes from Latin word '*virtus*' = moral excellence of a person. A virtue is a trait valued as being good. Its opposite is vice, virtue signifies manliness or courage virtue refers to excellence.

As used by moral philosophers and theologians virtue is an operative habit essentially good, as opposed to vice, operative habit essentially evil.

The four cardinal virtues enumerated by Greek philosophers Plato are wisdom, temperance, courage and justice; other important virtues are like fortitude, generosity, self respect, good temper and sincerity.

A virtue is a habit or quality that allows the bearer to succeed at his or her purpose.

Example the virtue of knife is sharpness, of race horse is speed.

Criticisms: - Difficulty of establishing the nature of virtues.

- Not focus on actions to be good or bad, but qualities some one ought to have to become a good person.

1.1.2 Duty theories (deontological ethics): deontology comes from the Greek word deo= ‘to bind’ duty obligation commitment. The right and wrongness of actions has nothing to do with results. There are four central duty theories.

1st championed by 17th German Philosopher Samuel Pufendorf who classified dozens of duties under three headings.

- i) Duties to God: theoretically, to know the nature and existence of God; and a practical duty to both inwardly and outwardly worship God.
- ii) Duties towards one self: duties of the soul which involve developing one’s skills and talents and of the body, which involve not harming our bodies as we might through gluttony or drunkenness and not killing one self.
- iii) Duties towards others: absolute duties which involve avoiding wronging others treating people as equals and promote the good of others and conditional duties which involve various types of agreements the principal one of which is the duty to keep one’s promise.

2nd duty based approach to ethics is *rights theory*. Most generally, a ‘right’ is a justified claim against another person’s behavior such as your right not to be harmed by some body.

- ❖ Rights and duties are related in that rights of one person imply duties of another e.g. if I have a right to payment of 100birr from Abebe, then Abebe has duty to pay me 100 birr. This is called the correctively rights and duties.

3rd duty based theory is that by Immanuel Kant, which emphasizes a single principle duty. It is as single self evident principle of reason that he calls “categorical imperative”. Kant gives points of categorical imperative of these the direct one is treat people as an end and never as a means to other end.

The 4th and recent duty based theory is that by British philosopher W.D Ross which emphasizes *prima facie duties*. For Ross our duties are “part of the fundamental nature of the universe”. Ross’s list of duties is shorter, which he believes reflects our actual moral convictions.

- ❖ Fidelity: the duty of keeping promise
- ❖ Reparation: to compensate others when we harm them
- ❖ Gratitude: duty to thank those who help us
- ❖ Justice: duty to recognize merit
- ❖ Beneficence: duty to improve the condition of others
- ❖ Self improvement: duty to improve our virtue and intelligence
- ❖ Nonmaleficence: duty not to injure others

1.1.3 Consequentialist theories: consequences of actions matter most according to this theory. In a consequentialist normative theory, correct moral conduct is determined solely by a cost benefit analysis of an action's consequences. Sometimes, it is called teleological theory. It comes from Greek word telos =end, purpose, goal etc. if good consequences outweigh the total bad consequences, then the action is proper, and reverse is improper.

Types of consequentialist theories

There are three branches which focus on the consequences of actions for different groups of people.

- i) **Ethical egoism:** some ethicists believe that in deciding the morality of an action we should consider the consequence only for ourselves. It is an ethical theory which emphasizes in highest pleasure /happiness for the agent him/her self. I is the center of moral consideration.
- ii) **Ethical utilitarianism:** asserts that the promotion of every one's best interest is the standard of morality. An action is good if it produces maximum pleasure for maximum possible number of people or if the consequence of an action favorable for most than unfavorable.
- iii) **Ethical altruism:** the opposite of ethical egoism we should always act to produce the maximum possible happiness for others, but not to the agent of action. Simply, we sacrifice our happiness for others 'others' is the center of moral consideration.

1.2. Meta ethics (analytical ethics)

It is highly technical discipline that investigates the meaning and origin of ethical terms including a critical study of how ethical statements can be justified.

It investigates the meaning and origins of such ethical terms as good, bad, right, wrong, etc. It is also concerned with where our ethical principles come from and what do they mean? Are they social conventions?

Two components of meta ethics

1.2.1 Metaphysical issues: objectivism and relativism

Metaphysical components of Metaethics involve discovering specifically whether moral values are eternal truths that exist in a spirit like realm, or simply human inventions. There are two general directions for this;

- Other worldly and

- This worldly

Proponents of other worldly hold that moral values are objective in the sense that they exist in a spirit like realm beyond subjective human convention. Moral values are eternal, absolute, unchanging, universal in so far as they apply to all rational creatures around the world and throughout time. Of different other worldly views to metaphysical status of morality divine command theory is one from God's will and sometimes called voluntarism, this view was inspired by the notion of an all powerful God who controls everything. God wills things and they become reality. He wills physical things in to existence, human life, in to existence and similarly wills moral values in to exist.

The proponents of 'this worldly' approach to metaphysical status of morality follow the skeptical philosophical tradition and deny the objective status of moral values. Technically, skeptics didn't reject moral values themselves, but only denied that values exist as a spirit like objects or divine commands in the mind of God. Skeptics argued that moral values are strictly human inventions called moral relativism; cultural individuals.

Individual relativism: individual people create their own moral standards.

Cultural relativism: morality is grounded in the approval of one's society and not simply in the preference of individuals.

1.2.2 Psychological component of Meta ethics

It involves the psychological basis of our moral judgments and conduct, particularly what motivates us to be moral. We may explore this subject by asking why we need to be moral. Some answers are to avoid punishment, dignified, or to fit with the society.

- ❖ Psychological egoism: self oriented interests ultimately motivate all human actions. Hobbes said humans are inherently selfish.
- ❖ Closely related which psychological egoism is physiological hedonism, which in the view that pleasure is the specific deriving force behind all our actions we also have an inherent psychological capacity to show benevolence to others psychological altruism, at least some of our actions are motivated by instinctive benevolence.

