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## Affirmative Evidence

### Objective Morality True-Acceptance

#### Objective Morality exists because people accept that there are norms in society that are inherently true

**JAMES BARTLETT, STEVEN**. THE OBJECTIVITY OF TRUTH, MORALITY, AND BEAUTY, 2016, http://cogprints.org/10282/1/Bartlett\_The%20Objectivity%20of%20Truth,%20Morality,%20and%20Beauty.pdf

This is not a sophism, not a smokescreen to disguise, elevate, and dignify the “merely relative” by coining an unfamiliar phrase. Let me give some examples of objective results that are framework-relative: Euclidean geometry’s theorems are objective in this sense; they are provably true relative to a set of definitions, postulates, and rules of inference. Similarly, Riemannian geometry, which rejects Euclid’s parallel postulate, leads to a set of true propositions, which are provable relative, again, to a specified set of definitions, postulates, and rules of inference. Lobashevskian geometry, which also repudiates the parallel postulate in a different way, leads to demonstrable results relative to an alternative set of definitions, postulates, and rules of inference.

All such results are objectively demonstrable. What meaning does the term ‘objectivity’ have, other than simply the capacity to establish results that are not subject to controversy and can be replicated by competent colleagues1in a given discipline—provided that they accept the framework which the establishment of such results must presuppose? If they don’t accept that framework, they beg the question, they engage in what philosophers call a petitio principii—they refuse to abide by the rules of the game at issue, perhaps because they wish to use alternative rules and play a different game, or perhaps because they are being intellectually recalcitrant, believing that the skepticism they express is not itself self-undermining (which it is).2 As long as you accept the rules of chess, some moves are objectively good, and others are objectively bad. As long as you accept the definitions, postulates, and rules of inference of Euclidean geometry, then there are results in Euclidean geometry that are objectively provable. This is what ‘framework-relativity’ means, and the metatheory that leads to the recognition of framework-relativity is itself objectively provable—by showing that any (possible) attempt to deny it leads to self-referential inconsistency of a particularly devastating kind.3

### Objective Morality True-Justice

#### Objective Morality exists because people feel a need for justice, which is rooted in a moral foundation of what is fair

**Zhuoyao Li** (2016) The public conception of morality in John Rawls' political liberalism, Ethics & Global Politics, 9:1, 28679, DOI: 10.3402/egp.v9.28679 <https://doi.org/10.3402/egp.v9.28679>

There are three features of a political conception of justice that is the focus of an overlapping consensus: first, ‘such a conception is, of course, a moral conception ... worked out for a specific kind of subject, namely, for political, social, and economic institutions’; second, ‘it is presented as free-standing and expounded apart from, or without reference to, any such wider background’; third, ‘its content is expressed in terms of certain fundamental ideas seen as implicit in the public political culture of a democratic society’.17 In a footnote, Rawls further comments that in saying that a conception is moral, he means ‘among other things, that its content is given by certain ideals, principles and standards; and that these norms articulate certain values, in this case political values’.18 Together, these remarks point to a puzzle regarding Rawls’ understanding of morality. Since Rawls is explaining what it means for a political conception of justice to be moral in the footnote, it is reasonable to interpret the statement to mean that the content of the political conception of justice is given by certain moral ideals, principles, and standards. But one cannot understand these ideals, principles, and standards to imply comprehensive moral doctrines.

Moreover, it is almost certainly wrong to say that the political conception of justice is amoral or even immoral. So how should one reconcile Rawls’ remark that the political conception of justice is ‘of course’ a moral conception with his explicit commitment to exclude comprehensive moral doctrines from the domain of the political? Besides the footnote, the only concrete clue we have from Rawls is his claim that ‘the distinction between political conceptions of justice and other moral conceptions is a matter of scope, that is, the range of subjects to which a conception applies, and the wider content a wider range requires’.19 It is clear that Rawls has in mind a broader conception of morality, and a narrower conception of political justice, which naturally follows given Rawls’ distinction between comprehensive doctrines and the limited political conception of justice. But this does not help us understand what specific conception of morality Rawls has in mind.

