

ANALOGY AND SYMBOL

ANALOGY

Analogy – compares the normal use of a word to its religious use, used by Aquinas and Aristotle

Univocal – words with identical meaning in different statements

Equivocal – words with entirely different meanings in different sentences

Aquinas – we can deduce 4 ways of making judgements – strength of any analogy depends on similarities; similarity only exists in identical relations/properties; good analogies are based on underlying principles; they do not need to assume acquaintance

Aristotle – the apophatic way says human language is wholly inadequate in describing God but we do not need to assume it tells us nothing

AQUINAS

Analogy of attribution – something about an author/maker from the product he has created (eg “the bread is good” suggests “the baker is good”)

- Based on the belief that God is creator of the universe so everything comes from him

Analogy of proportion – from a lesser object, say something else such as God has proportionately more of the same quality (eg a 3yo is good at drawing might be good at drawing for a 3yo, not compared to an artist)

- doesn't apply to God – we can 't say God is proportionately more just than us as he is infinitely more just than us

PROBLEMS OF ANALOGY

Brummer – God's nature is not accessible to us as use of an adjective only tells us what humans mean by it

Ramsey – there has got to be something in language we can use to describe God; Disclosure situation – happens when see something beyond reality/understanding vs Qualified Model – language models something else

Barth – Ramsey/analogy is mistaken – we cannot approach God through language based on our experience

SYMBOL

- Developed the theory that religious language could be symbolic but distinguished between a sign/symbol
- Signs are just conventional whereas a symbol requires participation
- Religious language has the characteristics of a symbol
- If you say “God is love” - utterance is not merely a sign of what God is but a participation in the reality of God
- Religious statements do not give us literally true about God but they are cognitive
- May have a limited lifespan, changing in power or meaning

J. H. RANDALL JR

- Argues religious symbols are non-cognitive and non-representative (does not stand for any reality beyond itself)
- Religion is a human activity and contributes to human culture
- Eg a piece of music speaks to us in a way translated into anything else
- Religion has it's own world like music – arouses certain feelings
- God is another aspect of our psyche and spirituality so it makes no sense to ask if this is “true”
- We don't need to determine truth/accuracy of God as a symbol, religion is a human enterprise which performs a valuable function but symbols are non-representative

PROBLEMS OF SYMBOL

- Is symbol any better than analogy? - tells us what the terms do but not what they mean
- If God simply stands for the unknown nature of God, how does symbol participate? – is the symbol the entire proposition or the underlying concept of the goodness of God?
- What are the different levels of participation with a symbol?