1.3. Applied ethics:

To be considered as A.E, Something must be _a controversial issue

- must be moral issue

It is branch of ethics that perceives various conceptual or theoretical questions with the frame work of particular contemporary issues. It consists of analysis of specific, controversial moral issues such as abortion, animal right, euthanasia, infanticide, environmental concerns, homo sexuality, capital punishment, nuclear war etc. It attempts to apply theoretical ethics, such as utilitarianism, social contract theory, and deontology to real world dilemmas. Applied ethics include medical ethics, legal ethics, environmental ethics, computer ethics, corporate social responsibility, business ethics, development ethics and professional ethics etc.

CHAPTER TWO

CHALLENGES TO MORALITY

2.1) The challenge from logical positivism:

Regarded the language of morality as meaningless, moral claims can't be said as true or false and have no cognitive meaning. The claim can be cognitively meaningful only if it can be verified (justified) in sense experiment and as a result it is cognitively meaningless.

The famous view in logical positivism emotivism, holds that moral claims are simply emotional experience of one's own feelings and they don't have anything factual and objective rather they have to do with only the speaker's personal desires, inclinations, volitions, likes and dislikes, praise and blame etc. one of the most known figures of logical positivism A.J Ayer said, "ethical concepts are pseudo concepts". For him, for any claim to be cognitively meaningful, it has to be capable of being verified based on empirical evidence. For him, moral claims have nothing to do with empirical sense experience but rather are only expressions of an individual's attitude towards something not about reality.

2.2. The challenge from ethical relativism

This notion is associated with the person called Protagoras, who is known for his maxim "*a man is the measure of all things*". Unlike emotivism, ethical relativism states that moral propositions are cognitively meaningful or can be judged as true or false, and the standard for their truth and falsity is the individual's attitude, perception volition, thought, thought desire etc.

All forms of ethical relativism reject the existence of absolute moral values. A person, society community etc is the standard of judgment. For instance, cultural relativism holds that right and wrong, good and bad, moral and immorality of ethical claim depends on each culture. There is no trans-cultural moral claim. Example polygamy is allowed in Muslim culture while it is morally forbidden in Christian culture.

According to ethical relativists, even the individual's judgment of moral claims can be affected by circumstances like one's upbringing, race, color, height and even religious teaching etc.

Bernard Williams holds that there is no objectively valid ethical claim that can function for every one and every where. He also says that there are no universally accepted moral values and hence one individual, culture; societies etc must not interfere with the moral judgments of another.

2.3. The challenge from determinism

It is the view that holds that every thing is causally determined and hence can't be otherwise. If everything is causally determined, it is true also for our will and ability to choose. This means there is no free will and if this is so, as many said, there will be no morality.

Because morality presupposes the presence of free will and there by some one's action may be judged as morally wrong if he/she does that other wise, which in turn presupposes the presence of ability to choose and act freely.

But determinism can be viewed from two vantage points hard determinisms and soft determinism.

- ❖ Hard determinisms hold that every thing is determined absolutely by factors external to ourselves that we can't control them. If this is so, one is not responsible.
- ❖ Soft determinists like hard determinists, hold that our choices can't be other wise. But, unlike hard determinists, soft determinists state that the causal determining factors rest within the individual. Our actions and choices are conditioned by our personal volitions, teachings and characters etc. Therefore, it is possible to say that we are responsible for our actions and there by morality is possible.

2.4. The challenge from existentialism

Although existentialists have varied and have different positions, they have posed difficulty to traditional morality. For example the Danish philosopher Soren Kierkegaard argued for the teleological suspension of the ethical by which the individual is able to surpass traditional ethical values and get his/her commandments directly from God.

The German philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche, denied Christianity as consisting in a 'slave morality' and searched for a 'trans valuation of values' by which 'will to power' is affirmed as fundamental quantity life and leads to the coming of higher type of humanity (superman).

The French contemporary writer and philosopher Jean Paul Sartre is also the best existentialist is "existence precedes essence". This means, the existence of an individual comes first and then its essence is produced by what he/she does.

As an atheist existentialist, Sartre places everything within the individual and there is no way of contemplating for his/her essence or meaning. According to Sartre's claim that "*we are condemned to be free*" implies that there is no moral sanction that conditions us. Therefore, we have to shoulder every thing that comes from our freedom and by our choices. It is what we choose that we become or be coming is determined by our choices. Sartre said, we are alone, with neither excuses behind nor justifications before us.

Sartre's existentialism is humanistic because he replaces God the source of eternal values, with individuals. Humanism is the view that makes humanity as the source and standard of all values and meaning.

Soren Kierkegaard, as existentialist, shares points with Sartre like existence precedes essence and subjectivity taken as the starting point for any consideration. But the case of Nietzsche is different in that he would have rejected Sartre's understanding of subjectivity and argues that will to power is more fundamental. Will to power is something natural and manifests it self through individuals and that we affirm it. Nietzsche is not subjectivist in Sartre's sense, but rather he is perspectivist.

CHAPTER THREE

PERSPECTIVES OF MORALITY

Morality has to do with the distinction between good and bad, right and wrong moral and immoral of human conduct. But the right and wrong, good and badness etc of human action may be affected by different circumstances. For this, there are different perspectives regarding morality.

3.1) Teleological theory of morality *telos= end*

An action is judged as right or wrong, good or bad moral or immoral depending on what **comes as the consequence of it**. This is like the end justifies the means.

Two common teleological theories hedonism and utilitarianism;

a) Hedonism: *pleasure principle* Hedonism comes from the Greek word ***hedone***= **pleasure**. Thus hedonism is an ethical principle that sees **pleasure as the good, not a good**, or parts of the good. Pleasure is the standard by which we judge (distinguish) right acts from wrong ones. **An action is right if it produces pleasure**. Hedonism has two forms egoistic hedonism and social hedonism.

Egoism comes from the Greek word 'ego' =I; **I= ism**. For any form of egoism **the self is the central concern for all considerations**. Egoistic hedonism is thus the view that each individual should seek primary his/her own pleasure to maximize one's pleasure.

- ❖ **Psychological egoism** is the doctrine about human nature, claiming that every one by nature pursue primary his/her own interests.
- ❖ **Ethical egoism:** involves a value judgment, claiming that every one ought to pursue primarily his/her own interests.

