We're going to have 2 sessions that are dealing with ethics and professionalism moral reasoning and it's pretty well divides between these 2 theoretical underpinnings of ethics and then more reasoning and professional ethics and we're going to deal with these things pretty much in that order up. Let me. We don't. First I want to do a bit of ground work. And this is it. This is a hypothetical late last night when you were. Locking your car you happen to bump into a car in front of you you notice that you dented the bumper on that car. When this happened what thoughts went through your mind. Now there is an ethical dimension to your thought process here and that's really what this is about so just imagine you were doing that you ran your car into another car and you dented the bumper. This is a question not about what you imagine that you did you know how what you ultimately did after having dented that car but what fox went through your mind when you did. And in this respect is conceivable in perfectly consistent with this experiment that you thought you should put a note on the windscreen but you didn't do that you walk away that's okay this is only a question about what you thought and this is my point is you would have thought of writing things for instance like man did I do that then I do it again was anybody watching me you think all those kinds of things probably what's my insurance like. But somewhere in there in that sinking would be something like you know what about what if she was on the other foot what do you suppose would be the right thing to do it was I called the damage should not do something. Somewhere in your thinking I'll bet you there was an ethical thought whether you act on it or not is irrelevant for this particular example and this is really important because that there was this ethical thought is this some people have thought. That. This might be all there is to ethics. Is recognizing that there are appropriate interests other than your own. That should act as constraints on basically doing whatever you want. Pursuing your own interests. Now almost everybody who's thought about ethics has considered this to be an element. Some people and I think actually quite a few have thought really this is all there is to it 6. Is that recognition that their interest other than your own that you should take into account. What this means it doesn't mean that you have to always act on those it certainly doesn't mean that you must be an altruist and sacrifice yourself but what it does mean is that there are these other interests and in taking them into account if you act on them it's going to cost you something and this is a really important element genetics that follows from this one and that is that by and large Essex costs is giving up something. Probably that would benefit you for the sake of something or more likely somebody else. In thinking about this kind of case. Bumping your car to somebody else's the thinking is focused on. What should I do. The central question in ethics what should I do. We're going to be talking a lot about that question and what it means and what the approaches are for dealing with that question what should I do. I believe this. 6 calls I said and so with ethics in making an ethical decision or solving an ethical problem. There's gonna be a winner and a loser. Almost every time. Seoul I believe when it comes to matter of ethics probably the most important practical problem is how could you turn this thing that seems to be an ethical problem into one on ethical one. If it's an ethical problem is going to be a winner and a loser. If you can turn it into something that's not ethical at least there's the possibility it doesn't mean unethical you turn into something that has nothing to do with ethics. Then maybe it can be win win. Well let me give you a simple example very very simple and keep in mind I'm going to tell the story in the way that actually favors what I'm trying to talk about. Let's just imagine. That Sam told you something in secret you said look I want to tell you something but can you can you keep it a secret. And you say yes okay fine unburden yourself Sam tell me. And so Sam tells you this stuff. And you realize after he's told you that look everybody would be better off if you actually call Janet this kind of thing. Because then everybody would know this is really something she should know also. But you realize you just promised not to tell anybody and if you tell or you'll be breaking your word so forth and so on and that isn't good. If you don't teller the whole world is going to be worse off than it would otherwise have to be. Now the way I'm telling the story it is I go to Sam and say look Sam this is how things are it would be great if Janet knew this too is that okay with you if I tell her again I'm telling the story most simple way and Sam says yeah okay teller. All right so now you can tailor and what was this ethical problem. Do I keep my promise and have bad consequences or do I do what I think will produce the most results the best result of the break my promise and Sam will get really angry at me. This problem just evaporated. And evaporated because what had been at least look to be an ethical problem we turned into a non ethical one okay I realize what I'm given is the most simple and I've given as I mentioned I've told the story the way I wanted it to turn out just to make this point. All right let's consider this. Think about what are the most important few for 5 important ethical characteristics that somebody possesses somebody that you admire you know what ethical exemplar. Possesses. Now you might want to think about this in the abstract you know what are the ethical virtues what do you think of the things people should have you might think of somebody who you think is a terrific ethical human being and what are the characteristics that they've got that you think makes them such a great human being either way and if we if this were a different environment and we have more time we would actually do this and you would say things I would write them down we look at the list but I'm just not going to pretend that you've done all that and what you came up with was this. So after we put everything on the on the white board. What people had to say about the virtues then I would really impress you by saying well I knew this is basically what you're going to say up honesty integrity fairness compassion or caring and openness there might have been some different ones or some some variations but this is the kind of thing that would have been there. And the reason I know this and the reason I was so confident about this this is what everybody says. I'm not just everybody in Australia and not just everybody in the western world I've done this experiment myself in China and in Tonga other people have done it in other parts of the world and it always comes back about the same. That's really important that there are these values. I want to use this as an example not merely to show that while these are important virtues that we are pretty well agreed are the virtues but also to dispel the significance of ethical relativism. Ethical relativism is a view according to which values are different from time to time from place to place from Europe to Europe and maybe even from person to person certainly from culture to culture. Well what I think this kind of experiment shows is that that's simply not true. That is values are the same where ever we wherever we ask this question. There might be some. Debate about what to do when these values come into conflict with each other. And there might be some debate and disagreement about what each of these amounts to on the ground what is well what would be the fair distribution here anyway but the fact is there's not disagreement about fairness being a virtue. Okay now what Mike common. Comment I've made this comment a number of times is. If you make an academic really angry. You make me really angry all right an essay that's what I do when I get angry. In having arguments about this with an anthropologist who was I say with all due respect just wrong. This was so upsetting that I wrote a chapter in a book that is the person was claiming that because people act different ways in different places well values are different and we need to respect those different values. My point my first point is well the values are different but even if they work different which they're not. All you've done is indicate that. As a matter of fact this is what goes on in different places. You haven't indicated anything about whether that's okay it goes on like that that is you've you've talked about what I would call descriptive relativism and I'm going to say a bit more about descriptions and prescriptions very shortly. But even if you could show which I don't think you can. That values are different from time to time replace the place your tear up even if that were correct it wouldn't establish that therefore it was okay that is that the values were equally correct or that we all need to interfere or judge other cultures values. If it's true and it's not I don't believe that different values are equally correct you don't establish it merely by establishing that there are different values. And similarly if it were correct which I don't believe it is that we all need to interfere or judge other cultures values you don't establish that by simply showing that they have different values okay I want to make one other point about this relativism business. When we say or some people the relativist will say things like that culture think such and such. Well that's that too is a dangerous kind of thing to say you might point out for instance that in. The nineteenth century America 18 century America they thought slavery was okay. And therefore on this view while slavery was okay for them. Well. Thank you the slaves didn't think it was okay. Maybe the people who own the slates did but the fact that they did doesn't make it okay and it doesn't make it the case that the slaves themselves would have thought it was okay something like you know well we realize that in this culture slavery is okay therefore it's okay even though I really don't like it very much I don't believe that would be the okay I've harped on this for another we're gonna move on. In looking at that first case of. You pump your car into another car. The emphasis was on what should I do. And we're talking about identifying these moral qualities these virtues the emphasis is on what kind of person should I be. Now I'm going to say if they're a bit more about those 2 things what should I do and what should I be as identifying the main thrusts in people's thinking about ethics these days between it ethics being prescriptions that you