

Metaethics and Ethical Analysis

- 3 types of ethics
 - Descriptive → study of ethical beliefs
 - Normative → identify, justify, and apply ethical judgements to world
 - Metaethical (...)
- Metaethics
 - **Attempt to understand the** metaphysical, epistemological, semantic, and psychological, presuppositions and **commitments of moral thought, talk, and practice**
- Euthyphro Problem
 - Plato looks at the claim that “all moral knowledge about what is right and wrong comes from God”
 - What gives God **authority to dictate** moral concerns
 - If authority somehow justified, what grounds is his **moral authority absolute?**
- How do we know which morals to accept?
 - No universal moral claims
 - Not something you can experience via senses
 - Similarly this is a problem with religious beliefs, mathematical principles
- Fact/Value Distinction
 - **Fact** : what IS and what CAN be known
 - **Value** : what OUGHT to be
 - Example → fact : garb landfills are bad for environment
 - Example → value : we should aim to reduce landfills
- Ethical Judgement
 - Action-guiding
 - Agreement-seeking
 - Motivating (ethical theory + factual premise)
- Hume's Guillotine
 - The 'is-ought' logical gap problem
 - All facts are derived from **logic** and definitions and/or empirical **observation**
 - MORAL knowledge **cannot be derived in these two ways** ^^^^
- Ethical Relativism
 - Actions that are right and wrong for a specific person is determined by their culture
 - STRENGTH → allows for cultural variation (diversity of morals)
 - WEAKNESS → there is no truth, how do you argue this
- Ethical Analysis
 - Goal → identify underlying ethical claims that are made in environmental policy
 - To justify ethical judgments, we need ethical theory
 - Theory helps assess whether or not they are good reasons for the recommendation
 - 1) recognize the ethical claims
 - 2) identify ethical reasons

- 3) classify reasons via ethical theories
- 4) examine who or what the recommendation assumes to have moral standing
- 5) reflect critically on strengths and weakness of assumptions
- 6) decide which policy to adopt or recommend
- **Ethical Theories**
 - **Virtue/Vice** → character
 - **Deontological** → rules and principles
 - **Consequentialist** → outcomes of an action
- Justice & Sustainability
 - Environment justice is concerned with
 - Inequitable access to resources (clean air, water, food)
 - Injustice of greater pollution in lower income communities
- Sufficiency & Compassion
 - Mandates that all forms of life are entitled to enough goods to live on and flourish
 - No one should waste or hoard resources
 - Future of humans is tied to well-being of all other creatures
- Solidarity & Participation
 - Consider how we relate to each other in community
 - We're all part of one biological family
 - Challenges us to consider the full range of relationships with others

Religion and Morality

- 3 assumptions
 - Religious belief is needed to get us to do our duty
 - Morality **MUST** be made by someone, in this sense God is best candidate
 - Religious wisdom is key to providing moral guidance
- Moral motivation
 - Assumption → w/o belief in afterlife → people lack motivation to avoid immorality
 - NOTICE → does not prove God's existence... only shows it's practicality
 - Genuine Moral Character → doing right thing **because it is right** not out of fear for punishment
 - *However... atheists and agnostics are JUST as capable of this as religious people...*
- Argument for God's Creation of Morality
 - Every law requires a lawmaker
 - Moral law requires a lawmaker
 - Humans cannot be the author of moral law → we are imperfect
 - If humans can't be the author → it must be God
 - therefore , God is the author
- Divine Command Theory
 - Acts are moral or immoral because it is simply commanded by God
 - We are to follow God's commands