Egoistic hedonism= egoism + hedonism= most widely practiced moral philosophy.

The two best examples in ancient Greek philosophy: **Cyrenaicism and Epicureanism**.

- ❖ Cyrenaicism= is so called because cyrene is where Aristippus came from and Aristippus was the founder of this school. **Aristippus was much influenced by sophist called Protogoras there is no fixed law to judge moral values**. He said why

we should act in one way or another should maximize our own pleasurable sensations. He was interested in satisfaction of **crude pleasure like bodily pleasures**. He said '*double your pleasure double your fun, eat, drink, and be merry for tomorrow we you may die*'. He focuses on **positive pleasures** gratification of bodily desires.

- ❖ **Epicureanism** = founded by Epicurus was **influenced by atomists and pre-Socratic** was **more philosophical than Aristippus**. He focuses on kind of pleasure. To evaluate moral content of action we have to use **peace of the mind and the health of the body or tranquility** and '**serenity**', not on gratification of desires. He focuses on '**negative pleasure**' absence of pain in our life.

Similarities

- ❖ Both are hedonistic, egoistic; believe in calculation of pleasures and pains.

Differences

- Epicurus focuses on duration of pleasure than intensity of pleasure but Aristippus holds the reverse.
- Epicurus focuses on **negative pleasure: mental pleasures** are superior than physical pleasure, but doesn't deny physical pleasure but physical pleasure must be taken carefully because it may lead to pain. Aristippus focuses on positive pleasures.
- Their conception of goal of life: Aristippus set goal of life as constant round of sensual pleasures (**immediate and crude**). (**Positive or active pleasure**).

Epicurus pleasure is important if it avoids pains not gratification of desires passive pleasures are more important than active pleasures because it is through them that positive pleasure is attained. The goal of human life is not constant sensual pleasure but serenity and tranquility or **pure pleasure free from troubling condition**. **Serenity= freedom of mental and physical pain, not satisfaction** e.g if we drink, first we may enjoy (gratify), but we may lose money and also we may face hang over. So, it is not pure pleasure, Epicurus's view is consequentialism as J.S Mill, J. Bentham.

b) Utilitarianism (social hedonism): the principle of utility is the basic concern of utilitarianism. The word utility literally means 'usefulness' but the utilitarian use it to

mean that which advocates greatest balance of good over evil. Thus Unitarianism is the view that.

1. We ought to act so as to promote the greatest balance of good over evil. But what is the nature of 'good' here.
2. We ought to act so as to promote the greatest balance of pleasure over pain. But whose pleasure is to be maximized. Thus, utilitarianism is the doctrine that.
3. We ought to act so as to promote the greatest happiness for the greatest number.

Hedonism + benevolence principle = social hedonism or utilitarianism. The English philosophers, Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill were the main figures or proponents of utilitarianism. The two thinkers, however, represent two different forms of utilitarianism, though the difference reduces more to a matter of emphasis:

- ❖ On quantity of happiness and in other
- ❖ On quality of happiness

Bentham's version: Quantity over quality

For Bentham, the founder of modern utilitarianism, the process of making moral decisions is really quite simple. What you do is first **consider various courses of action open to you, then taking in to account the persons affected, and counting your self as only one of them, calculate the pleasures and pains involved, then choose the course of action which will result in the greatest balance of pleasure over pain.**

Here pleasure is taken to be purely **quantitative one**. The greatest pleasure for the greatest number means for Bentham the **most pleasure**. How we determine the most pleasure? Bentham calls of **hedonic calculus**, takes the following seven ways, taking in to account its;

1. Intensity – how strong it is
2. Duration – how long it will last
3. Certainty – how likely it is to occur
4. Propinquity – how near at hand it is
5. Fecundity – its ability to produce still further pleasures
6. Purity – its freedom from ensuing pains
7. Extent – the number of people affected by it

Bentham is a **psychological egoist not ethical**. Bentham identified four **sanctions** or binding forces of threats or external ethical sanctions to act in accordance with to increase social utility or motivations for ethical behavior. These are;

1. Nature – order of nature and it is also law of present
2. Law – civil law
3. God
4. Opinion- norms

These are external factors to overcome our wrong inclinations and to increase social hedonism by acting in good manner. *He also labeled the four sanctions as the physical, the political, the moral and the religious.*

Utilitarianism **has not only moral but also legal and political significance** example, when law is judged (policy makers) it has to be noted that how many people it would satisfy.

Christian ethics focuses on rules on the bible as standard, but utilitarian focus on the result. **Bentham utility gives moral lives, not necessarily bible.** For him, why we do something, is because we are convinced that it may bring pleasure, and why we ought not to do something is that we are convinced that it may bring pain. He says, **pleasure and pain are standards of morality and are two sovereign masters that nature put on human beings.**

Utilitarian thinkers said, utilitarianism is simple, applicable, popular and natural because when ever we face moral dilemma, what we do is what I should do in particular situation to get pleasure something for greatest pleasure for greatest number of people.

Although Bentham is the father of modern Unitarianism, his student and successor, J.S Mill was most important because he made more philosophical advances on Bentham's thought.

J.S. Mill's version of quality over quantity

He gives clearer term for the principle of greatest happiness human actions are good, as far as they have tendency to increase pleasure in greatest number. Mill modified Bentham's utilitarianism and their difference is on the term 'greatest'.

Greatest = most (Bentham) quantity

Greatest = best (Mill) quality of pleasure

Mill doesn't deny the consideration of quantity in the calculation of happiness or pleasure, but says it is not as important as the consideration of quality.

❖ Higher pleasure (e.g. Mind)

❖ Lower pleasure (e.g. Body)

Higher pleasures= have intellectual aspect (e.g. We experience when we read fictions etc).

Lower pleasures= bodily pleasures (like we experience by drinking eating etc)

Bentham= If the game of push-pin furnish more pleasure it is more Valuable.

Mill= it is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied.

Mill acknowledged the four sanctions (moral sanctions), but the difference is that Bentham says these are external while for mill the most important is not external rather than internal factors that motivates us he calls conscience.