ought to do this this this this and this and that it's about virtues you ought to be this kind of person and this kind of person this is the way I think she is these days the thinking about ethics is these days. Now I begun to talk about this a few minutes ago. We could describe what it is get that goes on in a society. We could even describe what it is that somebody thinks is the right thing to do. That would be a description that would be as a matter of fact this is what they do think. For instance in in this society they think it's a sign of appropriate humility for men to have full facial hair and it's a sign of of brashness perfect for men to be clean shaven. That's what they think it's just a description of something that goes on it has nothing to do with it is that okay what do you think we should do and you might even say this although I don't like putting this example in as a matter of fact they think slavery is okay just as a description. Okay in talking about ethics moral and moral reasoning we're not concerned with descriptive ethics we're concerned with prescriptive ethics that is reaching a decision or view about what should be done. How people ought to behave. When I use the word prescription. I'm not talking necessarily about fine grained prescription as in a you should take your final exam using and a number to lead pencil with an eraser on the end sitting 2 seats away from anybody else. It can be something quite general like you should be nice to your mother it doesn't have to be particular prescription. And that gets me to this. Descriptive behave descriptive ethics is basically anthropology. It's going into a society and discovering more looking at a group and and discovering things about that group. In that respect it's not concerned with value statements about that group it's about whether what they're doing is right or wrong it's talking about what they do is describing it. If we're talking about ethics we're talking about prescriptive ethics and that means what should people do. Normative ethics is the most general level principles normally just means values. The most general level at which we could talk about ethics or argue about ethics or explain or discover or wonder is about principles and principles can be different they can contradict each other the 2 most widely known principles and the most widely known is probably utilitarianism which we'll get to which is basically saying the principle that says you should act so as to maximize utility. Often understood as happiness so the principal would be act so as to maximize happiness that's the most in general we can get. A competitor quite a different principle from that is the golden rule. Do on to others as you would have them do unto you. Now these are different principles. The golden rule you don't understand it this way that is do unto others as you would have them do unto you because if you do unto others as you would have them do unto you then they will do unto you as you would like to be done by which would be to say the principle is what goes around comes around. Nope the golden rule is saying you behave the way you would want other people to behave toward you end of story. No notice that's it quite different principal from. Figure out what do you think it's going to maximize happiness and do that. Okay so we understand that the most general level we could be talking or arguing or trying to explain about general principles. At the next level down from that that is getting less general we could be talking about issues. Things like abortion or euthanasia civil disobedience. Here if someone were to ask for instance what's the position should I should adopt on euthanasia. If you were to answer at the highest level that is I think the principal about euthanasia is are you should act so as to maximize happiness. Well what they've said is relevant but it hasn't really answered the question the question was asked at a level of. Listen generality then the principal. And the answer which would be in this case an inappropriate answer came back as to general. Now we can go even further down to be more specific the level of what I've called here casuistry or moralizing. So here's the question the ethical question is not what principle should I accept. Or what should we do about what looks to correct the best position to hold on euthanasia but rather here's my uncle Robert who's been on on. Life support for the past 2 weeks and he shows no signs of you fill out the story of you want. And the question is should we cut off life support uncle Robert. Answer that question is I think we should do unto others as we would like to be done by doesn't answer the question and similarly to give an answer the general enough about how do you think about euthanasia anyway notice you have a living will is what he would want it to one 's own song that isn't answering the question either even though it's relevant to answering the question the question is should we cut off life support to this person the answer is yes or no. Okay now I want to say. More about this this is the way this works no I've given an example here that you could fill out a different way. We were offering a moral judgment another look we go back to here this is going from top down most general most specific. When we're actually in the field as it were making moral judgments it's working the opposite way that is what we're making is the ground level judgment he shouldn't have taken the money. That's a judgment. We have a reason for that that is we're moving up up now to an issue. Because it was stealing and stealing is wrong. And then we can get to the most general level with somebody were to say what's wrong with that well because it causes great I'm happy for me that I feel that in this way. The idea is that we're. In dealing with an ethical issue that is and at the most level what the most specific level what do we do here. All these things the most specific moving to an issue and then moving to a general the general principle they are all relevant and we have to be able to supply them. What I mean by saying we have to be able to supply. I suppose I said to you. Chocolate ice creams a lot better than vanilla. And as though you really cared about that. You said to me why do you think so. Well maybe I'd offer you an answer but. But maybe I would just say I don't know just is it justice now maybe you would be disappointed. In that answer you'd expect more from somebody who claims to be an academic and as reasons for what they do but there's nothing logically wrong with my saying I don't know justice but notice in this in this case you shouldn't have taken the money. Well why not right no you shouldn't it doesn't fit. If it's a matter of ethics then when you offer it as an ethical judgment he shouldn't have taken the money you're implying that you've got these other things that is that you've got the reasons why maybe will argue about them but nevertheless you shouldn't have taken the money B. calls and then you can fill it out and if you can't fill it out. You might have thought initially you were offering an ethical judgment but you weren't. Now this maybe isn't all that uncommon. You might think I don't know if I'm giving too much away here autobiographic Lee to say that I used to think this guy was morally bankrupt. He wasn't ethically hideous human being. But then I realized it was none of that it was just that I hate his guts. That's a pretty strong emotion but I realized I couldn't fill in any of the rest of this stuff at least I couldn't fill it in in a way that makes it ethical but I have a generalizable principle here that I can make this judgment appeal to. If you're offering a moral judgment you are implying that you've got this this baggage that goes along with it that is a rationale and you can go from the bottom level moralizing casuistry. To identifying is as falling under the heading of an issue and then that issue being relatable to a general principle. Okay let's talk a little about what makes more reasoning so difficult. First I just want to mention this that I use these words moral and ethical interchangeably one of them has a Latin root one of them has a great group but if you if I happen to say moral this unethical lack it's not that I'm making some distinction that you should be aware of and if somebody does say as people often do say. We got it up and ethical and moral reason for such and such it's reasonable to ask you know what kind of different reasons you're referring to and maybe they are but it's up to them to tell you because the words don't give it away. Okay. For most of us we think we should visit the dentist. Likely say once a year. And that so that my. Please don't hurt. I'm looking after myself. So I am saying I ought to visit the dentist once a year. But my concern is about me that's what prudence is that's what prudential reasoning is it prudent person is a person who looks after themselves well. So for most of us we believe. Hi all to visit the dentist once a year. As a matter of prudence not got anything to do with ethics. You can imagine would be a strange person who thought the same thing I ought to see the dentist once a year but saw that as a moral ought. Maybe they're thinking something like this. I owe it to the world at large to present them with a bright shiny smile and the way to do that is to see the dentist once a year therefore I ought to see the dentist once a year for the sake of everybody else. So it would be the same sentence I ought to see the dentist once a year but for all of us reasonable people it's a matter of prudence and for this golf ball it's a matter of ethics. But political. What I mean is something about which you might have an opinion. But you do think it's it's appropriate to have a vote about it so you've got an opinion you're prepared to argue for that opinion. But you also believe that it's the right thing would be to have it settled by vote. Let me give you an example. What of the situation where it actually went kind of wrong. A few years ago. In Canada actually several now is reckoned the the indigenous population in Canada or the into what used to be called Eskimos. It was recognized at the end you would have had a really rough dell. In the Canadian parliament on one occasion one parliamentarian stood up and said. The end you would have had a really rough girl we need to have a national referendum to establish that the in you would have human rights. I felt rather self righteous and sat down. A colleague then got up and said basically this you're not. Don't have an IT referendum about people having natural rights you might have a metric a referendum about how to enforce them or to promulgate them or to support them finance them or protect them but not