### Objective Morality True-Mutuality

#### Objective morality exists because as a species, we mutually accept standards set by society for good conduct

**Zhuoyao Li** (2016) The public conception of morality in John Rawls' political liberalism, Ethics & Global Politics, 9:1, 28679, DOI: 10.3402/egp.v9.28679 <https://doi.org/10.3402/egp.v9.28679>

According to Rainer Forst, justification is behind everything.43 A variety of definitions of human beings, such as animal rationale and animal sociale, essentially characterize humans as justifying and reason-giving beings.44 Thomas Scanlon shares a similar view. The essence of Scanlon’s contractualist moral theory is famously summarized in his principle: ‘An act is wrong if its performance under the circumstances would be disallowed by any set of principles for the general regulation of behavior that no one could reasonably reject as a basis for informed, unforced general agreement’.45 This principle neither makes reference to the ontological and epistemological aspect of moral reality, nor does it appeal to any metaphysical truth. Instead, ‘the contractualist ideal of acting in accord with principles that others (similarly motivated) could not reasonably reject is meant to characterize the relation with others the value and appeal of which underlies our reasons to do what morality requires’.46 In other words, the objective basis of morality need not rest on naturalistic or metaphysical entities. Instead, it can be normatively constructed through mutually justificatory relations.

### Objective Morality True-“I” accept

#### Objective Morality exists because as people, we internalize the choice and that incites emotions and feelings that drives us towards what is good

**Zhuoyao Li** (2016) The public conception of morality in John Rawls' political liberalism, Ethics & Global Politics, 9:1, 28679, DOI: 10.3402/egp.v9.28679 <https://doi.org/10.3402/egp.v9.28679>

It will be remembered that the source of the queerness of morality is its objective prescriptivity. Once we adopt justificatory objectivity, this sense of queerness disappears. On the one hand, morality is objective. As for the epistemological part of the argument, one might respond that moral objectivity need not lie in its ‘external’ reality as ontological objectivity suggests; instead, morality is objective because moral demands can be reasonably, that is, reciprocally and generally justified to all. As for the metaphysical part of the argument, one might similarly respond that moral reasons are ‘independently’ valid regardless of the agent’s subjective motives, and they are reasons for all without their corresponding to a transcendent reality that must be ‘discovered’ with special faculties.47 On the other hand, morality is prescriptive in virtue of its justificatory objectivity. Moral demands are ‘subjective’ only insofar as that it is ‘I’ who demands it. Moral demands are equally ‘objective’, because these demands must first pass the test of reasonable justification in order to be ‘moral’. To ask for an answer to the question of ‘what ought I to do’ is also to demand a justification for the answer, and moral questions are ‘answered only with strictly shared reasons; they are ‘‘objective’’ insofar as they cannot be reasonably (reciprocally or generally) rejected’.48 Therefore, even though it is ‘I’ who utters the moral demand, it is really the justifying and hence the objective ‘we’ that give this demand its prescriptive power. Being reasonably justified excludes any moral reasons for an agent not to follow the demand, because so doing will be against her justifying and reason-demanding human nature (according to Forst) and will exclude herself from the cooperative relation (according to Scanlon).49 A justificatory view thus maintains the objective prescriptivity of morality. Once we adopt justificatory objectivity, the sense of queerness disappears and one does not have to accept Mackie’s overall conclusion that there are no objective values.

### Objective Morality True- Humans are Real

#### Objective Morality exists because the unconditional grounding is the fact that we are human.

**Zhuoyao Li** (2016) The public conception of morality in John Rawls' political liberalism, Ethics & Global Politics, 9:1, 28679, DOI: 10.3402/egp.v9.28679 <https://doi.org/10.3402/egp.v9.28679>

Reasonable justification, on the other hand, requires both validity and intersubjective acceptance. With this important distinction drawn, it seems that Forst is ready to address the plurality of reasonable moral foundations. However, following Kant, Forst claims that ‘a categorical and unconditionally valid morality cannot stand on an instrumentally or ethically hypothetical foundation. It requires an unconditional ground’.51 If a moral demand is right, it must mean that the (right) reason for this demand is similarly shared by all moral agents, which gives the demand its objective prescriptivity. Instead of a metaphysical ‘must’, Forst attributes this unconditional grounding to the simple fact of ‘being human’.52 The recognition of a moral ‘ought’ is part of our nature as justifying, reason-giving, and reason-deserving beings. In other words, morality is objective because human beings fundamentally share a reason for morality that is also part of our justificatory nature. Although Forst admits that there may be a plurality of sources to normativity in general, ‘such a plurality of sources does not exist in the case of morality\*that is, with regards to what human beings ‘‘owe’’ to each other as human beings’.53 Thus, morality is uniquely and unconditionally grounded in our justificatory human nature, on the basis of which people have the right to justification, and only norms that are reciprocally and generally justified are acceptable. This threefold truth, according to Forst, is a fundamentum inconcussum.