Act- utilitarianism and rule utilitarianism

Bentham discovered act-utilitarianism and Mill discovered rule utilitarianism.

Act= any particular action that are conducted in particular circumstances.

Rule= general action conducted in every situation (rules to be followed)

For AU the Q is what particular action should be done in this situation to bring about the greatest happiness for the greatest number? Situational ethics. For RU, the Q is what rule should be followed in this situation to bring about the greatest happiness for the greatest number? Examples;

Bentham (Act) telling truth is good in general, but not always because there are particular situations that lying is good (to the greatest people, when we have independent reason that lying is good.

Mill (rule) = what we have to appeal is not utility of action simply; rather if we act against the rule the action can't be good. RU emphasizes on centrality of rules in morality and insists that we are generally to do good and in particular situation by appealing to rule.

Traffic light (example)

- ❖ Bentham= it is good, but sometimes can be violated, if we have independent reason that we have maximizing pleasure e.g. when we hold patient.
- ❖ Mill = law (rule) by it self promote the over all pleasure.

Critical examination on utilitarianism

- ❖ Utilitarianism is simple to apply what we need is to calculate good and bad, and if good>bad=right and if bad>good= wrong.
- ❖ Avoids the need to appeal to divine revelation even if we suspect them, there are ways we can be moral (we can live moral live apart from bible).
- ❖ Replaces faith with reason.

(Utilitarianism) it has number of problems

- ❖ Leads to idea that end justify the means mentality. If any worthwhile thing justifies the means, then the ground of ethics and morality is lost, by and don't always justify the means. But generally the means justifies it self. If end justifies the means, Hitler and Stalin etc may be good.
- ❖ It can't protect the right of minorities like democracy.

3.2. Deontological theory of morality

Is the doctrine that focuses on the performance of duty, not the consequences of any action as the standard of right or good action. Deontological comes from the Greek word **deo= 'to bind'**. The will is bound to duty.

The standard for an action to be right or wrong, good or bad is the **actor's conformity to his/her duty, whether the action is done out of duty or not.**

Deontological theory was developed by **Immanuel Kant**, who considered it as the only possible way to understand an authentic moral conduct. **For him, morality is a matter of ought or obligation.** He **made a distinction between a conditional ought and an unconditional ought.** A conditional ought can be *affected by circumstances*, but an unconditional ought *can't be conditioned by circumstances* and Kant said this is a moral ought because morality should be **universal, unconditional and necessary.** For any action

to be morally right it must be performed out of duty, not by expecting some useful results.

Kant expresses the idea of duty as “duty is the necessity of acting from respect for the law”. Here, Kant is talking about moral law, not legal law; an action may have inner moral worth if and only if it is performed only from respect for the moral law.

Kant identifies the connection between a good will and duty. “A good will is one that acts for the sake of duty”. The goodness of the will has nothing to do with the consequences and it is good in and of itself even when it fails to get what it aims to get.

Good will is the very thing that other things depend on for their goodness, and without which they would become corrupted and turned in to evil. It is absolute good, the necessary and sufficient condition for all right action, the foundation of rational morality.

Kant says “Nothing in the world, indeed nothing beyond the world can possibly be conceived which could be called good without qualification except a good will.”

According to Kant, the highest doctrine or moral rule that the good (rational) person should follow is the **categorical imperative**. Kant differentiates between **categorical imperative** and **hypothetical imperative**. C.I is unconditional, functions without exceptions, necessary, and universal; whereas hypothetical imperatives are conditional, not necessary, not absolute, may be affected by the consequences of actions may have exceptions. According to Kant, the moral rightness of an action is judged only by its conformity to C.I not by personal desires or consequences.

Morality Kant argues “entails rational beings acting in accordance with the **categorical imperative**.” Rational being for him is the necessary condition of a being thinking and assumes itself as free. For Kant, categorical = objective; imperative = a kind of command. Therefore, morality depends on objective command and has no any relation with something conditional and thus morality can be applied only to rational beings that can control their inclination and choose to follow the law of freedom.

The general applicable laws can be derived only from a purely *apriori* study and not from experience or any contingent and empirical study. Categorical imperative, the foundation of rational morality, is not concerned with the matter but the form of morality. It can be said in several ways. The C.I

- ❖ Isn't concerned with what you do but how you do it
- ❖ Doesn't address specific moral issues but the nature of morality itself
- ❖ Doesn't prescribe the rightness or wrongness of particular actions but what makes any action right or wrong.

There are different versions of categorical imperative

- 1) Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law.
 - ❖ Action is right if it passes the test universalization.
- 2) Act only so that the will through its maxims could regard itself at the same time as making universal laws, principles of autonomy or formula of freedom.
 - ❖ Every rational will must consider itself as legislating laws that are will of universal law.
- 3) Act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only. (Humanity principle) do to others as you would have others do unto you, golden rule.

Few common criticisms of Kant's ethics which are based on patent but widespread misinterpretation of his theory.

- 1) Kant's ethics is 'empty' because the categorical imperative doesn't have any definite implication for actions.
- 2) Kant's ethics is trivial, and doesn't discriminate between moral and merely permissible actions.
- 3) Kant minimizes the role of practical intelligence in life and instead of calling for more facts and acknowledging the problematic and tentative character of most of our difficult decisions, he requires us only to apply mechanistically a single logical rule.
- 4) Kant's theory is not 'true to human nature' Kant requires man to be more rational than he can be.
- 5) Kant's ethics is one sided because he despised the emotions.
- 6) Kant is too rigorist every law has exceptions but not C.I.
- 7) Kant takes a 'provincial moral code' and absolutizes it;

- ❖ Is there moral law?
- ❖ Consequence are ignored
- ❖ Down play the values of nature
- ❖ Made faculty of psychology subservient to reason

3.3. Divine command theory of morality

This theory was formulated by Philip L. Quinn and states that morally right and wrongness of any action depends on the will of God. God's command is the central and determining factor or standard of morality. An action is morally right only if God commands it to be done, and wrong if God commands it not to be done. God can decide every thing right, wrong, good, bad, moral, immoral, or compulsory simply by willing it to be so.