Ethics



Conscience Knowledge Organiser

<p>Kohlberg's 3 levels of conscience</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pre-conventional: established in childhood through reward and punishment – right behaviours are rewarded and wrong behaviours are punished. 2. Conventional: the development of good relationships with others leads people to want to obey the rules of society to avoid guilt. 3. Post-conventional: Utilitarian understanding that good for society is more important than good for individuals. This leads to the development of an individual conscience that makes consistent choices for the good of everyone. This is Kantian in nature as choices become universalizable. Not many people get here. <p>Application to the Heinz Dilemma: (should a man steal medicine for his dying wife from a corrupt pharmacist?)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pre-conventional - Heniz should not steal the drug because he personally could be punished, e.g put in prison. 2. Conventional – whilst society thinks this is wrong, which means it could be wrong to steal, he may be justified in saving his wife as we understand this is good and he has a good motivation. 3. Post-conventional – we cannot universalize the act of stealing and we have to uphold society's rules, so he should not take the drug. 	<p>Freud's view of conscience as an aspect of the Super-Ego</p> <p>Psyche – Freud's term for the human mind and personality. Super Ego: controlling, restraining self. Controls the Eros and Thanatos. Acts as an "inner parent" and gives moral commands. The conscience is the operating of the SE: giving moral commands and punishing us with guilt. Ego: the rational self, helping us to process the desires of the id. Id: the unconscious and instinctive part of personality, containing the Eros (sexual desire) and Thanatos (aggression). The role of upbringing: Conscience is an expression of the rules that we learnt in early childhood – we were "trained" as children to understand what is right and wrong – therefore the conscience is developed by our relationships with other people and does not exist as a moral authority without those people. The function of guilt: The conscience cannot be seen as the voice of God, but feelings of guilt and shame can be caused in us through religious laws, particularly if we had a religious upbringing. The conscience, as the "Inner Parent" is simply our internalised views that have come from our upbringing, experienced as feelings of guilt and shame.</p>	<p>Durkheim's view of sanctions in society:</p> <p>God is a useful idea: God is a useful idea in society, giving us a moral obligation to obey society's demands. Conscience is part of our loyalty to society and fear of judgment from others.</p> <p>The collective conscience: beliefs agreed on by those in the same society. Acts are bad because society disapproves of them.</p> <p>How the conscience is evolutionary: allows society to grow stronger, it is a survival mechanism developed by people sharing the same moral values.</p> <p>Therefore, the conscience develops to allow society to survive, and having a good conscience allows us to fall in line with society's expectations of us. We are controlled by our fear of judgement and exclusion, so we follow our conscience, this is particularly true in religious social groups.</p>	<p>Fromm's 2 types of conscience:</p> <p>Authoritarian Conscience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Society is designed to make us obey rules and conform to norms. • People feel guilt and fear when they are disobedient to the rules of society. This is because they don't want to be shunned by society for disobeying rules. • Rather than people focusing on moral issues, people feel guilt when they have broken a rule. • The conscience becomes the internalised voice of society, which disapproves of our actions. <p>Humanistic Conscience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The humanistic conscience has awareness of what makes life flourish and what destroys it. • The humanistic conscience leads humans to civil disobedience when necessary – humans therefore resist societies norms when they are morally wrong. Examples come from those who resisted the Nazi regime and more recently have resisted that implementation of nuclear weapons. • Rejecting the authoritarian conscience and embracing the humanistic conscience allows us to reach our full potential as people.
<p>Aquinas: Conscience as a faculty of reasons.</p> <p>Synderesis Rule: Act in a way that does good and avoids evil</p> <p>Relationship to Natural Moral Law: Conscience is our God-give ability to reason, so it is how we work out the primary and secondary precepts, and allows us to formulate deontological rules.</p> <p>Relationship with Divine Law: The laws that we understand through reason are supported through divine law, meaning that the Bible and Catholic tradition work as a useful guide to help us confirm our reasoning is right.</p> <p>Why conscience is NOT the voice of God: This implies that God lead us and gives us direct commands through divine revelation – rather, he has given us our ability to reason so does not need to speak to us directly as a voice. <i>"Reason in man is rather like God in the world."</i></p> <p>Why conscience is fallible, give adultery as an example: Due to the Fall of Man, the conscience can make mistakes ("err") – there are times where we think we are being reasonable and in reality we are not. This often happens when we act on good intentions rather than following the rational law. It can also occur "invincibly" when we do not have all the information in a situation when we act.</p> <p>Why conscience should always be followed: - regardless of its potential to go wrong, the conscience should always be followed because it is the method that God gave us to be reasonable.</p>	<p>Butler's reflective Principle.</p> <p>Conscience as a natural property: Like Aquinas, he agrees that the conscience is our God-given ability to reason that should always be followed. He presumes that all human beings have a sense of right and wrong. Everyone has a conscience and ought to obey it.</p> <p>2 principles that govern human behaviour:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Self-love - This is a desire for happiness for the self. It is "who can reflect upon themselves and their own interest or happiness, so as to have that interest an object to their minds" 2. Benevolence - This is the desire or hope for happiness in other people. <p>Conscience as an intuitive moral judge: It is not an intuitive feeling about what is right - instead, it is an ability to use reason to weigh up factors in a moral decision. This is teleological, we weigh up the consequences and decide.</p> <p>Why conscience must always be followed: Butler says we have a number of influences, but the conscience should not be seen as merely one among many drives or passions. The conscience should have ultimate authority over all of our instincts God has given us this ability to reason so it is our ultimate authority. Key quote: Conscience is "fixed, steady, and immovable" – it should be followed in a deontological way.</p>	<p>Fletcher's Agapeic Principle:</p> <p>Act in a way that produces the most loving consequence in every situation.</p> <p>Conscience as a verb, not a noun: Conscience is not something we have, it is a process that we use, it is more accurate to say that we are "consciencing" because it is an active and dynamic process.</p> <p>How conscience relates to the Rule of Love: We are using this process of weighing up the consequences of our actions and considering, in a teleological way, how we can limit human suffering and act in the way that Jesus did (showing unconditional love).</p> <p>The importance of the situation: There are no moral absolutes, which means that moral decisions cannot be made in advance. Fletcher: "the morality of an action depends on the situation."</p> <p>Example of Mrs Bergmeier and adultery as a POW: She used the process of weighing up morality to decide that it was acceptable to commit adultery so she could become pregnant and be released from the POW camp. In this case, she recognised that her obligation to her marriage vows were less important than being reunited with her family, who needed her.</p>	<p>Christianity – conscience as the "voice of God":</p> <p>Augustine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conscience is a part of God's creation of humans. • The conscience is innate – meaning that it is put into the minds (or souls!) of humans by God. • He literally sees the conscience as the "voice of God". <p>St Paul:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Romans 2:15: The conscience is "a witness to the requirements of the law." • God judges those who are "pure of heart" – showing that there is some internal part of us that God will consider when giving out eternal life. <p>Schleiermacher:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a sin to go against one's conscience. • This is because God acts through the conscience, guiding a Christian over how they should behave. • The conscience should take priority over all other forms of morality as God is actively working through it. <p>The conscience is:</p> <p>"...as the voice of God within... an original revelation of God."</p> <p>This means that God speaks into each situation and guides people through divine revelation.</p>