whether people have them people do have some it's not a matter of a vote that's non negotiable and that's the important point here. To hold something as a moral opinion is to hold it is non negotiable. That doesn't mean that you won't change your mind about. Maybe you will change your mind about but it won't be as a result of negotiation. As it something like a. We're we're in a classroom and we're saying you know how many people think that abortion is an act that should be left to a woman's choice raise your hand. All right how many people think that there should be strong legislation prohibiting abortion other people raise their hands and then we see you as the majority and then we say all right well then I guess I guess such and such is the case no we don't think that at all we don't think that issue that moral issue. Is something that. Is right police settled there is yes or no right or wrong by having a vote. Okay we hold is a moral view you can convince me to change my mind but not merely by saying. You know 52 percent think such and such maybe they'll give me cause to think about it but it won't it's not the defining feature okay and some things are preferences we can feel very strongly about preferences people who for instance in the NRL I have very strong preferences are. I was at roosters game and boiled or use them as an example later on if you just imagine the strongest possible preferences in the face of any kind of. Opposition well man there's something really strong going on there but I'll talk about that later okay. There are other things we could say about holding an opinion as an ethical one other than non negotiable Eddie but what I want to talk about here emphasize here is that it's not the kind of thing that you just change your mind because more people than not you know we negotiated it you know what you are having a discussion we have opposing views both on abortion and euthanasia. And I say to you all right I'll give you a portion if you'll give me use in Asia right now we're both happy it doesn't work like that. Okay. I think we're still talking about what makes stuff difficult. In the world ethical thinking. There's gonna be a number of hands here but let me start with just 2. On the one hand there are rules like for instance the golden rule that's at the top. Are there other rules tell the truth Playfair be honest keep your promises but on the one hand we when we're talking about ethics we're talking about rules and following rules and as I said at the most general level we could be talking about the golden rule. On the other hand. The most widely held moral principle there's ever been has been one based on consequences and that is utilitarianism what will make something right or wrong is what kind of consequences the act produces. Most difficulties in thinking about ethics. Most dilemmas in thinking about ethics come from these things conflicting with each other and what do we do when they do conflict how do we resolve the conflict okay we're not done talking about what makes it difficult. There's another part to this pint. The first part the top 2 bits are sometimes referred to as private morality or individual morality it doesn't mean what you do at private or what you just happen to think as an individual what it means is. Moral principles the correct moral environment as applied to people when they are just being people going about their daily lives. Just doing what people do. The bottom part of this is sometimes called public morality role morality and it doesn't mean what you do when you're in public it means the appropriate moral perspective moral perspective. From when you're in a role. And how that can be different from the appropriate moral perspective when you're not in a role. Let me give you just one example. Of this. I suppose. Well lawyers need to maintain confidentiality otherwise lawyering doesn't work and okay the importance of confidentiality for lawyers is not merely a matter of a look the the lawyers code of ethics and such and such it's not long lawyering isn't going to work unless lawyers maintain confidentiality and so the appropriate perspective. Moral perspective if you're in that profession will be maintenance of confidentiality. All right now let's just imagine. Imagine. Your. In. Having a discussion with your client you're a lawyer. And the client tells you something that you think boy the public really ought to know this. And you're wondering should I ring Sydney morning Herald let him know. Well maybe you'll decide yes and maybe you'll decide now what you will think about and if you don't you're being absolutely negligent it is your duty to maintain confidentiality with those things that your client culture. Now imagine this this is to contrast imagine that where that lawyer was operating in that building you happen to be walking down the corner and you just happened over here that conversation. And you think also for the public really ought to hear this and now you're wondering whether during the Sydney morning Herald tell them. One of the things you don't have to think about is your your duty to maintain confidentiality with that client because you don't have that duty. Maybe you might think about whether you should respect the confidentiality of that lawyer but that's a different matter if you can see that difference between what it would be like to be the lawyer in that position and to be somebody else who just happen to hear that conversation if you can see the difference there or feel it you can see the difference between public morality and private morality. And these things all conflict rules and consequences all by themselves can conflict. When you're in a role morality there are some things that are rule some things that are consequences that can conflict with public with private morality so things are pretty complex in the possibility of conflict is great. All right now we're not done with the complexity. Things are gonna get a little more complex complex. What I mentioned before about. The other way to look at ethics that is what kind of person should I be. Well if we're talking about rules and consequences we're talking only about what should I do. If we're talking about what kind of person should I be are you wondering how to solve this problem and you're basically wondering now what sort of virtue should I exhibit here. What would a honest person do okay now we're talking about about what kind of virtues you ought to have and now. We've got this we've got what action should I perform with virtue should I cultivate. And then we have this this chart again only now we got another element in it that is we got rule on the one hand rules on the other hand consequences on the third hand we have virtue all right well that's taken care of thinking about individual morality well on the other hand we've got role rowdy and what it what rules require for it and another hand what a consequence is required for it and on the other hand what kind of virtue should I be exhibiting here. So that's really pretty complicated and there's no formulas for this stuff that I'll say more about that next time that what's making moral reasoning difficult is not that the formulas are so difficult is that there are any formulas but that doesn't mean anything goes all right now let's go into a bit more of the theoretical kind of stuff. In the world of moral theories the the reason I'm separating now talking again only about the ones that talk about consequences and let's talk about rules yes that's occupied most of the terrain in talking about ethical theories. In 2000 years ago with Plato and Aristotle and we'll get to them there was more talk about virtue and in the last 20 some years there's been more talk about virtue but the interim time was taken up almost exclusively by talk about these things rules and consequences. And what that's why I'm emphasizing this but we're gonna talk about all this stuff. If we're talking about. Moral principles based on consequences we could be talking about egoism but that's that's a non starter really because of all you're concerned about looking after yourself that's what prudence is. You too low terrain ism is the Biggie which we'll talk about happiness or pleasure welfare general utility or the satisfaction of desires being that stuff that should be the consequences that are important. I put in a couple of others just to get the idea of nationalism would be right and wrong are determined by whether or not what you're doing is good for the nation or knowledge of the steam ism is just a philosophy word for knowledge of. Actions are right if they advance knowledge wrong if they don't the ones the important one of course is utilitarianism. On the non consequential side. Well consequential ism is sometimes called teleology that just means ends. And non consequential ism is sometimes called the oncology bad choice of words because the ontology means duty but we don't have to be talking about duty we can be talking about anything that's not consequences. As this was explained to me many years ago if we're talking about consequential or teleological theories or principles we are forward looking. Axar right if they produce something or other and so we look to the future. If it produces that something or other it's the right thing to do. If it doesn't it's not the right thing to do. Do you know the logical theories are backward looking will present looking to determine what's right or wrong that is. I should do such and such because I made a promise that's looking backward or I should do such and such because it's fair that's present so things we could be talking about if we're talking about non consequential theories we could be talking about rights or duties or contract or fairness and we will I'll mention some examples of all these. I put in the utilitarianism basket I put 3 Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill and Peter singer singer I put here because he's a current Australian philosopher who and also it's more about him up some mistakes he's made but nevertheless. Engine him a bit later. I'm not going to answer my phone is not supposed to ring in this room. Besides probably somebody wants to so many solar cell. John Stuart Mill is the one who everybody there are new views about utilitarianism and what counts and how we should figure but it will all go back to John Stuart Mill one way or another. When we're talking about non consequential views Emmanuel Kant is the Biggie here but there are some others Thomas Hobbes I mentioned briefly John rolls are mentioned little bit more than briefly and then I want to mention this guy who falls in the middle. W. D. Ross. Who when people talk about him they put him in the non consequential Dion to logical basket but I