With in divine command theory, morality functions with three major concepts; they are rightness, wrongness, and obligation, morally right action are actions that are morally permissible. Actions are morally wrong if and only if they aren't morally right, actions that morality forbids or prohibits.

Actions are morally obligatory if and only if not performing them is morally wrong= not performing them is not morally right. Therefore, morality is a system of requirements, permissions, and prohibitions governing actions.

The principles of a divine command theory of morality can be formulated in the following way.

- 1) An action is morally right if and only if (a) God doesn't command that it not be performed, and (b) if it is morally right, what makes it morally right is its not being the case that God commands that it not be performed.
- 2) An action is morally wrong if and only if (a) God commands that it not be performed and (b) if it is morally wrong, what makes it morally wrong is God's commanding that it not be performed and
- 3) An action is morally obligatory if and only if (a) God commands that it be performed and (b) if it is morally obligatory, what makes it morally obligatory is God's commanding that it be performed.

CHAPTER FOUR

SOME IMPORTANT FIGURES IN MORAL PHILOSOPHY

4.1 The moral philosophy of St. Augustine

St. Augustine was a medieval philosopher even the founder. Medieval philosophy is the mixture of classical and early Christian thought.

- ❖ Augustinian family: reason and faith can be reconciled.
- ❖ Tertullian family: reason and faith can't be reconciled.
- ❖ Platonism: an intellectual preparation for Christianity. Augustine, the founder of medieval philosophy says "I believe in order to understand".

Medieval philosophy has two things;

- 1) Believe in order to understand
- 2) Divine revelation

Revelation: God's movement towards man or God revealed him self to human. Knowledge and wisdom are derivation of divine revelation.

Augustine was a pagan thinker but converted to Christianity in his 30 years old. He was also Neo-Platonist which made him to be converted. His intellectual and moral development was up and down.

Even if he remained Platonist, he made critical examination against Platonism (thoughts and teachings of Plato). In medieval period there was conversion of philosophical endeavor to Christianity.

Augustine was the first to undertake Plato's teaching as a rational justification for Christianity (faith and reason are complement). But many theologians say faith and reason are in consistent.

The central point of Plato is the notion of participation of the soul in the supernatural world (the form of the good) that acquires knowledge (wisdom), which our soul will be enlightened.

Augustine also accepts the notion of participation. But Plato's Good is equated with Augustine's God. Augustine believes in divine revelation, while Plato speculation. *Status they attach to philosophy*: Augustine to find out solutions for practical human problems, while Plato pure speculation.

Epistemologically; Plato rationalist (sense experience doesn't have role to knowledge but for doxa or reason is the source of knowledge).

Metaphysically: Plato = idealist

Aristotle = materialist

Augustine also undermined sensitive cognition and can't be the foundation of knowledge.

To get knowledge Plato = the participation of the soul

Augustine = it is from illumination knowledge is gained

Augustine accepts the role of intellect but he said our natural intellect is not enough. This affirms that humility and prayer are greater than intellect, but intellect has role. For Plato knowledge is gained through active philosophical discussion. Augustine human beings are rational and are conscious of our selves.

The presence of justice, equality etc that we understand these notions presupposes the existence of God, which is ontological argument or there is the notion of equality, justice, etc in our selves.

Sense experience is important at least in facilitating the acquisition of knowledge. Knowledge is apriori but we need experience to recollect. God is absolutely devoid of potentiality; God is perfect, pure, and eternal and has the same attribute to Plato's notion of God.

The theory of divine illumination emphasized God's activity within the soul and the dependence of the human mind on God.

4.1.1 Augustine on evil and human freedom

Augustine identified three kinds of evil that leads us to deficiencies to a descent from BEING.

- 1) *Metaphysical evil*: lack of perfection. It is not actual evil that set us a part from God. We are less of a BEING the only perfect is God.
- 2) *Physical evil (natural evil)*: evil that results from natural causes. It can be called evil of suffering. Starvation, physical deformity, disease such as blindness. Like metaphysical evil it is not actual evil that set us a part from God.
- 3) *Moral evil*: evil results from personal depravity. Sin or deviation from the will of God. Example, torture, murder, cheating, exploitation etc.

It is evil that springs from the human will. Freewill is given to us from God but we act against that freewill (God) is because of evil.

But the problem is how to reconcile the evil in the world with a God who is at once omnipotent (all-powerful) and omni benevolent (all-loving). The problem is also called theodicy, which means literally “the justification of God”.

The simplest statement of the problem of evil

“Is he willing to prevent evil, but not able; then is he impotent? Is he able, but not willing; then is he malevolent? Is he both willing and able; then whence then is evil?” By **Hume**.

If God is not the source of evil and if evil doesn’t have metaphysical entity why do evil acts prevail in the world? They (evil acts) occur simply we deviate from the will of God. Augustine’s doctrine of the primary of the will over intellect; the will is love and it is necessary to love in order to know. He says love leads to knowledge. But Plato, intellect leads to knowledge or knowledge leads to love or to be virtuous person knowledge is needed.

4.1.2 Augustine’s position in “on the free choice of the will”

What is the relationship between God on one hand and man’s freedom and experience of evil on the other hand? The dialogue is between Augustine and Evodius. Evodius asked Augustine whether God is not the cause of evil. Augustine wants to deny that God is the

cause of evil, and said man's experience of moral evil doesn't compromise the absolute goodness and omnipotence of God. In seeking and showing the intelligibility of Christian teachings, Augustine finds that human reason stands in a complex relation to faith.

- ❖ First, reason can help to prepare a man for faith, which always involves a conversion of the will as well as intellectual assent.
- ❖ Second, reason can also help to clarify and draw out the significance of what one has appropriated in faith.
- ❖ Finally, the relation of God and men to which faith points is regarded by Augustine as proper resting point for reason.
- ❖ The content of faith provides the ultimate satisfaction for man as a rational being. The wholeness of life depends on the harmonious interaction between faith and reason.
- ❖ The relationship between philosophy and theology is that. Theological claims find clarifying support in philosophical analysis and the natural culmination of sound philosophical thought is found in Christian teaching.