### Objective Morality True- Public Perception

#### Objective Morality exists because the morals in questions are reasonably accepted by a plurality of society

**Zhuoyao Li** (2016) The public conception of morality in John Rawls' political liberalism, Ethics & Global Politics, 9:1, 28679, DOI: 10.3402/egp.v9.28679 https://doi.org/10.3402/egp.v9.28679

The realization that morality has a plurality of reasonable foundations leads to a clear contrast between a foundationalist view and a structural view of morality. The latter, when situated in shared public culture of a democratic society, is what I refer to as the public conception of morality. Morality of course refers to the domain of ideals, principles, and standards concerning the distinction between right and wrong. But the public conception of morality has two additional qualifications: 1) it is devoid of the traditionally ontological character of morality, meaning that the objective prescriptivity of morality no longer hinges upon the independent truth regarding the foundation of morality but on its possibility of being reasonably justified; 2) its objective prescriptivity is justificatory only in structure, meaning that the principle of reasonable justification cannot itself play a foundationalist role. The public conception of morality therefore serves as a filter through which reasonably justified ideals, principles, and standards enter into the shared public culture from which the political conception justice draws its basic ideas and principles. When Rawls says that the political conception of justice is a moral conception, he means ‘among other things, that its content is given by certain ideals, principles and standards; and that these norms articulate certain values, in this case political values’.64 It is clear now that these ‘ideals, principles and standards’ are reasonably justified and publicly endorsed moral ideals, principles, and standards that can serve a variety of purposes: giving meaning to people’s lives, actively guiding people’s behavior, setting limits to what the state can do, and so on. In the case of political conception of justice, they serve the particular purpose of expressing political values for the limited focus of the basic structure of a well-ordered society. In Rawls’ own words, ‘the distinction between political conceptions of justice and other moral conceptions is a matter of scope, that is, the range of subjects to which a conception applies, and the wider content a wider range requires’.65 The political conception of justice thus covers a narrower domain of subjects than the public conception of morality, but the former nonetheless shares the justificatory structure of the latter by virtue of being part of the shared public culture.

### Objective Morality True-Torture Example

#### Objective Morality exists because it is the view of others not the view of the individual committing the action. No matter how much the actor defends their behavior, that does not make it justifiable or objective

**Hopster, Jeroen.** “Two Accounts of Moral Objectivity: from Attitude-Independence to Standpoint-Invariance.” Ethic Theory Moral Prac (2017) 20:763–780 DOI 10.1007/s10677-017-9796-zm https://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1874/358613/10.1007\_2Fs10677\_017\_9796\_z.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

A recurring criticism against a realist understanding of objectivity, which has been pushed both in the domains of ethics and mathematics (Clarke-Doane 2014), is that it raises epistemic quandaries. For example, Sharon Street (2006, 2016a) has forcefully argued that if moral truths or facts are fully attitude-independent, then we have no guarantee that our moral judgements reliably track these truths or facts. Other critics, such as John Mackie (1977), argue that a realist view is not only epistemically, but also metaphysically problematic.3 However, whatever difficulties moral realism might face, there is a general consensus that at least with concern to the aim of capturing the moral appearances, it does a good job. For instance, the realist has resources to argue that in cases of moral disagreement, at least one of the disagreeing parties must be mistaken, since his or her judgement does not correspond with the attitude-independent moral facts or truths. Prima facie, this seems to accord with people’s intuitions. Consider an imaginary agent who values an action that many people would regard as decidedly immoral – say an agent who values torturing innocent human beings for fun. Presumably, many people would want to claim that this agent is morally wicked, and objectively so. Torturing innocent people for fun is morally wrong, no matter what this agent thinks or feels about it, or so our intuition tells us. Since realists take objective moral truths to be attitude-independent, they can procure this intuition in a straightforward manner. Many metaethicists agree that realist theories do a good job at accommodating morality’s objective pretensions’, and that in this respect they have a leg up on rivalling theories (e.g. Finlay 2007, p. 844). Some philosophers implicitly treat a realist understanding as the default understanding of moral objectivity (e.g. Mackie 1977; Enoch 2014), or even equate ‘moral realism’ and ‘moral objectivism’ (Kahane 2011), thus implying that all moral objectivists are moral realists.4 This is an uncharitable move, however, since there has been an extensive, predominantly Kantian tradition of providing alternative accounts of moral objectivity, which do not centre on the notion of attitude-independence. Call these antirealist accounts of moral objectivity. What unites antirealist accounts of moral objectivity, as I shall understand them, is that they understand morality’s objective features in virtue of our attitudes, or at least partly in virtue thereof.5 For example, an antirealist might argue that moral judgements are objective if they result from a procedure that elicits dialogical understanding (Habermas 1995). Or she might maintain that moral judgements are objective if they are independent of the whims of anyone’s particular attitudes: BObjectivity (…) is not so much a ‘view from nowhere,’ but a view of no one in particular’^ (Sen 1993, p. 129).