want to explain to you how he's actually a crossover he's in both and we got a word for that but we'll get to that should. Okay now don't be scared by this. This is the most complicated but also the most revealing slide I have. That's actually talking about what these things are. Teleological stuff consequential stuff is right and wrong are based on the consequences of your actions and some examples of this are utilitarianism I have eagle is among the lowest I have it's a largely discredited view because egoism is prudence that's the person who's you know seeing the dentist once you're out to do that because I'm looking after myself. And nationalism is just another example. Non consequential use this content effects that is the the one that's talked about most. S. non consequential Dion to logical is called unisex and we'll talk a fair bit about that. And then there's some other possibilities and I mentioned the golden rule or do what's fair keep your promises or follow the rules and then there is this whole area of. As an approach to ethical reasoning and behaviour virtues. That is the whole idea is to cultivate a virtuous character. And then the actions take care of themselves the questions are not are not. What will produce the most happiness 44. What would be the fair thing to do. But rather what would the virtuous person do here. We support and pick a virtue what with a courageous person did okay. This is another way of just looking at this the same thing we're talking about consequences or rules were talking about what should I do. And if we're talking about virtue we're talking about what kind of person should I be. Okay that's the. The overall view of how things sit now what we're going to do is talk about some of these people we're gonna talk about mill roll skunk calls roles. Okay we're not gonna do it in that order. Because we're gonna talk about called first. Let me just mention a couple of things cut is probably the most difficult moral philosopher. Read and understand that there is what I'm going to try to do now which is you know is violating my contractors moral philosopher is to try to give you a feeling for a number of the most important moral thinkers have ever been I'm going to do it all in about 12 minutes this I've actually contracted that I would never do in order for them to give me my license but I'm that's what we're gonna do. With cult who is the most difficult. I'm not going to try to give you. A full understanding of everything that he said but what I want to do is give you a feel a feel for what it is he thinks. That if with talking about morality and moral reasoning. We must be talking about something other than consequences. We have to. All right that's what I want to give you a feel for that and if you can get that then then frankly my job is done. For you to understand that this is the kind of thing count is getting. In this little book is called the foundations of metaphysics of morals. Which is really small. He begins by saying the only thing that's good without qualification as a good will. But he doesn't mean it is as you know it. Has to have a good will in the sense of trying to do good. Because he knows like everybody else that the road to hell is paved with good intentions so he doesn't mean the only thing good without qualification is to have good intentions what he means about a good will is a will that will swell a will that does a good job willing. That is to be able to will something is basically to have will power. It's to decide that you're going to do something and that there's a principle behind what you're going to do and come hell or high water or even what you'd rather do you're gonna make yourself do it. That's where it is. In his view is that this has to be the basis of morality because any other proposed criteria are either inappropriate or inadequate now I'm going to try to explain why that so. But let me get a couple of other things out on the table first. What we're looking for according to Kompas duty not inclination. Not the achievement of some particular result. Duty is the central notion. And now this is part of what you need to understand to see why he's saying this. This is the only thing he thinks that makes sense. Otherwise right now the wrongness or just matters have been lucky. You know you you happen to have a good result you think you get credit for that no you don't. It or it could be just like your natural characteristics like height weight maybe even a sense of humor we don't get credit for those things. Those are characteristics you've got maybe we enjoy the fact that you've got a but you don't get more credit for that. Rather what we're looking about his behavior over which you exercise control okay and it's not me because things can intervene you're trying to do the right thing and something happens is true not only comes up and it doesn't get a cheap or you were trying to do the wrong thing and a strong wind came up and made it great for everybody you don't get credit for that. What is concerned with I want to tell you the story and this relates to this last bit. And this is a story that cocktails to separate himself from Aristotle who will get to in a little while. This is called story. We imagine this one person who's on a pier. And there's water all around he's walking along the pier. And struggling in the water there's someone who's clearly drowning. And there happens to be a lifesaver nearer to kind of thing right at this person's feet. Well era startles virtuous person who's got you know the virtues really doesn't even think twice about this is just the kind of person he is grabs the lifesaver trucks in water and there you go fine hold on and the person is safe. Now imagine this other person says called. Same situation this person's walking along the pier sees the person rap person drowning and thinks to himself. I don't like you very much I actually don't like human beings very much. If I had my druthers I just seen you drown is not but hi all to save you therefore now picks up the inner tube throws it to the guy and says they're be saved. According to Kant. Although that first person might be a lovely person have over to dinner. That person's action has no moral worth. Because the person was just doing basically what came naturally he didn't have any is as it were a choice in the matter it's just the kind of guy he is working for the person drowning. But the other person did the right thing he made himself do it he willed it yet by will power succeeded in making it happen even though it was contrary to his inclination that's where moral worth lies okay. So what's important here is autonomy that is you make the decision yes you it's not something else pushing you you did the willing you made it happen. Willingdon wealth is a matter of consistent and universal universal is ability so we don't understand a little bit about this so it's not just the individual act of picking up the unit to. Yes picking that up as part of a principal unless we want to talk about that earlier I mentioned a couple of times that if you're making a moral judgment they'll be the particular thing. The reasons why I will relate to an issue reasons why will relate to a principal. Now what come to saying is that any actions that you perform. Can be relatable to principle and it's your your relating by will power doing something which conforms to a principle that will make your action more. Okay. Here's an example where it doesn't work. Now what do you like this example are you think it's right or not there's been a fair bit of discussion about this but you'll see what Khan has in mind. The question is. You made a promise that you'd really like not to keep. It's a tough situation and you're wondering. Is it okay for me to break this promise. And we're now thinking. Breaking a promise in the hard case. Is there some generalizable principle. That this could be. This could be could flow from you know it's okay to break your promise in the hard case. The way that you don't do this because of this because of this all relatable to universal principle. All right what kind of sales will be short answer is no. It can't for this reason. I can make a promise that you know is not a problems. I might right now promised everyone of you that in the next 30 seconds I'm going to appear in the flesh in person right by you in your computer. Well that's not a promise even though I use the words I promise why because there's no uptake on your part you know damn well that can't happen so it can't be a problem it could be the words but promise keeping requires somebody to say the words in there to be uptick okay. Now let's just imagine. What could be the principal. According to which is all right to break a promise when the going gets tough. Well. If it were a principle that said promises are gonna get broken. Police might be broken if the going gets tough now let's just think what it's like for the person who's hearing me make this promise you know right I'll be there no matter how inconvenient it is for me I'll be there exactly at 630. And your thinking well. Maybe won't be because it's okay to break promises. The point the complex is the institution of promise keeping would collapse there couldn't be such and such a principle that says it's okay to break your promises in the hard case because if there were a principal there would be no uptake to somebody's making a promise and if there's no object somebody's making a promise there can't be any promise keeping therefore it's not okay to break your promise in the hard case and this is called as a matter of logic. It would be shown to be inconsistent to make to try to come up with a principle according to which is all right to break a promise okay. I hope you understand what that's all about what do you think the reasoning is is right but the point is the answer to is it okay to break my promise is not because there can't be a principle according to which that's okay. It would violate the principle promise keeping because it's inconsistent. Almost giving an example of what Kant calls a perfect duty that doesn't mean that it's super duper it just means it doesn't allow any latitude for information means you made a promise there's no thinking about whether you'd like to do it what are you going to do it today or tomorrow you promised to do it today there is no latitude for anything except keeping it today. Full stop no exceptions. There's some duties that count believes are which she calls him perfect not because they're lesser. But they allow some latitude for information. Kind of like he believes that you have a duty to develop your talents. But it's really up to you I mean you've got a lot of potential and a lot of different areas so do what you want to develop what you