Augustine shifts the original question of Evodius that the possibility of God to be the cause of evil to two closely related issues.

1) *What is involved in doing evil? And*

2) *Why do we do evil?*

Augustine said attention should be given to the nature of evil and its relation to human activity.

Augustine's approach to the first issue reveals the influence of Neo-Platonism. Man exists in the middle range of a spectrum of being at the top of which is God and at the bottom of which is nonbeing. Not only is man dependent on God for his existence but also man's nature is such that his well being and fulfillment depend on a positive orientation toward God, an orientation in which one responds to God's will in obedience, love and service to others.

Augustine contrasts two styles of life in terms of one's concern and love for what is *eternal* as opposed to what is *temporal*. Augustine says that what is eternal is also the

most real and of the greatest perfection. Proper balance requires that priorities be given to one's relationship to God.

Temporal concerns will find their rightful place if this ordering is followed. An orientation that gives primary to temporal concerns will bring out the qualities of lack and deficiency that are qualities of evil. To do evil is to create a lack or a deficiency in one self or in others.

Augustine's approach to second (why do we do evil); sees in terms of man's will. Men are not creatures who are exhaustively controlled by factors external to themselves. We have freedom, autonomy, and power that help to determine how our attention will be fixed and how our capacities for thought and action will be used.

For him, we do evil because we freely choose to do it.

Two implications for this response;

First, there is nothing necessary about man's doing of evil. Men do evil, but it results from free choices.

Second, emphasizes on relationship between human freedom and evil. God doesn't cause evil and the cause is to be found in the human will rather than in God.

Why do we choose to do that which is evil?

Factors are complex, Augustine consider the following.

First, one's training and up bringing might have an effect of leading one to attend primarily to temporal concerns and things.

Second, because of physical and sensory structure of our existence which necessarily involves us to some degree in natural world, our choices, while free, may tend increasingly toward concerns involving our relation to that temporal and changing world, rather than toward that less immediate, but eternal, immutable ,and perfect.

Third, the prospects of social prestige and political power may attract our attention and lead us to choose in their favor in a way that excludes priority for our relationship to God. Freedom of choice remains as an essential component in man's doing of evil.

For him it will be difficult to avoid doing evil if they lack a proper relationship between understanding or reason on one hand and will on the other hand.

Augustine's chief argument for the existence of God, which is based on man's awareness of his rational capacity and its power to apprehend truths that are eternal. Evodius acknowledges human reason to be our highest capacity.

Evodius was willing to consent to the following idea. If it can be shown that a reality higher than our reason exists that is an existent;

- 1) That lacks the defects of human reason and hence possesses quality of eternality and immutability and;**
- 2) To which nothing could reasonably be granted to be superior- then this would be God and his existence would be demonstrated.**

For Augustine finding the existence of something that is immutable and eternal will be sufficient to constitute a demonstration of God's existence, his argument implies that eternal and immutable truth is God. Immutability and eternality are identifying marks of God. He said all good things come from God. To exist and to be good imply the presence of God, but except in God, form is never totally self generating.

Augustine said, God exists and all good things come from God, the pressing question is: *Is freedom a good, and if so, how?* He said that freedom of the will is an intermediate good. Evil enters because of the misuse of man's freedom.

Augustine regards God as perfection itself. Implies that God is characterized by completeness, self-sufficient, absoluteness of power, knowledge, goodness and eternality and immutability.

God's knowledge is complete. God sees everything including time itself from a perspective of eternity that encompasses all being.

Evodius 'how can it be that God has foreknowledge of all future events, and yet that we don't sin by necessity?

Augustine position is this: God knows that I will choose to do in the future, whether my action be good or evil, but his knowledge neither produces the action nor binds me in necessity; so that I'm forced to do some particular thing. Rather God knows my will as free. He knows what I choose. God is not the cause of all that He fore knows and he doesn't do all of the things that he knows will occur.

Salient features of Augustine position.

1-Certainly God exists. There is harmonious relationship between faith and reason.

2-Man exists in the middle ground.

3-Man's possession of freedom makes him, and not God, responsible for the evil that men do.

4.1.3 Augustine on good and evil

For him, it is not the case that the less good something is the more evil it is. Good and evil aren't related as positive and negative, so that a certain degree of evil may be defined as simply the absence of a certain degree of goodness. Something with only a low degree of goodness is not there by automatically evil. It is evil only if it ought to have a higher degree of goodness and doesn't. Therefore, evil is not simply an absence of good, it is the privation of the good. It is the absence of the good that ought to be present.

In his hierarchy of things: higher things ought to rule and govern (have power over) lower ones never the other way round. Augustine also regards evil as injustice or disorder, when lower things have power over the higher, reversing the proper order.

Augustine's hierarchical world

- ❖ God → human soul → physical objects or
- ❖ God → good angels → soul of good humans → soul of wicked humans → fallen angels → material objects → nothing.

4.2 The moral philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas

Aquinas has a well deserved (known) reputation for making Aristotle acceptable to Christian thinkers. He said, Christianity can be philosophically justified (they are complementary) similarity between *Aquinas and Aristotle*.

They had teleological understanding (concept) of the universe believing in universe is done for end or purpose.

Difference: Aristotle humans are rational and said we "achieve by rational exercise of our highest rational faculty (moral excellence, happiness etc), not given to us.

Aquinas: we as humans possess more than we exercise or supernatural source (eternal after life). For him, God can give us happiness.

Aristotle, pagan thinker, didn't give concern for after life. Aquinas made a distinction between happiness and the exercise of rational faculty, and for him, happiness can't be attained by intellectual understanding rather we get happiness by God. Aquinas, like Aristotle, says our reason plays a role to attain happiness but not enough. Aquinas goes beyond Aristotle and believes in revelation. For Aquinas, philosophy is a hand maiden to theology.

Aquinas gave a clear statement about the difference between philosophy and theology is only in *method*. That is philosophy begins and ends with reason. For philosophy the existence of God is the conclusion. Theology starts and ends in faith (revelation) the existence of God is taken as a premise.