Scholar	Strengths	Weaknesses
Kohlberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Everyone has a conscience, which develops throughout our lives – it is not a religious or supernatural idea. The conscience is a clear moral guide for everyone, making people understand what they should do. Evidence from psychology. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fact that there are different levels means that not everyone will act in the same way – it does not give a clear framework of actions in a deontological way. Sometimes people's motivations are bad – e.g. pre-conventional conscience is very selfish, thinking only of own reward and punishment.
Freud	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence from psychology to back up his points. Everyone has a conscience – it is not supernatural and does not depend on God. Explains feelings of guilt and why people have religious convictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Freud's work has been widely discredited, particularly his methods. The psyche is unverifiable by empirical means. Religious people would reject it. There are no deontological rules provided by conscience as it depends on one's conscience.
Durkheim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Everyone has a conscience because it is not supernatural or from God. The conscience is a clear moral guide – encouraging the development of society. It helps people to survive by upholding law and order. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What happens if society is immoral? We become immoral to when we help it to survive. Religious people would reject the vice of God as being useful for society control. There are no deontological rules.
Fromm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives people the opportunity for civil disobedience, overcoming the issues of Durkheim's sociological view. Non-religious view that is relevant to everyone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are different levels so there are no deontological rules, everyone makes their own interpretation, there is not set morality. Some people get stuck in the authoritarian stage, and can do immoral acts.

Scholar	Strengths	Weaknesses
Aquinas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquinas argues that everyone has the ability to reason, so it is universal. There are deontological rules so conscience should lead to everyone behaving in the same way. It explains why people make mistakes, and encourages human development to avoid these mistakes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be criticised with Divine Command Theory criticisms – how can non-religious people still be moral? Not everyone has the ability to reason – e.g. disabled and mentally ill. Evidence from different cultural practices across the world give evidence that the conscience is not universal. Why should it be the ultimate authority if it makes mistakes?
Butler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conscience is not a supernatural concept from God but is a process of reasoning. Balances between helping oneself and helping others. There are intuitive aspects making it flexible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People make mistakes, so why should it be an ultimate authority? Atheists would not agree with this process coming from God. Intuition makes the conscience more objective – people will do different things based on their own reasoning.
Fletcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conscience is not a thing but a process, meaning it is not supernatural. It is flexible to all situations. Unloving rules can be broken, unlike in Aquinas' view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is subjective – individuals interpret "love" differently. This means that there is no set morality, and it makes dialogues between moral agents confusing. Can allow any action as long as the consequences are good. It is impossible to predict the future so we cannot use it properly.
Traditional Christians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schleiermacher – the conscience is God's Divine Revelation, so it is flexible to all situations. St Paul – God considers both how we follow the law and our intentions, making it a hybrid approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no set definition of conscience in the Bible, so these interpretations may not be correct. If the conscience is the voice of God, it could lead us to break divine law (Leibniz's paradox). Does not apply to atheists.