want and this is what actually doesn't occur with a perfect duty there is no no place to talk about what you might want or what you might be inclined to do if we're talking about a perfect duty because there is no latitude for you're making for you for doing this rather than that. Okay. So promise keeping is a logical matter he says it's logically impossible to have any other any other way. Helping somebody in need. This is another one where. This is. Perfect you have to do it but it's not logical that doesn't mean it's illogical it just means it's not a matter of just piecing shoes line him up what in tales what. If somebody's in need you have to help them. Why because you can't imagine a world in which nobody help anybody else. So a principle according to which I don't have to help this person because it's okay if there were sexual generalizable principle that nobody ever helps anybody else well there could be such a world but you couldn't will there be that world. Therefore. There's a further duty to help somebody who's in need okay I'm going to say a little more about this. Hello. The categorical imperative actually has 5 formulations are not going to talk about all the more we can talk about to. But you need to understand this. An imperative is something that just says do this do that don't do that that's what imperatives. For something to be categorical means no exceptions no ifs ands or buts this is just the way to do it it's not a matter of what you want to do this is what you do. All right come talks a lot about maxims which is general principles now we've talked a lot about general principles and the fact that when you act or when you make a moral judgment your involving a principal okay. So maximus is a general principle and whenever somebody does anything there's a principle involved here's an example. When asked me to give this lecture and I said yes and so here I am okay. Yes wasn't just a reflex. There was a principle involved. Principal might have been when a friend asked me to do something that if my calendar's clear all do it kept principal another will be whatever somebody offers me lots of money to perform for an audience all do it that would be a principal. The point is in order to understand my saying yes yeah it worked harder to understand it is being rational you have to be able to understand that there are reasons behind it that is there must be some kind of a principal operating here. It wasn't. It's not a matter of what I'm doing but why I'm doing it. If you can't have some idea of why it's happening then it's just the preciousness of reflex it was just must muscle twitches. A simple example. What if somebody running to catch a bus well first they're running in the buses alongside them what now you figured out some part of the rationale they're running want to catch a bus so just of their legs 7 to be churning today. Well you might even ask why. Well any immediate quick answer is going to be well because I think it's worth their while to catch the bus we understand people's actions we don't understand them. It's simply filings we understand them as rational that doesn't mean people are the most reasonable people on earth it just means we understand them as being rational okay so this business of somebody's doing something we're going to interpret that as somebody's being rational and in order to interpret as being rational we have to be able to link it to some kind of a maximum of principle okay. Now I said there's just one categorical imperative the 5 formulations and for calling although they sound quite different from each other each one of them he claims that he tries to show is derived logically from the one before but I just want to make I just want to call your attention to the first 2 formulations they are the most well known. First formulation is act only according to that that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law that is everybody is required to do it. And the test kind of like with promise keeping his let's imagine a world. Where it's not that everybody would be choosing to do this but everybody had to do it like a law of nature is just what will happen. And if we imagine that with the false promising. What we'll see is there can't be such a world because a good many promising at all in that world long falls from. Okay. Second formulation which is just a glorious formulation. So that you treat humanity whether in your own person or that of another always has an end and never is a means only. This is a requirement to respect people respect persons. You can ask somebody you might ask somebody to open the door because it's getting hot in here but you don't treat somebody like a door stop. Huh or to use the example used before you might have somebody to do a bit of farming for you but you don't treat him like a tool you don't treat him like a slave it's a requirement to respect somebody's personhood okay. No I just want to make these points about appreciating what Kant is about duty is the basic moral feature. We understand that that's involved that what's involved here is good will that good will is not in terms of effect it's in terms of your having the power to make it happen. Okay that involves agency autonomy which I've talked about and morality is not a matter of luck. It's something you're responsible for you will that it be done you made it happen wasn't more looking more accidents as it were you get full credit or you take full blame. For this it was your doing. Okay now I want to say a little something not indicated why he thinks it's not a matter of character that would be that you know you just have to be that way so good on you. Avoidance of hypocrisy I want to say something about this he doesn't use the word but it's it's what he's talking about. I need to say something let me say this and I'll get back to it this is the same thing again duties not inclination or the treatment of a particular result. Agent autonomy you decide what to do when you make it happen you're responsible for it not a matter of luck. Or an accident. In this occurs in the part of constable is the preface where he's not really arguing for these things he's saying look this is simply how we understand stuff this is how we know this is what's involved so it's not like this there for this there for this and therefore you must accept this in this part of his book it's just look these are the foundations just starting place moreover these all matter of luck or accident if consequences are character is the determinant of right and wrong and whether or not your particular action is right or wrong could simply be the result of luck or accident and this is a bit we just note that morality is not that kind of thing so yes tell what's your your basis for this the answer is well I just not and so do you buddy okay with indicated some duties are perfect and what that means somebody's room perfect. Okay now let's talk about hypocrisy. And that has to do with this. Okay let's just suppose. I suppose. I'm a racist. And on one occasion you ask me am I racist and I tell you now of course not course I'm not. But then I go ahead and do all the things that you know racists do. And so. I am a racist regardless of what I told you but in this case in going on to do all the things that racists do I'm not being a hypocrite I just lied to you. I lied to you about what I think I am a racist fine there you go. This situation is different. You ask me whether I'm racist and I tell you know. And I actually believe that I'm not. But the way I run my life. It's clear to anybody observing still I'm doing all the stuff that racists do. So I am a racist whether I know that about myself or not whether I believe that about myself or not that's what being a hypocrite it's. It's a practical inconsistency practical just means displayed in action. Practical inconsistency between what somebody believes about themselves. And how that person actually behaves that's what it is to be a hypocrite and now that's the business about. Most promising. You made a false promise and you thought it was in accordance with the maximum. What we've shown says cop but it can't be in a in. It can't be consistent with the maximum the calls to try to come up with the maxim to allow Foles promising would defeat the whole institution of promise keeping there cannot be such a principle no maybe you think there is and that's why you're telling your false promise. But if it is you're being a hypocrite. That is you think you're being consistent and willing according to a maximum but you're not so that's why I've I've called this full skate false promise in the hard case a matter of hypocrisy even though that's not a word that god uses. Okay. Don was caught. Okay moving on. John Stuart Mill. View. Is. Basically that cult is not. In all indicate that in just a minute bill says this early on he has also little book called utilitarianism. And it's not a difficult book to read. It's one of the well it's just not a difficult book to read but it is one of those cases where there's a whole lot here even though you can read it quickly and you think you get it all it's worth a really careful read because there's a lot here. He says this that when we engage in any action. We first have to have some idea of what we're trying to accomplish you know you don't just flaming again their reasons for you're doing what you're doing. Well reasonable gauge of rightness or wrongness then would be whether the means that we've chosen to get what we're trying to get well actually do the job. So there's a question in the most general Kate most general sense what are we out to achieve no this is not just a person. Running what is hoping to achieve is to catch the bus it's not just that well it was to catch the bus because it's worth it's worth while but in the most general sense what are we trying to achieve not just catching buses. Well to be happy we're out to achieve happiness that's the most general sense of what we're trying to G.. Given that happiness is what it's all about we'll get more about what it's all about later when we talk about Aristotle. Given that happiness is what it's all about and I can't see any in principle reason to distinguish what I want from what you want of them I mean you're you but that's no principle. There's no in principle reason why. Our own happiness my own happiness is preferable to anybody else. It's not sex not to say there is preferable to mine is just to say mine's not preferable to their happiness is happiness no matter who's in his. So and this is the prince diss the utilitarian principle according to milk. Actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness. Wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. And my happiness is intended closure in the absence