For Aquinas, there are truths that we can get by exercises of our rational faculty, but there are truths that go beyond our faculty and can be attained only by revelation. Therefore, there are three types of truths.

- ❖ Revealed truths= only by faith e.g. the problem of trinity
- ❖ By reason = only philosophical
- ❖ For both = e.g. The existence of God

Aquinas, like Aristotle, an action is good or bad with respect to whether it contribute to final good (end).

Both focus on perfection (completion) of our purposes for Aristotle happiness is understood as perfection and considered it as final goal. For Aristotle final goal must be;

- Desirable for its own sake
- Self sufficient
- attainable by man

Aquinas as theologian goes beyond Aristotle and believes that mundane happiness can't be true happiness while we are in this world. So, final happiness consists of beatitude (absolute blessedness of soul)= perfection. **Beatitude**, perfection etc are beyond our rational faculty, **example salvation**; and we need the help of God. The reason why it is impossible to get final happiness by our rational faculty (reason) is because *we aren't pure* or we have the scar of original sin (tendency to sin) inherited from Adam and Eve. For Aquinas the happiness that we get in this world is qualifiable.

The metaphysics of Aquinas is influenced by Augustine, Anselm, and Boethius. Augustine: evil things haven't metaphysical existence. If something exists then it must have some degree of goodness = existence presupposes goodness.

Aquinas – Goodness and being are really the same. Being refers to what is actual. Something is good in so far as it exists. Evil has no actuality.

4.2.1 The existence and nature of God

Thomas Aquinas holds that when we deal with material things we are involved with a composite of form and matter. Ultimately the form of a thing is the structuring principle that makes the thing what it is. Matter on the other hand is an underlying element of potentiality that is capable of receiving a plurality of forms.

Thomas Aquinas account of distinction between body and soul in human existence reflects the form matter relationship. The soul is the principle of vital functions sensations and intellectual operations. In combination with the matter that it informs the human organism is produced.

The human being that inhabits the natural world is neither form alone, nor matter alone; and thus it is neither body alone nor soul alone. Thomas thinks that God's existence can be demonstrated *by reasoning from empirical data*. We may not apprehend immediately, but a rational analysis of phenomena in the natural order pushes us to an affirmation of God's reality. In the *summa theologica*, Thomas states that God's existence can be demonstrated in five ways.

The first argument starts with **our experiences of motion or change**. Following Aristotle, Thomas interprets motion or change in terms of the *transformation of potentiality in to actuality*. A thing can't be moved unless it has a potential for movement, for this potential be actualized, something actual must set the thing in motion. It is impossible that the same thing can be simultaneously actual and potential in the same respect (for instance, something can't be actually hot and potentially hot in the same respect at the same time, or I can't be actually sitting and potentially sitting in the same respect simultaneously) it is apparent that "what ever is moved must be moved by another". Moreover, if that by which some thing is moved is itself moved, as is the case in our experience, then a third mover must be posited.

An infinite regress of these moved movers, however, is unintelligible and hence is to be rejected as an adequate explanation of movement. Thus, our experience pushes us to assert that there must be a first unmoved mover, which humans recognize as God. The unmoved mover, is dependent on nothing but everything is dependent on it, creator, ultimate, independent, whose existence is necessary, not contingent is required= God.

The second argument concentrates **on cause and effect relationships in general**. The natural world functions in terms of efficient causality. That is everything that we directly encounter in the natural order is an effect of a cause that has produced it. This means that strictly speaking, nothing in the natural order can be the cause of itself.

To meet the conditions necessary for causing itself, the thing would have to exist prior to it self, which is an absurdity. On the other hand, it is not intelligible to rest with an infinite series of efficient causes in the natural order. An ultimate grounding is required, and therefore there must be first efficient cause which again humans recognize to be God. God stands as the ultimate and necessary source of all the cause and effect relationships we know.

The third argument focuses on the nature of existence it self and utilizes a **distinction between necessary and contingent existence**. In the natural order we see that things come in to existence and perish. Such beings are contingent. If we should assert, however that contingent existence is the only kind of existence, we find ourselves in trouble. Any existent which is contingent and therefore capable of non existence has also come in to being and hence at some juncture did not exist. Moreover, Thomas asserts that if it is possible for every thing not to exist, then at sometime there was nothing in existence. If this were true, however, there would be nothing in existence now, because contingent beings can't generate their own existence.

But clearly things do exists now, and this means that there must be something that exists necessarily. Furthermore, there must be one ultimate, necessary being. This conclusion is generated by the fact that any necessary being either has its necessity caused by another necessary being or it does not.

However, it is impossible that there can be an infinite regress of necessary beings, and therefore we are forced to acknowledge the existence of one ultimate, necessary being, which is God.

The fourth argument is inspired by Augustine, Anselm and Aristotle. It moves to God from **the degrees of truth, goodness**, and like properties in the things of natural order. When we judge things comparatively with respect to such positive characteristics, we do so in terms of something which is the maximum of the quality of perfection in question. Now, Thomas asserts that which is the maximum, of the quality we are noting must be the cause of the quality in all the things that possess it. Thomas argues that whatever is supreme in goodness or truth is also supreme in being, and whatever is supreme in being is the cause of being in all things that exist. If these things are not the case, then the conditions that are required to make basic comparative judgments intelligible are eliminated. But such judgments are intelligible. He said we are pushed to acknowledge one ultimate cause of goodness, truth, and being and this is God.

The fifth (last) major argument is called **teleological argument or the argument from design**. We live in a world in which things that lack knowledge (for example, natural bodies) still function in patterned and ordered ways. As he puts it, they “act for an end”. Moreover this order occurs with such regularity that it is unthinkable that it is due to chance. The presence of pattern or design in that which lacks knowledge points to the reality of a transcendent directing intelligence. That which lacks knowledge can’t be said to move it self toward an end or toward the fulfillment of a purpose, but some intelligent being must exist through whom “all natural things are directed to their end and this being we call God”. “*We know of God that he is rather than what he is*”

4.2.2 The four cardinal virtues of Aquinas

His grand master piece that he used to compromise Aristotelian philosophy and theology is *summa theological*. With the nation of happiness;

Aristotle = earthly happiness

Aquinas = after life

Aquinas acknowledged the following four virtues to achieve human goodness (happiness as under stood by Aristotle’s).