- *But does God command these actions because they are morally right?*
 - *Or are these actions morally right because God commands them?*
- The Euthyphro Argument
 - God either has reasons for his commands/ or lacks reasons for his commands
 - If he lacks reason → commands are arbitrary → God is imperfect → undermines moral authority
 - If there are reasons → take the reasons instead of the divine commands?
 - Therefore God is imperfect OR the divine command theory is false
 - But we know God is NOT imperfect
 - Therefore the **divine command theory** is **false**.
- The Divine Perfection Argument
 - If DCT is true → morally perfect God **could** have created a flawless morality that requires rape, stealing, and killing and forbade us from acts of generosity
 - A morally perfect God could not have issued such commands → anyone who did so would be morally imperfect...
 - Therefore, divine command theory is false
- Religion and Moral Guidance
 - FINAL ASSUMPTION → religion is essential source of moral guidance
 - Difficulties
 - Defending belief in god
 - Defending view that god offers moral advice
 - Selecting a scripture
 - Defending an interpretation of that scripture
 - Reconciling scripture with tradition

4) Explain psychological and ethical egoism. How are they different? What is Hume's Guillotine? Is it a problem for psychological and ethical egoism?

Psychological and Ethical Egoism

- QUOTE → "*Earth provides enough to satisfy every man's needs, but not every man's greed.*"
- Psychological Egoism
 - Theory → all human actions are aimed at
 - Avoiding personal loss
 - Gaining personal benefit
 - If this theory is true, **altruism does not exist**
 - Altruism → direct desire to benefit others for their own sake
 - What if the theory isn't true?
 - This theory is NOT an ethical theory, but rather a descriptive theory
 - Only says how we DO behave
 - Not how we OUGHT to behave

- Implications of Psychological Egoism
 - 1) if theory is true → can't be altruistic
 - 2) if can't be altruistic → our duty can't be altruistic
 - 3) if psychological egoism is true → duty cannot be altruistic
 - 4) psychological egoism is true
 - 5) therefore it can't be our duty to be altruistic
- Arguments for Psychological Egoism
 - Strongest Desires
 - Whenever you do something → motivated by strongest desire
 - Whenever motivated by strongest desire → u are pursuing self interest
 - Therefore whenever you are doing something you are pursuing your self interest
 - Expected Benefit
 - When u do something → expect to be better off afterwards
 - If you expect that → aiming to promote self interest
 - Therefore whenever you do something → aiming to promote self interest
 - Avoiding Misery
 - Would never do action that promised only PERSONAL misery → means all our actions are done in effort to avoid such misery
 - We would never do an action that promised ONLY personal misery
 - Therefore all actions → effort to avoid personal misery which is a self-interested motivation
- 2 Egoistic Strategies
 - 1) Appeal to guilty conscience
 - 2) Expand the realm of self-interest
- Ethical Egoism
 - Actions are morally right because they best promote self-interest
 - Psych egoism is support for this theory
 - *"People should act in own self-interest and morally obligated to do what is best for themselves"*
 - Governments
 - This idea fits with consequentialism
 - How practical?? → no environment ethics/foreign aid...
- A Challenge for Ethical Egoism
 - If a theory requires killing, raping, or stealing JUST because it promotes self-interest → that theory CANNOT be true
 - Ethical egoism sometimes requires such things just because they sometimes do promote self-interest

- Thus ethical egoism cannot be true
- Arguments for Ethical Egoism
 - Self-Reliance
 - If everyone mind own business → everyone would be better off
 - Ought to do what will make everyone better off
 - Therefore we ought to mind our own business and tend to our own needs
 - Libertarian Argument
 - Moral duties only have 2 sources
 - Consent
 - Reparation (compensation)
 - Therefore if I have not consented to help someone and owe NO REPARATION → not obligated to help.
 - Ethical egoists believe our moral duties have only ONE SOURCE
 - Self-interest
 - Best Argument
 - If morally required to do something → must be a good reason for it
 - If good reason for doing it → it must make you better off
 - Therefore if you are morally required to do something → it'll make you better off
 - PROBLEMS FOR ETHICAL EGOISM
 - 1) Egoism violates core moral beliefs
 - Egoism requires rape, murder, torture whenever these = self-interest
 - 2) Egoism cannot allow for existence of moral rights
 - Any harm can be justified if it was done under grounds of self interest
 - 3) Egoism arbitrarily makes my interests all-important
 - Egoism must explain “why are my own self-interest take precedence over everyone else’s interest??”
 - Prisoner’s Dilemma
 - Remember the game show about “steal” and “split”?