of pain my own happiness pain in the privation of pleasure. Now he has a fair bit about what pleasures are all mentioned that in a moment. But his view is nothing else makes any sense. Now you notice when we talked about comes in the bit about well we know it can't be a matter of luck it's got to be a matter of willing you're having control what count would go on to say is nothing else makes any sense. Well now we've got milk offering the polar view the view that says the only thing that's important is consequences. And what he's saying about that is nothing else makes any sense. He says this which is it's really interesting and this is all he says about company says this very early on in this little book in that the chapter called general remarks before you guessed it arguing for anything it's not my present purpose to criticize but these thinkers who thought they could deduce moral principles are priori that's called but I can't help referring to the most illustrious of them namely cons. This remarkable man lays down a universal first principle as the origin and ground of moral obligation then he gives us the first formulation of the category compared. So active the rule would you act could be adopted but as a low hold rational beings but then mill says this. But when he begins to deduce from this precept any of the actual duties of morality that's when you now ask what what what should I do. He fails almost grotesquely to show that there would be any contradiction any impossibility in the adoption by all rational beings of even the most outrageously immoral rules of conduct only shows that the consequences of their universal adoption would be such that no one would choose to in car. So what mill saying is you know help tied himself in knots trying to show us that something could be the foundation of morality other than consequences. But when it really when you know when it comes to the crunch and he's trying to give any examples the only things that that ring true this is Mel talking the only things that ring true are we talking about this because it will produce good consequences or produce or because it will produce terrible consequences so central part even though this is all the millers the same account central the central tenet of mill is anti cult. Consequences are what are what matters and that gets us to the utilitarian principle which is a principal about consequences. And it the principal in particular about happiness. Let me explain just give you a rough idea of why he thinks happiness is where it all ends up and this was been sound remarkably similar to something we're going to get to in a little while. If you ask that guy running why are you running in the answer would be to catch a bus. Why do you want to get to the bus well because the bus is going to get me to my job on time why do you care about the job on time well because it's the only way I'm going to get paid for doing any work why do you care about that we keep asking these questions at some point the answer is going to be because that's going to make me happy. Now you might ask why do you think that will make you happy but not why do you want happiness. That's where it will stop and happiness. The utilitarian principle on mills of you is a principle of course about consequences because any principle that makes any sense in talking about morality must be about consequences says Mel and the only consequence that is the general shared among everybody consequence for all things is happiness therefore that's that's the consequence we're talking about is a separate argument to show that what we need done what we should understand happiness to be is pleasure. And the reason he mentions pleasure at all is that the people before mail Benjamin particular and mills father named James mill. Wrote about utilitarianism and talking about. Leisure and were subject to a certain kind of criticism which referred to it as the pigs morality that is the pleasure of just rolling around in the mud having fun. Mill argues that there are different kinds of pleasures and so not every pleasure is a sort of a big role in the mud pleasure there other pleasures but anyway point for this is the central deal in his production of a consequence and that consequence is happiness. The more you produce the better things are as it were writer and longer dependent on how much happiness or lack of happiness they promote. Okay. Let's talk about this fellow W. D. Ross. Ross. Wrote well in the 19 thirties. What Ross thought. Was that there are a number of prima facie duties as well any time we're wondering what to do. There are a number of things that impinge on she calls these prima facie duties on the surface they're the ones that come out to help this person. Be it be there on time. Your debts do whatever there's a whole bunch of stuff that at any moment really you could be doing and the question is what should I do. Okay okay an example I'll give you next time is up you promised to be at my house for dinner at 630 on your way to dinner at my house there's somebody who's got a flat tire on the side of the road you could help what do you do what you gotta do to help only got a duty to be at my house at 630 all right there these things which impinge on us. Rawls's view is these things all impinge and we are now if you can see above a lot of arm waving that's what philosophers do when they don't have really good arguments we weigh all these things up. And the the way they point when we wake them all up he refers to as our actual duty. Whatever I think about this I think about Victor's coming in from different ways and then there's a resolution of the vectors. These are what Ross things are are prima facie duties some rest our own axe which okay so you made a promise you have a duty to keep a promise I'll. Somebody did something to help you out gratitude. Date notice number 3 the inappropriate distribution of pleasure happiness well would be to read redistribute. But ever since that's making people happy. Improving yourself. Not hurting other people. Now this is a funny deal. Ross is identified in the literature always as a non consequential because he thinks there are these duties that impinge on ours. Ross himself when he's argued this said look if you're looking at John Stuart Mill and you see what you have to do in terms of utilitarianism. It requires an enormous amount of calculation because mills response to that is yes there is every other science we complain about them too anyway. Also thinks is all too complex if you look at middle. Duties are the thing but when you look at Ross. He's got these duties one of which is utilitarianism yes and simplified things that always if anything made it more complex. So Ross when he's categorized by those moral principle categorize hers is put into the D. oncology group but in fact he's a crossover guy. And that makes me get to this point. If we were talking about all this stuff 30 years ago. We would have talked about there's rules rules based principles and there are consequences based principles. You can't be both because they they conflict with each other. You got to be one of the other you can't be both. The. View now at least a more considered view now is that look there's this thing which we can refer to as moral pluralism. That means we're aware of a variety of different principles. We can see that there is an appeal not just one in one but in another. Even though those principles by themselves. Contradict each other in points. Nevertheless we're trying to deal with more than one we're not trying to deal with just rules we're not just dyed in the wool D. oncologists we're not just dyed in the wool utilitarians we can appreciate that there is an appeal that is a moral appeal and moral integrity in these different views and we're trying to navigate through the mall it would be and this is not a lot anyway he was ever describe this but it would be negligent of me not to think about those other possibilities and not to be aware of the weight of those other possibilities all right so that's what moral pluralism is there's no single moral theory or principle that should be accepted as preferable to others they're different diversity even mutually inconsistent ethical positions that should be recognized and there's not necessarily any single moral principle or set of principles that everyone should accept. Not notice and I wanna make a big deal about this this is not moral relativism. This is not what they do in that culture is fine over there or even that is different over there and because they do it over there if they ever did it's okay this is not this at that at all this is just saying when you are hired or having an argument or I'm having a lot an argument with a colleague in China. It's not going to end it any place at all by saying well you've got your values not got money no it's saying look there's consequential thing at work here there's a deal to logical thing at work here let's try to put them together and see how it works and what we're what we're. Dedicated to or committed to and what we're not let's work this out but not dismissing that you know where you got your values not got much more pluralism is I don't know said this 12 times is not moral relativism. Okay moving on. Okay this is what I was just talking about. This is another kind of non consequential view. Cold contract Arianism which is the same just as the name indicates that what morality is based on is either actual or hypothetical contract. Among people. Or between people of the state or something Hobbs wrote a book called Leviathan. What Holmes argued was that morality doesn't even exist outside. A civil society that without society this is a quote from a rather famous quote from Hobbs vocalizing without society there's continual fear and danger of violent death on a life of man is solitary poor nasty brutish and short. He thought that it. A number of writers political philosophers and these well these but both political philosophers who are talking about the the foundation of the state. Talk about this thing they call the state of nature. Now whether there was actually state of nature doesn't matter they probably think that was you know in case people roamed around doing whatever they did but a fictional time and meaning by that. Imagine you've got a society we're sorry that you don't have a society you've just got individuals and there is no society we're in a state of nature okay this is even worse than survivor we're in a state of nature. What Hobbs says in the state of nature he says there's this there's continual fears over and so on why well basically because. Each of us thinks the other one 's going to try to get us. Huh. He believes that. For all intents and purposes people are equal