Application of Sociological and Psychological Views

- Adultery:**
- There is no set view on the morality of adultery, it depends on our context and upbringing.
 - Freud – we may think adultery is right if we witnessed it as children. Those in religious households may feel a lot of guilt if they break the rules regarding adultery that they learnt in childhood.
 - Durkheim – we change our behaviour based on how society will judge us – this means in some contexts (e.g. religious societies) it is wrong, but in others it may be accepted.
 - Kohlberg – our attitude to this issue depends on the stage of conscience that we are at – e.g. post conventional will not do it as it breaks down society and the concept of marriage, whereas conventional may find times when it is justifiable despite society's rules.
- Lies and breaking promises:**
- No set approach.
 - We naturally avoid guilt, if this makes us feel guilty we will avoid it (Freud).
 - There are times when it may be necessary for the good of society – Fromm's Humanistic and Durkheim's evolutionary (although for Durkheim if it harms society it is wrong as it doesn't let society evolve and survive).

Application of Christian Views

- Adultery:**
- Outlawed in divine law – relevant to all Christians.
 - Aquinas and Butler – our reason should tell us that this is wrong, if we think it is right we are making an error.
 - Fletcher: Example of Mrs Bergermier does show that there are extreme circumstances where it may be necessary.
- Lies and breaking promises:**
- Outlawed in divine law – relevant to all Christians.
 - Aquinas and Butler – this is unreasonable.
 - St Paul – does not show that we are pure of heart and this God will judge us for it.
 - Fletcher – there are times where it could be necessary.

Practise Questions: Bullet point plan your answers as an optional extension:

- A01:**
- Examine the variety of views on how the conscience is used to make decisions about the act of adultery.
 - Examine the varying religious views of the conscience.
 - Examine the differences between religious and non-religious views of the conscience.
- A02:**
- "The conscience has no value as a moral guide." Evaluate this statement (40)
 - "It is best to view the conscience as a sociological phenomenon." Evaluate this statement (40)
 - "Psychological studies have undermined Christian views of the conscience." Evaluate this statement. (40)

Conscience A02

Ethics



Meta Ethics Knowledge Organiser

ETHICAL NATURALISM

How good is defined: "There are objective moral facts and properties and these moral facts and properties are natural facts and properties." This means that good is defined as something that is naturally occurring in the world, and is equated with pleasure. In this case, good refers to the feeling of pleasure, whereas bad refers to the feeling of pain.

Which scholars and theories are naturalistic: Bentham's Utilitarianism is naturalistic because of the Utility Principle, that morality is based on whether or not an action causes pain or pleasure. He is hedonistic, atheist and democratic in his understanding of what constitutes morality.

How naturalistic perspectives make moral decisions: As well as simply considering, from our own experience, what actions cause pleasure in comparison to those that cause pain, Bentham also offers the Hedonic Calculus to help people consider how much pleasure their action will bring about.

1. **Intensity:** stronger happiness is better than weaker.
2. **Duration:** longer lasting pleasure is better than brief.
3. **Certainty:** An act that will definitely produce pleasure is better than one which only possibly produces pleasure.
4. **Propinquity/Remoteness:** the more immediate in space or time the anticipated pleasure, the more relevant it should be to the decision.
5. **Fecundity/Production:** a pleasure that leads to more pleasure is of greater value than a pleasure that does not lead to more, similarly a pain that leads to more pain is worse than a pain with no painful after effects.
6. **Purity:** A pleasure with no pain mixed in, is the greatest pleasure.
7. **Extent:** the more people sharing the pleasure, the better.

DIVINE COMMAND THEORY:

How good is defined: for theories that fall into this category, good is what is commanded by God and evil is what is forbidden by God. Divine Command Theory is a **non-naturalist theory**, because it holds that the source of 'good' is not in nature at all, but is in a supernatural being (a being who is literally 'above nature') – God. The reasoning behind DCT depends on a Classically Theist view of God: **because God is omnibenevolent (all loving and all good) this means he is the source of goodness in the world, and by extension, everything that he forbids must be evil.** St Thomas Aquinas develops this idea in his Gradations of Good Theory/ the Analogy of Attribution

Aquinas says that God is good and that we have good in us because we are **pale imitations** of god. The good in us **isn't as big** as the good in God, but it is there because God is good. In summary, then, Divine Command Theory is based both on God's moral character and God's moral commands, and these commands are understood as statements of God's will.

Which scholars and theories subscribe to DCT:

Religious Legalism: a legalistic/fundamentalist religious viewpoint that the ethical commands given in the Bible are deontological rules that cannot be broken. Legalistic branches of Judaism uphold the rules of the Torah, including the strict code of morality and ritual cleanliness found in Leviticus. Christians are more likely to uphold the Decalogue of Exodus 20 and the teachings of Jesus such as the Beatitudes and the Sermon on the Mount.