### Objective Morality True- Not the same as normal facts

#### Objective Morality is not the same as other facts we read in science, history or math class. They exist in a different state. Evaluating them on the same basis is unfair and skews the results

**Hopster, Jeroen.** “Two Accounts of Moral Objectivity: from Attitude-Independence to Standpoint-Invariance.” Ethic Theory Moral Prac (2017) 20:763–780 DOI 10.1007/s10677-017-9796-zm <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1874/358613/10.1007_2Fs10677_017_9796_z.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

In this paper I have highlighted two accounts accounts of moral objectivity: a realist and an antirealist account. On a realist account, morality’s objective features are understood in terms of their attitude-independence. Just like the judgement that the Earth revolves around the sun, but unlike the judgement that ice-cream is tasty, the moral realist maintains that the truth or falsity of a moral judgement is independent of what people think or feel about it. By contrast, on an antirealist account, morality’s objective features are understood in terms of their standpoint-invariance. Invariance differs from independence. According to the antirealist, the objectivity of moral judgements does depend on people’s attitudes but is constituted by the fact that these judgements withstand scrutiny from a diverse set of evaluative standpoints. As a result, moral judgements are not objective in the same sense as facts about planetary orbits: their truth or falsity is not similarly attitude-independent. But moral judgements also differ from judgements of taste, convention and aesthetics, in the sense that moral judgements typically purport to have an inescapable authority, which these other classes of evaluative judgement do not. When an agent judges a moral truth to be objective, the constructivist maintains, she is committed to achieving social convergence about this truth. It is this commitment that gives moral judgements their prescriptive force, which seems to be absent from evaluative judgements in non-moral domains. Hence, if the constructivist account is correct, we are mistaken to think that moral judgements either have to be factual judgements, or judgements of taste. Instead, at least where their objectivist aspiration is concerned, moral judgements belong to a different category altogether. This idea fits well with research about folk objectivism: while moral judgements are generally regarded as much more objective than judgements of taste, most people regard them as slightly less objective than factual judgements (Goodwin and Darley 2008; Wright et al. 2013).

### Objective Morality True- Choice

#### Objective Morality exists because humans chose to be moral

**Howe, Richard G. Ph.D.** “Does Morality Need God in Order to Be Objective? The "Yes and No" Answer of Thomism.” Emeritus Professor of Philosophy and Apologetics Southern Evangelical Seminary, Does Morality Need God in Order to Be Objective? The "Yes and No" Answer of Thomism, https://catholichawaii.org/media/646947/110-catholic-morality.pdf

Moral good is a narrower concept. Morality has to do with a human choosing an action that perfects the human towards what a human ought to be by virtue of the kind of thing a human is, i.e., because of his nature. What is morally good for a human to do is tethered explicitly to what it is to be a human. We can see, therefore that not only is morality unique to humans among sensible creatures, but it also follows that God is not a moral being. This is so because God does not choose a course of action to perfect Himself as He aims at a telos. God does not have a telos and cannot be perfected because He already is infinite being itself—ipsum esse subsistens; substantial existence itself.