in strength and intellect. He means by the strength that you might be stronger than I am. But you're not so much stronger that I can't do you in if I pick up a club and hit you in the head with. So basically we're just you know for all intents and purposes recall and similarly you might be a whole lot smarter than I am. But you're not so much smarter than I am but I can't figure out that if I get a club that hit you in the head you're gonna. Okay what's the thing that's going to. Get us out of this we hate this situation but it's a situation where we're standing next to each other we got our clubs and you're saying to me you put yours down I'll put mine down hello I know if I put my don't even want me in the head take everything I got mine you know wrapped around me and similarly for you. The only way we can get out of this is to get a third party. Who. It's got a bigger club. And if anyone to either one of us gets online is gonna samples. Okay so we both do lay down our arms we contract to this third body that calls calls the sovereign and with the sovereign promises us is security all right that is going to protect me if you try to attack me going to protect you if I try to attack you and the place where morality comes in it's now been as it were invented. It comes in when either one of us behaves as though we hadn't entered into that contract. So I'm behaving immorally when I tried to steal from you or try to club you because I've entered into a contract that says not the solver has all those powers not me I've given it away okay so it's been invented by contract and this is the idea that that without a society we're just like Tigers lions bears as you might be unhappy with what they do when the the tiger runs into your campground tent but you don't think the tide anything immoral you're happy with what it did but it's not a moral thing that's what helps things we're like free society. Roles has another view. Again if you that's based on a contract. In his book called theory of justice. Again he is all based on a contract you say well what kind of contract how would people enter into a contract where is it all dentures this question by saying we make with the song. And the reason we make it is because we're scared to death. All the same we're starting from scratch. All right then we have what he calls the original position and the question he asks the theoretical question you put people in the original position K. state of nature. What principles would people in that state agreed to. Well how can we even begin to answer that question what would they agree to what we have to know well. He says let's just suppose. That the way we approach this question is we assume that each one of these people is operating behind a veil of ignorance that is meaning by that they don't know what their particular talents are and particularly with their talents are relative to anybody else they don't know whether they're strong they're weak they don't know what kind of position they're going to be assigned in the society. So if that were the case in the original position where we're all equally free. And none of us knows. Much about even ourselves let alone how we stack up with everybody else what principles would we agree on okay that's what he said that's that that's going to be the foundation of morality. One is there's going to be a principle of equality. Every person will have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty that's compatible with liberty for everybody else and then this is it this is a real B. E.. Because you don't know where you're going to be in society. You don't want to be left out of any advances in the society so any benefits that there are 2 people in society you know some people don't get paid more because their jobs will be this will be doing that they'll have more privileges anything that benefits anybody. Has to benefit the least advantaged class. Okay. And what he thinks we're going to get I just wanna mention is this what I've called the mini Max dreaded G.. The only one I want to talk about this is what he said is the rational strategy for agreeing to principles about. Ethics. He says just imagine. That you and this is this is going back to here. Operating from the veil of ignorance. Just imagine as you know know your place in society imagine you're going to be assigned to your place by your worst enemy. So roll says you're gonna mention that that's what you got to think about and you're going to imagine how could my worst enemy harm me at least. Well it's going to be any benefits to anybody have to have to benefit the least advantaged class which is exactly where my worst enemy would put me. Okay. What roles is claiming but many Max strategy is a strategy for minimizing your maximum loss. What roles is claiming is that that is V. rational strategy. For accepting a political set up. Maxine Max would be a strategy which would maximize your maximum gain. Could be something like you know I'm going to. Adult for set up where the most well off in society get all the money everybody else suffers they work for them okay this is come into some kind of criticism very bit of criticism that is it might be a rational strategy to go for mini Max it's a very conservative strategy. The roles is not only claiming that it's a rational strategy he's claiming it's the rational strategy I want to mention a couple of other things that are just interesting about roles. He's talking about a set up or whatever set up we've got which is unethical one we'll have some account of. Seadrill justice. Okay now we can talk about if not we can talk about procedural justice in different ways. Different types of procedural justice or different criteria for establishing procedural justice. R. applicables to different kinds of situations. The case where there's perfect procedural justice is a case where we know what would be the just outcome we know what would be the just outcome. And we can come up with a procedure that will guarantee it. The example he gives is you want a pie cut into 8 equal slices well have the person who cuts the pie take the last piece. Hi everybody is going to be going for the biggest piece they can get out if some are bigger than others that person's going to be left to the smaller beats he he could have just said have somebody use a compass or project nevertheless we've got a procedure that can guarantee that result. All right. Situations which. Which are accommodate imperfect procedural justice are situations where. We know what the just outcome is we know what we're trying to achieve. But there's no procedure that's going to guarantee it. You can get a procedure that will get close but you can't guarantee it. And I think the criminal justice system is a reasonable one what we would like to do would be fine guilty all those people who did in fact commit the crimes. And find not guilty those people who didn't. We have a jury system we know that it makes mistakes we try to slice it one way rather than the other but we know that it's not perfect it's not it's not getting that perfect result. And it's no fault we just can't get the perfect result okay that's imperfect procedural justice. Now there are some cases where the justice of the procedure doesn't depend on the outcome. It depends on the procedure itself. If you are going to play a game of tennis we're trying to decide who who's got a server at least you can choose your service. And so we flip a coin hedge you choose tales I choose this is not a matter of well the right thing would have been for you to serve it's rather will make it the right to you do you service that you won the coin flip and it was a fair coin so was that the procedure itself is what was just and in virtue of that what ever result came about is a just result because of the procedure. Okay. All right so much for that. Those roles. Moving on to to virtue ethics. In talking about everything we've talked it will not roll stuff and the the contract Ariens and called we're talking about following rules the other stuff was talking about producing consequences it's all been in terms of what should I do. Now we're gonna talk about virtue ethics which is all about what kind of person should I be. This stems back to. To Plato and Aristotle the Greek word for this is R. J. to talk about virtue. And let's talk about them Plato. When Plato and Aristotle wrote they weren't. When I talked about virtue. They weren't they were talking about a generic kind of thing. Something that doesn't pertain only to human beings whether we're talking about human virtues. Virtue wouldn't general pertains to anything that has a function according to Plato. Then we can talk about the function of mostly function of a knife is to cut. A short age is what's gonna let it cut well. And so sharp age is the virtue of in life. Now the the enterprise as far as Plato's concerned is. Let's talk about what human beings do as human beings. And talk about what virtues human beings could have. That would allow them to do those things well. And his view is courage wisdom temperance and justice and we can talk about what those things are but these for our purposes here it's to appreciate that. The goal of ethics. Is to get people so they are courageous so that their wives so that their temperature so that they're just. Not that they think about what should I do but the beast kinds of people who have this as their character it's who they are so wise person a courageous person. Okay. When. Plato unlike. Most contemporary people writing about ethics. Sole virtue as basically an internal thing. Yes get your own house in order. Not interpersonal. But once you got your own house in order. The way you behave toward other people is this gonna be good that's exactly what's going to happen but it will be the flow on. We got it from getting your own house in order rather than what you were trying to achieve namely with other people that's just ineffective what's going to happen and it's there that you're going to be a good person. All right now I'm not quite done with Plano but I want to talk about here is the whole. There is little to talk about virtues that's why I'm going to say a little bit more about Plato in talking about this. Arsenal wrote a book called the nickel McKeon ethics. Which is a huge book huge book consisting of 10 books. And the question that he's out to answer in the nickel McKeon ethics is what it's all about anyway the capitalized life. And the answer to what it's all about anyway is happiness. So what does happiness amount to how do we get to it and what are the characteristics that we we should develop it ourselves so as to be happy. Whatever those characteristics are they are the human virtues. You get this kind of. Characteristic within yourself. You're