- ❖ Prudence: has to do with virtue about good judgment about how we should act or behave. So, our action has to be justifiable= we have to have right reason with respect

to action. It is intellectual attitude to morally good things. It is not an end in itself but means to facilitate the end.

- ❖ Temperance (moderation): concerns with moderation of our physical desires. We humans sacrifice for physical desires but qualifiable. We should restrain our physical desires
- ❖ Courage has to do with restrain our excess fears and rashness (un reasonable dareness and high fear. we have to curve excessive fear and unreasonable dareness.
- ❖ Justice: derived from above three. It has to do with what kind of relationship we should have to others. Although Aquinas acknowledge the above four virtues, he said they are short and there are other theological virtues like beatitude, charity, faith.
Aristotle: final happiness understood in terms of us in achieving our own potential.
Aquinas: supernatural union of our soul with God. For Aquinas two types of happiness.

1) Happiness attained by our natural capacity (by above 4 virtue *natural*)

2) Complete happiness, beyond our natural faculties (*supernatural*).

And to achieve this final and complete happiness, theological virtues (beatitude, faith, charity, hope etc) are important.

Faith: a virtue where we assent to truth. Faith asks our galabrity (light hearted and cheerful mood or behavior).

Hope: a Virtue we trust God so as to get final life, salvation.

Charity (love): a virtue of love of God for his own sake.

From eternity God had in his mind, to speak anthropomorphically, an idea of human nature. He saw the acts required for the attainment of the end of that nature, which is for full development of its potentialities. This plan for man is the eternal law, but it doesn't depend on divine caprice. Human nature is one way in which the divine essence can be externally reflected, and given human nature, there are certain acts which are required for the development of its potentialities and certain acts which are incompatible with that development.

The moral law is thus ultimately based on the necessary and changeless divine essence itself. This eternal law of God is reflected in the natural law, which is the totality of the

dictates of man's practical reason concerning the good which is to be sought and the evil which is to be avoided.

The moral law is not purely formal, but possesses a necessary content, determined by human nature. But this positive law of human being must be compatible with natural law; if not, it will be a perversion of law, not true law. It will be an unjust law, and it will not bind in conscience. For him the law of the state is simply one kind of law. Ultimately all derives its authority from God and thus possess a transcendent foundation.

4.3The moral philosophy of Thomas Hobbes

Two nations of morality;

- ❖ Morality as a dictate of nature (law)
- ❖ Morality as a dictate of reason

Metaphysically he was influenced by Galileo, Copernicus, Newton, 17th scientists and was absolute materialist. He believed that if philosophy to be systematic, it has to be supported by science. This is mechanistic materialism, every thing can be explained in material nature, and also says spirit and human thought are reflections of material nature. Being an absolute materialist, he believed that human behavior and thoughts have materialistic or physiological motivation. Naturally humans have no idea of cooperation, very complicated to physical entities. Human nature is complicated because it consists of passions which are fear, hope; indignation, ambition etc are natural to humans.

He divides human passion in to two;

- 1) Object of appetite (desire)
- 2) Object of aversion

1) He viewed appetite (desire) from four angles;

- ❖ Some human desires are innate (e.g. appetite for food).
- ❖ Some human desires change continually (not static). More over different from each other.
- ❖ Human appetites are insistent (non stop) no end of human desire, live as we live.

❖ Human desires differ in strength from one to another.

Generally, desires are what move us towards an object.

2) Aversion= force that moves away from an object or what repels us from something.

Fear: recognition that some apparent good may not be attained or some object of appetite may not be attained.

Hope: recognition that some apparent good (object of desire) is attainable.

Hobbes says both (desire and a version) are important to determine our behavior and are standards of morality. If an object we pursue is an object of desire, then it is moral, and if it is an object of aversion, then it is bad. There is no other distinction between morally good and bad except there two.

He was also absolute relativist in terms of his account of morally good and bad. He said there is no human action that is intrinsically good or bad. He said people called good those objects that are their desire and bad if there is aversion.

He believes that value of same object is transient according to time, place, individual etc. Therefore, the same thing can be good, bad, and indifferent across time, individual etc.

Hobbes definition of human nature

Humans are absolutely, selfish, solitary, no sympathetic feeling, no sense of brotherhood, no benevolence, egoistic, no sociability; sociability is the behavior we get after the contract. We act for ourselves or happiness is gratification of continuous personal desires. He identified *power* as a means to attain happiness. For Hobbes, physical power, while for Aristotle's Plato Augustine, Aquinas etc knowledge, virtue, love etc.

Psychology is (as for Hume) important as law for human morality. His master piece "*Leviathan*" a thought experiment to test his theory of human psychology, what is the end that human aim, what motivates for end, theory of morality.

The world before leviathan is world with no morality, justice etc (human action can be judged only when there is law). The world before levitation (state of natures) is war of all against all. Everything was judged according to leviathan. In the state of nature there is

no distinction between mine and yours. All is for all or humans are absolutely free to do every thing as long as they have power.

In leviathan he identified 3 types of equality among and between persons.

- 1) Equality of ability (prudence)
 - 2) Equality of hope
 - 3) Equality of strength (rough equality)
- ❖ In equality of strength: he is not talking about amount of physical strength rather every one has potential physical strength to threat other, even the weakest person may threat the strongest every one is vulnerable.
 - ❖ Equality of prudence: every one is able and free to pursue his/her object of desires.
 - ❖ Equity of hope: in the state of nature, when there is the same object which the object of desire for both two people at the same time and each sees himself equal with other(knows physically equal) and ultimately collide. But there is weak and strong, the weak knows that he doesn't have equal hope of prevailing in conflict and so he limits his desire. All of these natural conditions transform to state of fear, which leads to state of nature. The ultimate end for Hobbes is continual success in self preservation in state of nature. Hobbes identified fraud and force as cardinal virtues to get success in state of nature, since there is no mine, yours; property, everything is for everyone, but it is so as long as you keep it. There fore morality is possible after contact (leviathan).