Natural Moral Law: NML is deontological, and constitutes DCT because what God has commanded in the scriptures forms legalistic secondary precepts that cannot be broken. Furthermore C16th Manualism contributed to the legalistic nature of NML, by monks compiling large volumes of secondary precepts, based on God's will in the scriptures and church tradition.

How DCT perspectives make moral decisions: use of scripture, consultations of Church tradition, prayer and advice from religious leaders.

MORAL INTUITIONISM:

How good is defined: good cannot be a natural fact or property because this constitutes the "naturalistic fallacy" (Moore). G.E. Moore argued that good is not the same as a pleasure or any other natural quality, it is simply "good" < a quality that is indefinable beyond that one term. Goodness, Moore argued is simple and indefinable like 'yellow.' If you were to try to define 'yellow' to a blind person, you would be unable. Moore argued the same thing about good: it is a mistake to define good in terms of something else, such as pleasure as you have failed to define good, you have simply given an example of it. In the same way, if you try to define yellow by referring to the sun or sand on a beach or a rubber duck, you haven't defined yellow, you've simply described an object that possesses the quality 'yellow.' Moore comments "good is good, and that is simply the end of the matter."

How intuitive perspectives make moral decisions: According to Moore, "goodness" is self-evident. He discovers this in a teleological way – he argues that looking at the consequences of an action tell us if something is right or wrong. **Intuitionism argues that morality is objective and cognitive.** Intuitionists argue that we just know what goodness is.

H. A. Pritchard said that working out right/wrong is our **duty**, which we use intuition to work out. In this respect, the concept of duty sounds a little more **deontological** than Moore's teleological perspective. said there were two kinds of thinking: **reason** brought together the facts about a situation, **and intuition** perceived the right thing to do.

WD Ross argued that **moral principles can't be absolute.** He said that we have **prima facie** (at first appearance) **duties:** keeping promises, making up for harm done, gratitude, justice, beneficence, self-improvement and non-maleficence. Intuition identifies our prima facie duties, but our actions are down to our judgement.

WEAKNESSES OF DIVINE COMMAND THEORY:

Euthyphro Dilemma:

An unresolved philosophical question: Are moral actions good because God commands them to be so, or does God command them because they are good actions?

If morals come from an independent source, then God is not omnipotent as morality applies to God too. The possibility of moral judgement is removed completely if we say morality comes for God – it is only good because God says so, humans no longer have free will to judge for themselves. Peter Geach argues morality exists outside of God so God is irrelevant (i.e. does not exist).

Leibniz's Paradox:

"If God wills a person to do the opposite of what God has already willed, this would be morally good."

This is a possibility within Divine Command Theory.

It applies to issues such as murder – God commands us not to murder but also supports war in the OT.

This shows that Divine Command Theory is logically absurd.

Ineffability:

God's character is fundamentally unknowable.

We are not omnipotent or omniscient so we cannot know the will of God.

Aquinas: No one can fully know the will of God.

God's will is not always understood in the same way by everyone who applies their reason to it.

The message of Scripture and Church Tradition is not always clear: e.g. in the past it was wrong for women to lead a Church (CoE) but now it is acceptable.

Supervenience:

Statements from the Bible that intend to convey facts or information are seen as being on a lower "level" than ethical commands.

However, people often move between the levels without distinguishing them – a piece of information from the Bible such as "mankind is made in the image of God" is formed into the ethical command "abortion is wrong."

There is no way of measuring if it is right, or in keeping with the will of God, that Christians form ethical commands from facts they read in the Bible.

God does not do this so should humans?

Situation Ethics:

Rather than being deontological it is better to follow the example of Jesus and use a flexible ethic to determine morality – actions are right if they produce the most loving thing, rather than being right because they follow the law.