### Objective Morality True- Animals are Moral

#### Animals exhibit all of the traditional hallmarks of morality

Bekoff and Pierce 14 <Marc, Professor Emeritus of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology at the University of Colorado, Boulder, and Jessica, American bioethicist, philosopher, and writer. She currently has a loose affiliation with the Center for Bioethics and Humanities, University of Colorado Denver, “Wild Justice : The Moral Lives of Animals,” PUBLISHER, University of Chicago Press, 2014-05-14>#SPS

The social lives of numerous animals are strongly shaped by affiliat­ ive and cooperative behavior. Consider wolves. For a long time research­ ers thought that pack size was regulated by available food resources. Wolves typically feed on prey such as elk and moose, both of which are bigger than an individual wolf. Successfully hunting such large ungu­ lates usually takes more than one wolf, so it makes sense to postulate that wolf packs evolved because of the size of wolves’ prey. However, long-term research by David Mech shows that pack size in wolves is regulated by social and not food-related factors. Mech discovered that the number of wolves who can live together in a coordinated pack is governed by the number of wolves with whom individuals can closely bond (the “social attraction factor”) balanced against the number of individuals from whom an individual can tolerate competition (the “social competition factor”). Packs and their codes of conduct break down when there are too many wolves. As we begin to look at the “good” side of animal behavior, at what animals do when they’re not fighting each other or committing siblicide, we begin to take in just how rich the social lives of many animals are. In­ deed, the lives of animals are shaped at a most basic level by “good”—or what biologists call prosocial —interactions and relationships. Even more, it seems that at least some prosocial behavior is not a mere byproduct of conflict, but may be an evolutionary force in its own right. Within biology, early theories of kin selection and reciprocal altruism have now blossomed into a much wider inquiry into the many faces and meanings of prosocial behavior. And, it seems, the more we look, the more we see. There’s now an enormous body of research on prosocial behavior, and new research is being published all the time on cooperation, altruism, empathy, reciprocity, succorance, fairness, forgiveness, trust, and kind­ ness in animals ranging from rats to apes. Even more striking, within this huge repertoire of prosocial behav­ iors, particular patterns of behavior seem to constitute a kind of animal morality. Mammals living in tight social groups appear to live according to codes of conduct, including both prohibitions against certain kinds of behavior and expectations for other kinds of behavior. They live by a set of rules that fosters a relatively harmonious and peaceful coexistence. They’re naturally cooperative, will offer aid to their fellows, sometimes in return for like aid, sometimes with no expectation of immediate re­ ward. They build relationships of trust. What’s more, they appear to feel for other members of their communities, especially relatives, but also neighbors and sometimes even strangers— often showing signs of what looks very much like compassion and empathy. It is these “moral” behaviors in particular that are our focus in Wild Justice . Here is just a sampling of some of the surprising things research has revealed about animal behavior and more specifically about animal morality in recent years. Some animals seem to have a sense of fairness in that they under­ stand and behave according to implicit rules about who deserves what and when. Individuals who breach rules of fairness are often punished either through physical retaliation or social ostracism. For example, research on play behavior in social carnivores suggests that when ani­ mals play, they are fair to one another and only rarely breach the agreedupon rules of engagement— if I ask you to play, I mean it, and I don’t intend to dominate you, mate with you, or eat you. Highly aggressive coyote pups, to give just one example, will bend over backwards to main­ tain the play mood with their fellows, and when they don’t do this they’re ignored and ostracized. Fairness also seems to be a part of primate social life. Researchers Sarah Brosnan, Frans de Waal, and Hillary Schiff discovered what they call “inequity aversion” in capuchin monkeys, a highly social and co­ operative species in which food sharing is common. These monkeys, especially females, carefully monitor equity and fair treatment among peers. Individuals who are shortchanged during a bartering transaction by being offered a less preferred treat refuse to cooperate with research­ ers. In a nutshell, the capuchins expect to be treated fairly. Many animals have a capacity for empathy. They perceive and feel the emotional state of fellow animals, especially those of their own kind, and respond accordingly. Hal Markowitz’s research on captive diana monkeys strongly suggests a capacity for empathy, long thought to be unique to humans. In one of his studies, individual diana monkeys were trained to insert a token into a slot to obtain food. The oldest female in the group failed to learn how to do this. Her mate watched her unsuc­ cessful attempts, and on three occasions he approached her, picked up the tokens she had dropped, inserted them into the machine, and then allowed her to have the food. The male apparently evaluated the situa­ tion and seemed to understand that she wanted food but could not get it on her own. He could have eaten the food, but he didn’t. There was no evidence that the male’s behavior was self-serving. Similarly, Felix Warneken and Michael Tomasello at the Max Planck Institute for Evo­ lutionary Anthropology in Leipzig, Germany, discovered that captive chimpanzees would help others get food. When a chimpanzee saw that his neighbor couldn’t reach food, he opened the neighbor’s cage so the animal could get to it. Even elephants rumble onto the scene. Joyce Poole, who has studied African elephants for decades, relates the story of a teenage female who was suffering from a withered leg on which she could put no weight. When a young male from another group began attacking the injured female, a large adult female chased the attacking male, returned to the young female, and touched her crippled leg with her trunk. Poole be­ lieves that the adult female was showing empathy. There is even evidence for empathy in rats and mice. Altruistic and cooperative behaviors are also common in many spe­ cies of animal. One of the classic studies on altruism comes from Gerry Wilkinson’s work on bats. Vampire bats who are successful in forag­ ing for blood that they drink from livestock will share their meal with bats who aren’t successful. And they’re more likely to share blood with those bats who previously shared blood with them. In a recent piece of surprising research, rats appear to exhibit generalized reciprocity; they help an unknown rat obtain food if they themselves have been helped by a stranger. Generalized reciprocity has long been thought to be uniquely human. The presence of these behaviors may seem puzzling to scientists or lay readers who still view animals from the old “nature red in tooth and claw” framework. But puzzling or not, moral behaviors can be seen in a wide variety of species in a spectrum of different social contexts. And the more we look, the more we see.