3) What is moral standing? How is moral standing different depending on your ethical view?

Using

examples, discuss the difference between utilitarianism and Kantianism.

Consequentialism and Utilitarianism

- Consequentialism states → acts are morally right because they maximize amt of goodness in world
 - The act that YIELDS the GREATEST BALANCE of BENEFITS OVER DRAWBACKS → aka **optimific action**

- Determining the Right Action
 - 1) Identify what is intrinsically good
 - 2) Identify what is intrinsically bad
 - 3) determine all options
 - 4) determine value of results in each option
 - 5) perform action that yields highest ratio of good:bad

- Act Utilitarianism
 - Most prominent version of consequentialism
 - There is one ultimate moral standard → PRINCIPLE OF UTILITY
 - *“An action is morally required because it does the most to improve overall well-being than any other action”*

- Maximizing Goodness
 - 2 misunderstandings
 - 1 → do what benefits most number of people
 - 2 → choose action that makes greatest amt of happiness
 - The actual view
 - Perform action that yields greatest net balance of happiness vs unhappiness

- Expectations and Actual Results
 - Most utilitarians claim:
 - rightness/wrongness determined by ACTUAL RESULTS not expected results
 - Intentions are good/bad based on whether they are reasonably expected to yield good results

- Attractions of Utilitarianism
 - IMPARTIALITY → everyone’s interests count equally
 - JUSTIFIES conventional moral wisdom → slavery, rape, and killing are wrong. It makes people very unhappy
 - CONFLICT RESOLUTION → provides method of making difficult moral decisions
 - MORAL FLEXIBILITY → explains why moral prohibitions are sometimes broken

- The Moral Community
 - All beings that are **capable of suffering**
 - Consists those whose interests we are morally obligated to consider... for their own sake

- The Argument from Marginal Cases
 - If immoral to kill/eat marginal humans → immoral to treat animals this way too.
 - It is always immoral to kill or painfully experiment on marginal humans
 - Therefore, always immoral to kill and eat animals/painfully experiment on them

- Measuring Well-Being
 - If Utilitarianism is true → act that brings greatest overall well-being is the right one
 - How do we measure it though?

- The Argument from Value Measurement
 - Utilitarianism is true IF → precise unit of measurement to determine value of actions
 - No such unit of measurement
 - Therefore utilitarianism is false

- Is this theory too demanding??
 - DELIBERATION → requires complicated calculations
 - MOTIVATION → requires us to be selfless at all times
 - ACTION → limited action, instead of going on vacation it would have been better to donate to charity.
- An Important Distinction
 - Decision procedure → method that reliably tells us right thing to do
 - Standard of rightness → conditions under which actions are morally right
 - **Utilitarianism is a standard of rightness but not a decision procedure**
- Problems of Impartiality
 - This theory requires everyone's interests to be considered equally
 - Pro → nobody is morally MORE important
 - Con → cannot weigh interest of loved ones over strangers
- No Intrinsic Wrongness (or Rightness)
 - This theory says morality of action depends on consequences
 - Therefore no action intrinsically wrong
 - Any action can be justified in right circumstances
 - Can even kill innocents
- Argument from Injustice
 - Correct moral theory will never require us to commit serious injustices
 - This theory sometimes requires us to commit serious injustices
 - Therefore utilitarianism is not correct moral theory
- Reply to Argument from Utilitarian
 - Justice is also intrinsically valuable
 - Injustice is never optimific
 - Justice must sometimes be sacrificed
- Rule Consequentialism
 - States → action morally right because it is required by an optimific social rule
 - This seems to solve problem of injustice
 - Some people say this is irrational rule worship

2) What is effective altruism? Name and explain the four underlying principles to effective altruism.