Weaknesses of Ethical Naturalism

Happiness varies between people, so is impossible to define. Some people derive pleasure from inflicting pain, which can hardly be called 'good' for the majority. "**Happiness**" is **therefore subjective**. It requires us (like all consequentialist theories) to second-guess the future, but the fact is that we can never be sure of the consequences of our actions, so any decision we make may turn out to maximise pain rather than pleasure. The principle of 'the greatest good for the greatest number' is assumed to be right, but it is often minorities who are right. Moreover, the principle in effect ignores the rights of the minority, and for many people there is something wrong with any ethical theory which does this. It allows us to do evil so that good might come (treats everything as a means to an end: this contradicts Kant who argues that humans should never be treated as a means to an end, but as ends in themselves). For example, in a time of crisis, innocent people may be imprisoned or executed if it calms down the population (if say they are believed to be responsible for terrorist acts). The British police were guilty of this during the Northern Irish troubles. It is too impartial: the burning house dilemma. If a house is burning down and it contains your Mum and a cancer specialist who is about to develop a cure for cancer, who should you save? It would have to be the cancer specialist. Utilitarianism does not take account of family ties. It is impractical to calculate what you should do to such an extent in day-to-day life.

Strengths of Ethics Naturalism

One obvious strength of ethical naturalism is that ethical propositions are true because they are factual. **It gives a factual basis for morality**. They 'reduce to' non-ethical properties about the world, such as happiness, love and well-being, and these facts are grounded in nature or in human nature. 2 Further, right and wrong are **objective** – they exist in the world outside ourselves. If there is an objective moral reality, then we can know if we are doing right or wrong. 3 Ethical propositions can give us **solid guidelines and rules to follow**, as with Rule Utilitarianism, for example and Bentham's Pleasure Calculus, where pleasure is measured by its intensity, duration, certainty, proximity, productiveness, purity and extent. 4 **We can be judged by our compliance with the rules**. It gives us a way of measuring the moral worth of people, if we break the rules, then this gives us the justification for punishing offenders. UK politics is broadly utilitarian in character. 5 Most people tend to follow (knowingly or otherwise) one naturalist theory or another. It is often said, for example, that many principles of law and politics in the UK are broadly utilitarian in character. **It therefore fits with human nature and society**: If you ask people what they want, most will say that they want happiness. 7. overcomes the problems of deontology: We are able to consider the consequences of our actions, unlike with deontological ethics. It is natural to consider consequences, so it is easy to use Hedonic Calculus. 9. Utilitarianism is secular: it could therefore appeal to the non-religious as an ethical system and does not depend upon God to underwrite moral norms. 10. Mill's Utilitarianism promotes general societal happiness and it is natural to see physical and mental pleasures are different.

Weaknesses of Moral Intuitionism

- It is very hard to define what actually constitutes "good", as it is wrong to compare goodness with natural facts and properties.
- Between scholars, it is not clear whether good is understood in a teleological way or a deontological way: Moore suggests teleological, whilst Ross suggests deontological.
- Intuitionism allows for objective moral values to be identified and therefore proposes a form of moral realism. It is not a question of dismissing the possibility of any moral facts.
- Intuitionism does not propose a subjective or emotive approach to ethics but it does avoid the problems of identifying ethics with a natural property.
- Whilst we may recognise the wrongness of some actions, it is difficult to specify exactly why they are wrong. Rather we interpret it through a moral sense, not a list of moral definitions.
- We can identify a moral sense in the same way as we might identify an aesthetic sense in art or literature.
- Intuitionism allows for moral duties and obligations, and so satisfies a moral absolutist.
- The intuitionist points to the existence of a considerable common consensus on moral issues, such as the value of human life, as evidence of a common intuition of morality.
- Intuition may be associated with the idea of conscience as a moral guide.

Strengths of Moral Intuitionism

- Overcomes issues of Bentham's ethic equating goodness with pleasure.
- It does not seek to define an undefinable concept, it simply accepts that goodness is goodness.
- Ross' prima facie duties help us to understand what constitutes moral behaviour, giving us a practical guide to use in everyday life.
- People do intuit and reason to different conclusions and there is no obvious way to resolve their differences.
- Saying that we can "just know" if a consequence is right or wrong is subjective and hard to measure.
- How can we be sure that our intuitions are correct? Is it a gut feeling? Is it God's direction? How reliable is experience as a guide?
- Intuition may be considered to be a meaningless concept, since it is non-verifiable.
- Hume argued that we have a motivation for acting in certain ways, although intuitionists may respond to this with the suggestion that if we feel motivated towards a particular action it is because we have an innate desire to do it that goes beyond reason.

Strengths of Divine Command Theory:

- Easy to use as it is deontological – actions are right or wrong and the circumstances don't need to be considered.
- Lots of sources of authority to check behaviour – e.g. Bible, church tradition, faith practitioners.
- Is ow most religions function, at least to an extent.
- Many of the laws of DCT are reflected in secular laws anyway – e.g. that it is wrong to steal or lie.