#### Err on the side of accepting animal morality - social conditioning causes human beings to reject it out of hand

Bekoff and Pierce 14 <Marc, Professor Emeritus of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology at the University of Colorado, Boulder, and Jessica, American bioethicist, philosopher, and writer. She currently has a loose affiliation with the Center for Bioethics and Humanities, University of Colorado Denver, “Wild Justice : The Moral Lives of Animals,” PUBLISHER, University of Chicago Press, 2014-05-14>#SPS

So far, very few scientists and other academics have been willing to use the term moral in relation to animal behavior without protective quota­ tion marks (which signal a kind of “wink, wink: we don’t really mean ‘moral’ as in human morality”) or without some other modifying trick, as in the term proto -morality (read: “they may have some of the seeds of moral behavior, but obviously not morality per se”). Indeed, there is strong resistance to the use of the term “moral” in relation to the behav­ ior of nonhuman animals, both from scientists and philosophers. **The belief that humans have morality and animals don’t is such a longstanding assumption it could well be called a habit of mind, and bad habits, as we all know, are damned hard to break**. A lot of people have caved in to this assumption because it is easier to deny morality to animals than to deal with the complex reverberations and implica­ tions of the possibility that animals have moral behavior. The historical momentum, framed in the timeworn dualism of us versus them, and the Cartesian view of animals as nothing more than mechanistic entities, is reason enough to dismissively cling to the status quo and get on with the day’s work. Denial of who animals are conveniently allows for retaining false stereotypes about the cognitive and emotional capacities of animals. **Clearly a major paradigm shift is needed, because the lazy acceptance of habits of mind has a strong influence on how science and philosophy are done and how animals are understood and treated.** The irony, of course, is that the field of animal behavior is already bursting with terminology that has moral color: altruism, selfishness, trust, forgiveness, reciprocity, and spite. All of these terms and more are used by scientists to describe the behavior of animals. Certain words like altruism , selfishness , and spite have been ascribed specific and carefully circumscribed meanings within the field of animal behavior— meanings that diverge from, and even sometimes contradict common usage. Other moral terms such as forgiveness , fairness , retribution , reciprocity , and empathy have joined the animal behavior lexicon, and retain, for now, their con­ nection to the morality we know and live. Lay readers and even scientists are bound to be confused by this apparent lack of consistency. We plan to clear up some of this mess. We could have coined a new word or phrase to describe our particular suite of prosocial behaviors in animals. The phrase “animal morality” will certainly strike some people as odd, and perhaps even as an oxy­ moron. And in some respects, morality is not the most solicitous term. Morality is notoriously hard to define and there is disagreement about how best to understand what morality is. On the other hand, morality is a very useful term, because “**animal morality” challenges some ste­ reotypes about animals and, as we’ll see, about humans. It also empha­ sizes evolutionary continuity between humans and other animals, not only in anatomical structure, but also in behavior.** And this emphasis, in our view, is important. Finally, morality is also a useful term because the root meaning— more , or custom— captures an essential element of animal morality. We need to be quite explicit that the meaning of morality is itself under consideration, and we’re suggesting a shift in meaning. How we define morality will, of course, determine whether and to what extent animals have it. And yes, we’re defining morality in such a way as to lend credence to our argument for evolutionary continuity between humans and animals. But this is not sleight of hand: our definition of morality is well supported both scientifically and philosophically and also by “unsci­ entific” common sense. We want to detach the word morality from some of its moorings, allowing us to rethink what it is in light of a huge pile of research from various fields that speaks to the phenomenon. We ask that you let us play freely with the term and, in the end, you can decide if you think “animal morality” makes sense.