Provide examples.

Effective Altruism PT1

- What is it?
 - Social movement + Philosophy
 - Seeks effective ways to improve the world
- The Heart → compassion to inspire action
- .. but give with your head → consider evidence and impact
 - Giving money vs giving food to food bank
 - Transaction, sorting, cost of you vs them buying
 - Makes most sense to give money to food bank
- KEY PRINCIPLES
 - COST-EFFECTIVENESS → how much good is generated for every \$ I give?
 - Keeping a child in school might cost 1000\$ but deworming can keep a child in school a year for just 40\$ (25 times better)
 - IMPARTIALITY → whose life is worth more?
 - CAUSE PRIORITIZATION → are all problems in world equal?
 - Imagine a burning house with family of 5 trapped, you run in and take a nice painting → right thing to do?
 - COUNTERFACTUAL REASONING → what action maximizes positive impact?
 - Donate to provide guide dog for blind american or use that same amt of \$ to cure 400 - 2000 people of blindness
 - Donating time → is donating time really all that impactful?
- THOUGHT EXPERIMENT : CHILD IN A POND → Peter Singer
 - On way to work → child is drowning in pond → nobody is around to help
 - Do you
 - 1) save the child and hand it over to someone = be late for work
 - 2) don't save the child and get to work on time
 - Cost = loss of resources and time
 - Benefit = saving a child's life
- But why go through all this effort? Well there's tons of "drowning" children out there.
 - 12 die per minute of poverty related causes

Effective Altruism PT2

- Psychological Barriers
 - Identifiable Victim → we give less when many victims are presented instead of just 1
 - Some sort of deeper connection/personal connection you feel for 1 vs 100
 - The Other → we give less to those that seem **unlike us**
 - There are good reasons for these tendencies relating to evolution and survival
 - Same with things like geographical location
 - 19k people are dying every day, does it matter if we aren't walking past them in the streets? - Peter Singer

- Futility → we give less when our **contributions feel small** vs the need
 - “Because I can’t do everything, I won’t do anything”
 - More likely to donate if you can save 15/30 than if it only saved 1/10000
- Diffusion of Responsibility → we give less because other people can do it...
- Sense of Fairness → we give less when **others don’t do as much**
 - You write a cheque to donate → neighbours tell u about vacation...
- These are all understandable barriers but it is simply invalid to use them as an excuse.
- **START WITH YOUR HEART AND GIVE WITH YOUR HEAD**

3) What is moral standing? How is moral standing different depending on your ethical view?

Using

examples, discuss the difference between utilitarianism and Kantianism.

Kantianism

- 2 morally charged questions
 - **What if everyone did that?**
 - **How would you like it if someone did that to you?**
- Both raise an issue of FAIRNESS → but neither provides test for morality of actions
- Kant’s Principle of Universalizability
 - CONSISTENCY and FAIRNESS are the heart of morality
 - Action is only **acceptable IFF its maxim is universalizable**
 - Understanding the Principle
 - Maxim → principle applied to oneself
 - What one is GOING to do and WHY
 - Maxim is universalizable if one’s goal can be achieved in a world in which everyone acted on the same maxim
- Determining what to do
 - 1) Formulate Maxim Clearly
 - 2) Imagine → world where everyone supports and acts on same maxim
 - 3) Ask → can goal of my action be achieved in such a world
 - Action is only permissible if answer to 3) is yes
- TEST CASE: The Lying Promise
 - Maxim → Lie to a friend to escape from being hurt
 - Analysis → if everyone lied whenever convenient → nobody would trust anyone
 - In such world lying is ineffective
 - Therefore maxim is not universalizable
- Hypothetical and Categorical Imperatives
 - IMPERATIVE → a command of reason
 - HYPOTHETICAL → what to do in order to get what we want
 - CATEGORICAL → requirements of reason that applies to everyone, regardless of their desires