going to be happy. So for him to just like for Plano let's consider the kinds of things humans do. And where we find happiness and then let's consider what's involved in doing those things well or badly and there will be corresponding virtues and vices now I want to mention this this be it occurs very early in the Nick of making an ethics big book. Very early on he not only asks this question but answers it. And then we're left with 98.5 percent of this book still to go. And the question now is what does that mean anyway no we've already we asked the question what's it all about answer happiness will sign your name you've done that's what this book was all about now we got the rest of the book telling us what that means to say that it's all about happiness and now how to how to achieve happiness. He called some things moral virtues but moral here just means doing so we've got the virtues that are concerned with doing things. And then he's got what he calls intellectual virtues which are. Which are virtues concerned with thinking different kinds of thinking there's practical wisdom you're thinking about doing things practically the scientific wisdom intellectual. Intellectual thinking different kinds of stuff now. Well I will mention this and that and then I want to say some more about what's involved in virtues according to Aristotle. I don't know whether any of you have ever come across the expression. Aristotle's doctrine of the golden mean. But just in case you have I want to correct the misunderstanding. Some people explain Aristotle's doctrine of the golden mane is meaning moderation in all things. That's just. Yes I guess it's kinda true with those words but that's just not it at all. Virtues are concerned with feelings according to Aristotle the virtue is a mean between feeling too much and feeling too little that's where people talk about the golden mean. But there's nothing moderate about this is just not feeling too much. Your courage I'm going to go back to this one courage is a virtue about feeling the appropriate feelings of fear and confidence. It's a mean between feeling too little fear which is being rash. Or feeling too much fear which is being powered. So the better when we think about moderation a golden mean you think about a straight line there is right in the middle that's what you're trying to get well it's more like this. It's a mean between feeling too much and too little but it's an extreme with respect to feeling the right amount it's exactly the right amount. That's what we're really trying to do is. I feel the right amount we act on. On the kinds of. On the kinds of feelings that we've got I want to mention a thing or 2 about this let me just go back to. This moral virtues and intellectual virtues. The stuff that Plato mention. Courage wisdom temperance justice are regarded as the cardinal Greek virtues. An aerosol says you know we'll play it was kind of on the something here but those are the only things there's a lot of other stuff that we do. When he mentions his pride kind of a funny thing because there are a number of people who written and consider pride to be hardly virtue and vice. Pride for aerosoles virtue but. Not full stride in order to be able to exhibit that virtue you gotta have something to be proud proud about and then there are better there's the right way and a wrong way to exhibit 6 to feel about this our. But ever since all right another one I want to mention which kind of an interesting once the only one that requires money is magnificent that's a virtue. If you think about. Throwing a wedding you're going to be the person who puts on this waiting for somebody and you're gonna make it grant. Now you can think of all sorts of ways that this could just be ridiculous. You gotta. 70 foot elephant made of Jello. Great you failed at being magnificent. Okay. Whatever startles tried to do is think of the waste the things that we can do now that the babies are gonna be things like courage. But there's other things that we do that you don't capture if you're thinking just about those beats and those are going to be things like pride and magnificent there is total claims when he's doing this and he's got about 12 or 14. He doesn't claim that he's got everything maybe does have everything but the idea is to look here stuff that we do. And these are ways that we can feel about doing stuff that we do and there's better and worse ways to think about these there's ways you can fail. Okay. According to Aristotle what we're trying to do. Is develop character that's what it's all about. We behave this way we as it were go associate with somebody who's courageous. And try to learn from them. Let them be your mentor. And you'll see the way that person behaves the way they act with they seem to be thinking what their demeanor is model yourself on them let them be your mentor that's the way you're going to get to be this and then the question will be. What not what should I do in this particular case but what would a courageous person do in this case. And if I'm courageous I don't even have to ask that question I'll just do it because it will become this is whatever startled how he describes it second nature for me not first nature I wasn't born with this it's become second nature. Not a reasonable example it's it's kind of unpleasant but anybody can smoke a cigarette. But and it might look the same but not anybody smoking cigarettes a smoker. So we can all go through the motions but somebody's going to be a smoker. And now imagine in a way is a terrible example. That for most of us we haven't cultivated as it were that virtue. Hello being a smoker even though we can do the acts the way that a coward could perform a courageous act that is not it is not courageous is it one off okay. The idea in cultivating virtues is as I said somebody's got to be your mentor you're going to practice this stuff. Till it becomes a habit. And as a habit is then going to become part of your character. Not be me here's here's a better example than smoking in this is smoking is an example for vice let's have an example for virtue I suppose the good thing if you give up your seat on a crowded bus to somebody who's having a little trouble walking. You might as utilitarian calculate this stuff you know where's the happiness going to reside well I'm happy sitting here the more happiness of that person to tears a little convenient to me let me do a bit more calculating right I'll get out okay better for that person to see here. A virtuous person isn't on duty calculating I gotta get up. No one way but because just who they are they see the situation they as it has the way their character reads they identify the situation and they behave accordingly why because they're virtuous now one way of characterizing. Virtue ethics it seems to me and maybe there's something to this maybe not. Would be is developing a character so that those acts which you could calculate out according to whatever Dion to logical or teleological view you except you could calculate them and get to this result or if you're already have this virtue it will be just second nature do you do it you won't have to calculate anything. Okay most people talk about virtue ethics don't talk about it that way as being just as it were a shorthand for doing what you could show to be right using some other method. Okay. 11 more thing and then we're done. I mention this first bit is associated with middle. With Aristotle it is explicitly associated with him. That is he spends a fair bit of time talking about white happiness the it is happiness and why it is it's the end of the chain when we ask why why are you doing this why you doing that when you do not. Okay it's the end of the chain when we get to that answer although there might be questions about well why why do you think that'll make you happy but not. Why do you want to be happy. Okay. The degree of precision we'll talk a bit more about this next time. I mention that this is a big book huge book early on we get the question and the answer to the question what's life all about anyway answer happiness. They're not much farther along these are very short chapters the chapters is pager page point 5 maybe 3 pages would be a big one. So we're still in book one and when we got chapter 3 and he says our discussion will be adequate if it has as much clearness as the subject matter that makes up. Is the mark of an educated man to look for precision in each class of things just so far is the nature of the subject admits it's equally foolish to accept probable reasoning from mathematician and to demand from a rhetorician scientific proofs what is talking about probable reasoning in a mathematician from a mathematician is not talking about something like probability calculus he's talking about you know what's 8 plus for. Well we don't want to hold somewhere greater greater than 10. No we want exactly a plus for its twelfth that's it. Exactly. Okay so we don't probable reasoning. And then equally foolish. To accept. Scientific proofs are demanded from a rhetorician rhetorician is like a debater or a lawyer. You're paying them I mean their job you've given what they're supposed to argue for. And now what you can expect to them is to come up with the best argument possible for that thing. All right your job today rhetorician used to argue that the earth is flat fine do it you can talk about it be cycles you can talk about all sorts of stuff but what you're not gonna be able to do is a kind of scientific proof that you know you might be able to do if you were to argue that the earth is not flat. Okay or got you guilty client well there you go do the best we can demand scientific proof for this guy's guilty but what we can do is we're paying you a lot of money. Come on give us a good argument. Absolutely appropriate for what's going on in the U. S. Congress right now but I'm not talking anything political. Now why is he said this. The reason he said this and this is what we're gonna talk a lot about next. Is. Moral reasoning is difficult. More reasoning is really really important. But it's not the kind of thing S. 8 plus 4 equal something. All tried it what what one of the things I'll be suggesting to you next time is that when we're dealing with moral situations we're not dealing with problems that can be solved. We're dealing by and large with dilemmas that we can navigate through and we can navigate through them better or worse but not as it were come up with an answer which is this is correct. What we can come up with an answer that we're prepared to argue was better than any other ants you can come up with and this is why you should accept it but not that it's true that's what I'll be suggesting to you next time but. That's the end of today I'm done.