- Practise Questions: Bullet point plan your answers as an optional extension:**
- A01:**
1. Examine the decision making of Ethical Naturalism
 2. Examine Moral Intuitionism with reference to the Naturalistic Fallacy
 3. Examine the differences between Divine Command Theory and Moral Intuitionism.
- A02:**
1. "Ethical Naturalism is an ineffective moral theory." Evaluate this statement (40)
 2. "Divine Command Theory is the best way to understand the difference between right and wrong." Evaluate this statement (40)
 3. "Moral Intuitionism is an ineffective theory." Evaluate this statement. (40)

Meta Ethics A02

The Naturalistic Fallacy:

Why does Moral Intuitionism reject Ethical Naturalism? The naturalistic fallacy is an argument from ethical non-naturalism. What Moore argued, is that a mistake that many ethicists have made is to describe or define 'good' in terms of things that exist (natural properties) that we already understand. For example, in Utilitarianism, goodness is associated with pleasure and in Natural Law, goodness is associated with things that do not go against nature. Moore argued that this is wrong. Goodness, Moore argued is simple and indefinable like 'yellow.' If you were to try to define 'yellow' to a blind person, you would be unable. Moore argued the same thing about good: it is a mistake to define good in terms of something else, such as pleasure as you have failed to define good, you have simply given an example of it. In the same way, if you try to define yellow by referring to the sun or sand on a beach or a rubber duck, you haven't defined yellow, you've simply described an object that possesses the quality 'yellow.'

For Moore, **good is not a natural property** i.e. it cannot be experienced, whereas pleasure, pain, joy, misery all are, because we can experience them through our senses. To say that something pleasurable is good, or that something painful is bad is a mistake for Moore.

If Moore is right, you can see straight away that there is a problem with Utilitarianism, where 'pleasure' is at the heart of Bentham's theory, which says that 'pleasure is good', so 'we ought to seek pleasure'.

THE VERIFICATION PRINCIPLE

Logical positivism and the Vienna Circle

- Logical positivism was an approach developed by the Vienna Circle suggesting metaphysics was meaningless and the task of philosophers was the logical analysis of sentences – separating the meaningful from the meaningless
- Basic premise – you can only make statements that you can verify empirically
- ANALYTICAL PROPOSITION – statements that contain all the information within the statement
- SYNTHETIC PROPOSITIONS – factual statements which can be confirmed a posteriori

The Principle

- A sentence is meaningful if and only if it is a tautology or is verifiable by sense experience
- Strong – requires conclusive empirical evidence, rejected by Ayer as impossible
- Weak – adopted by Ayer, states that one must be able to state what empirical evidence would make a sentence probable
- Ayer says strong is impossible as we can't conclusively make any statement about the world as our senses can always be mistaken
- If we ask for verification in the strong sense, every factual sentence would be meaningless – this would be irrational and science would be meaningless also

A. J. Ayer

- 20th century British philosopher, accepts the a priori/a posteriori division
- Says – must be a tautology (a priori), have practical verifiability or be verifiable in principle
- Says if we were to ask for verification in the strong sense, every factual sentence would be meaningless so can we really verify anything?
- Rejects as meaningless any metaphysical language that looks outside immediate sense experience to God or “The Absolute” - religious belief in God is without meaning, as is atheism

AO2

- How can we really verify anything? – if we look at historical records for example, they may also be wrong
- We can never experience every possible instance, past, present and future, to be able to say it is conclusively true

Swinburne

- Against logical positivism – as claims there are sentences which clearly have meaning even if they are not verifiable eg “some of the toys... while any humans in the house are asleep come out of their boxes and dance”
- AO2 against this – we can picture the event because we understand the words in the sentence but this doesn't make the sentence genuine or factual

Tautologies

- A sentence in which the definition of the subject necessarily contains the meaning of the predicate
- True by definition but with no factual information
- The sentence “a triangle has 3 sides” is true because the phrase “triangle” always includes having 3 sides but this doesn't tell us about the world, only the rules of language
- This is truth, but not a fact
- When we talk about facts, we mean to say something about what is actually the case

Empirically verifiable propositions

- A sentence whose truth can be determined by observation such as Ben Nevis is the highest mountain
- We require some sort of observation to determine if a sentence is truth – sometimes sense experience can be direct but it may be indirect.
- BUT – not all sentences can be determined by observation – so would be meaningless to a logical positivist