- Assessing the Principle of Universalizability
 - Maxim → kill anyone who damages your lawn
 - Appears universalizable → BUT wrong to act on it
- Kant on Absolute Moral Duties
 - Certain moral rules are absolute.
 - Principle of universalizability doesn't require this however...
- Principle of Humanity
 - Kant → always treat humans (self included) as an end, not as means
 - TREATING AS A MEANS → dealing with someone to achieve goals
 - TREATING AS AN END → treating someone with respect he deserves
- But what is Humanity?
 - Members of homosapiens
 - Kant → any being that is rational and autonomous
- Moral Status → how2be part of moral community?
 - Utilitarians → capacity to suffer
 - Kant → rationality and autonomy
- The Good Will
 - Kant says only thing good in all circumstances is the good will
 - THE GOOD WILL → ability to reliably know what your duty is
 - And a steady commitment to doing your duty for its own sake
- Moral Worth
 - Action is morally worth it IFF it is truly praiseworthy
 - Actions that possess moral worth = actions from goodwill
 - If you do the right things for the wrong reasons → Kant says those actions have no moral worth....
- Problems for Principle of Humanity
 - Notion of treating someone "as an end" is too vague → difficult to apply
 - Fails to give good advice about how to determine what people deserve
 - Autonomy Argument
 - Either our choices are necessitated or not
 - If they are, then they are out of control → we lack autonomy
 - If not necessitated, they are random → we lack autonomy
 - Therefore we lack autonomy
 - Principle assumes moral actions depends only on what we can autonomously control
 - But consider moral luck → cases in which morality of action depends on factors outside of our control
 - What about those that lack rationality and autonomy, why do they deserve respect?
 - Animals Argument
 - If principle is true → no animals have rights
 - No animals have rights → morally acceptable to torture them
 - If principle true → morally right to torture them

- BUT IT ISN'T RIGHT
- Therefore principle is FALSE

1) What is virtue ethics? Explain the ways in which virtue ethics can be used to support environmental ethics?

Virtue Ethics

- Most moral theories → What is right thing to do????
- Virtue ethics → What kind of person should I be?
 - AIM OF THEORY → discover conditions and **character traits that contribute to human flourishing**
- Acts are morally right because:
 - It is what a virtuous person, acting in character would do in that situation
 - Virtuous person → moral exemplar (role model for everyone)
- Virtue Ethics in the World
 - Nursing
 - Doctors
 - Teaching
 - Law
 - Things like → What kind of character do I want to have as a healthcare provider and what actions do I take to be consistent with this character
- Moral Complexity
 - Virtue ethics is a form of *ethical pluralism* → there is a moral rule corresponding to each virtue
 - There are many moral rules of thumb
 - BUT strict obedience of these rules leads us to error
 - Morality is an imprecise discipline...
- Moral Understanding and Moral Education
 - Requires emotional maturity
 - Emotions help see what is **morally relevant**
 - Emotions help tell **what is right and wrong**
 - Emotions motivate us to **do the right thing**
 - Virtue can be acquire only by training, experience, and practise
- The Nature of Virtue
 - Virtues → complex character traits that affect person's perceptions, thoughts, motives, and behaviour
 - Aristotle → character traits necessary to achieve **eudaimonia** → **happiness**
- Problem for Virtue Ethics
 - Tragic Dilemmas
 - Are there situations where there is NO morally praiseworthy action?
 - Moral Guidance
 - Sufficient evidence on how to live?
 - IMPRECISION → no clear cut rules to apply to situations

- MORAL LUCK → factors outside of our control
- DEMANDING → requires enormous sacrifices made by virtuous people
- ROLE MODELS → how2choose role model??
- Avoiding Contradiction
 - To avoid any contradiction virtue ethicists say:
 - Act is morally **required** because virtuous people would do it.
 - Act is morally **permitted** because SOME virtuous people would do it
 - Act is morally **forbidden** because NO virtuous people would do it
- Priority Problem
 - 1. Actions are morally right because virtuous people do it?
 - 2. Virtuous people perform those actions because the actions themselves are right?
 - Very similar to problem with DCT
 - If we accept the second reasoning, virtue ethics is not needed
- Advantages of Virtue Ethics
 - Can be made into an environmental ethic
 - In order to flourish → good environment
- Environmental Virtue Ethics
 - Extension
 - Justice, prudence, temperance, fortitude
 - Building from ground up
 - Care, compassion, respect, love
 - Exemplars
 - Julia Butterfly Hill → things in life of real worth are to be safeguarded

Test# 2 Review

2 of these questions will be included on the test. You will have to answer 1 question.

1) What is virtue ethics? Explain the ways in which virtue ethics can be used to support environmental ethics?

What is virtue ethics?

- about character and what kind of person should I be?
- aim is to discover conditions and traits that promote human flourishing
- morality of actions is determined by some virtuous figure (role model)
- is a form of ethical pluralism → there is moral rule corresponding to every virtue
- virtue is something obtained through training, experience, and practise
 - these all come alongside emotions
 - helps see what is morally relevant
 - helps tell you what is right/wrong
 - motivates you to do the right thing

Explain the ways in which virtue ethics can be used to support environmental ethics?

- one of the main advantages of virtue ethics is it can be made into an environmental ethic
- in order to promote human flourishing you MUST have a good environment

- completely new levels of virtue
 - instead of the traditional environmental ethics that regard humans as to having an obligation or duty towards the environment
 - environmental virtue ethics focuses on human relation to the environment
 - these relations are formed through character traits that humans ought to have without making its primary focus directed towards the environment
- THREE MAIN APPROACHES (via virtue lens)
 - 1) Extensionist Approach
 - a) Takes traditional virtues and extends them to promote operating in an environmentally meaningful way
 - 2) Virtue Theory Approach
 - a) Attempt to build an environmental virtue ethics from the ground up
 - 3) Environmental Exemplar Approach
 - a) Looking up to people who are considered environmentally virtuous models
 - i) Julia Butterfly Hill
 - ii) “Things in real life are worth it to go great lengths to safeguard them”

2) What is effective altruism? Name and explain the four underlying principles to effective altruism. Provide examples.

What is effective altruism?

- social movement and a philosophy
- aims to improve the world
- it starts with your heart but you give with your head
 - a compassion that is born inspires action
 - the action is carefully examined with evidence and its ability to impact the world positively

Name and explain the four underlying principles to effective altruism. Provide Examples.

- 1) COST-EFFECTIVENESS
 - a) how much good is generated for every \$ I give?
 - i) *Keeping a child in school might cost 1000\$ but deworming can keep a child in school a year for just 40\$ (25 times better)*
- 2) IMPARTIALITY
 - a) whose life is worth more? Must be impartial, do not benefit one over another
 - i) *Doesn't matter if a kid in poverty is 1000 km away, no lives are intrinsically more valuable than others.*
- 3) CAUSE PRIORITIZATION
 - a) are all problems in world equal?
 - i) *Imagine a burning house with family of 5 trapped, you run in and take a nice painting. Right thing to do? MUST CONSIDER ALL PROBLEMS [linked with #2]*
- 4) COUNTERFACTUAL REASONING
 - a) what action maximizes positive impact?
 - i) *Donate to provide guide dog for blind american or use that same amt of \$ to cure 400 - 2000 people of blindness*

- b) Donating time → is donating time really all that impactful?
 - i) In that same time, you could have made money and donated and made a bigger change

3) What is moral standing? How is moral standing different depending on your ethical view? Using examples, discuss the difference between utilitarianism and Kantianism.

What is moral standing?

- moral standing is the status of some entity and whether it is deserving of consideration in moral decision making
- when you consider if something has moral standing you ask... should I or other people take into account the well-being of that "something"

How is moral standing different depending on your ethical view?

- certain ethical views stand for different factors
- for example morality in religion simply depends on a transcendent being that tells you what is morally right and morally wrong
- your moral standing is dependent on what God considers to have moral standing
- in comparison, ethical egoism is largely focused on self-interest. Moral standing in both theories are completely different because ethical egoism involves mainly your own self and well-being

Using examples, discuss the difference between Utilitarianism and Kantianism

→ Utilitarianism

- a) There is one ultimate moral standard → PRINCIPLE OF UTILITY
 - i) *"An action is morally required because it does the most to improve overall well-being than any other action"*
- b) Goal is to maximize goodness
- c) What is wrong/right is determined from actual results
- d) Moral status due to ability to suffer

→ Kantianism

- a) Based on CONSISTENCY and FAIRNESS
- b) Moral standards based on PRINCIPLE OF UNIVERSALIZABILITY
 - i) "What if everyone did that?" [CONSISTENCY]
 - ii) "How would you like it if someone did that to you?" [FAIRNESS]
- c) We have moral status due to rationality and autonomy

4) Explain psychological and ethical egoism. How are they different? What is Hume's Guillotine? Is it a problem for psychological and ethical egoism?

Explain psychological and ethical egoism. How are they different?

→ Psychological Egoism

- a) It is a theory of how do we, as humans, behave not a theory of how we ought to behave
- b) Aimed towards avoiding personal loss, and gaining personal benefit
- c) Appeals to factors of SELF-INTEREST
 - i) Expected benefits
 - ii) Avoiding misery
 - iii) Strongest Desires

→ Ethical Egoism

- a) A theory of how humans ought to act
- b) Instead of just simply avoiding the bad and trying to obtain the good, actions are morally right if they best promote self-interest
- c) Appeals to factors that promote people being "better off"
 - i) Self-reliance → everyone minded own business → everyone would be better off
 - ii) Best Argument → morally required to do something, must be good reason → makes u better off

What is Hume's Guillotine? Is it a problem for psychological and ethical egoism?

→ precisely, the "is-ought" logical gap

→ You simply cannot obtain what humans ought to do based on some empirical evidence or what currently "is" in the world

→ there is no logical connection between logic/observation and moral knowledge

PROBLEM FOR ETHICAL EGOISM

- morally right actions are best promoting self-interest
- therefore we should do such actions

PROBLEM FOR PSYCH EGOISM

- no problems, it is simply attempting to describe how humans behave not how we ought to
- the logical gap has not been crossed

6) Utilitarianism is morally flexible. What does this claim mean? Explain how this is positive for this moral view. This flexibility poses a problem for a particular metaethical view, which view is it and explain the problem?

Utilitarianism is morally flexible. What does this claim mean? Explain how this is positive for this moral view.

→ This claim is essentially saying that, there is really no clear cut as to where utilitarianism draws the line for morally right and morally wrong

→ You simply attempt to maximize the goodness in the world, determined by the result of your actions and not your intentions

→ The big problem with this theory is that there is no way of measuring any of the moral goodness which urges the question of its flexibility

→ The main positive for this flexibility is that it is sensitive to circumstances

→ this invokes some form of practicality

→ as long as you provide a rule or some reasoning that maximizes the goodness

This flexibility poses a problem for a particular metaethical view, which view is it and explain the problem?

→ One of the metaethical theories is called the Error Theory

→ What is it?

- ALL ORDINARY MORAL JUDGEMENTS ARE WRONG
- INTRINSIC MORAL WRONGNESS does not exist to begin with

→ Problem : Morality and Self-Interest are not identical.

- This notion of flexibility should not even be there
- What is personally good for me is not necessarily the right thing to do
- More often than not, our self-interest do not line up with what is moral
-