### Objective Morality Exists- Human Nature

#### Morality exists. It is grounded in human behavior

**Moreh** Erkenntnis (1975-), Vol. 37, No. 1 (Jul., **1992**), pp. 115-143 Published by: Springer Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20012427 Accessed: 22/07/2009 13:24

Common-sense morality is grounded in the consciousness of ordinary human beings and the stringency of moral rules is a device based on psychological grounds meant to prevent the erosion of moral rules. In other words, the tendency for self-deception in order to reduce cognitive dissonance gives rise to high information costs and causes Conscience to set up a fence around moral rules. By contrast, Utilitarianism has been thought out by moral philosophers as an ethical system which people are advised to adopt. Because of the intellectual character of Utilitarianism, it has evolved no processes for hedging around its rules. One therefore understands Harsanyi (1985, p. 49) when he describes utilitarian rules as 'conditional imperatives', that is, people should fol? low them because in this way they will maximize expected social utility. Of course, he expects all rational people to have an interest in promot? ing the common good and therefore to be utilitarians. (By contrast, many people regard moral rules as unconditionally binding or 'categori cal imperatives').

### Objective Morality Exists Without A Belief in God

#### An Objective Morality can exist without belief in a god. Gravity exists before we know what it is. We know a knife should be sharp because that is what its nature looks like it should be. Knowing why something exists does not mean it does not exist

**Howe, Richard G. Ph.D.** “Does Morality Need God in Order to Be Objective? The "Yes and No" Answer of Thomism.” Emeritus Professor of Philosophy and Apologetics Southern Evangelical Seminary, Does Morality Need God in Order to Be Objective? The "Yes and No" Answer of Thomism, https://catholichawaii.org/media/646947/110-catholic-morality.pdf

Before my time runs out, let me now try to directly address the issue before us. In what sense can morality be objective without God? First, both the Thomist and the standard apologetic view agree that God is not epistemologically necessary for morality. All agree that it is possible for an atheist to know that it is wrong to murder. This is so even when the atheist cannot fully understand why it is wrong.14 Second, because mankind's good is defined primarily in terms of the perfection of his nature, what is good for him will be good for him as a matter of fact. Now, to say this much still does not distinguish Aquinas's view from the standard apologetic view inasmuch as everyone would agree that being virtuous is good for a person's soul and will contribute to human flourishing collectively speaking. What I think the Thomist might resist is when the standard apologetic approach is worded in such a way as to suggest that these objective goods cannot be regarded as goods by the atheist. Along these lines, if someone remarked that this was a good knife because it had such a sharp blade, what sense would it make for another to say "Who are you to say that a knife ought to have a sharp blade?" The question is nonsensical as a matter of principle. Whatever it is to be a knife, then to be a good knife is to possess all those perfections that a knife ought to have by virtue of being a knife. By analogy, certain questions like "Who are you to say that I (as a human) ought to do this certain action?" The question can be nonsensical as a matter of principle. (I am not suggesting that one could not come up with a question that makes perfect sense like "Who are you to say that I ought to listen only to country music?") But when it comes to many of the human virtues like honesty, fidelity, and courage, it is not as though we have not been having this conversation for over 2,500 years as to what constitutes a good person. For Aquinas, I think it is fair to say that the oft referenced sentiment in Dostoevskii's novel just is not true.15 Consider how this might compare to our relationship to other aspects of reality. Gravity is a real thing. It affects the Christian and the atheist alike. As such, it is objective. It does not matter whether the atheist realizes why there is gravity or, for that matter how it is that gravity affects us. It is enough that it does, and the atheist cannot help but know this. In a similar way, morality is real. It affects the Christian and the atheist alike. As such, it is objective. It does not matter whether the atheist realizes why there is morality (or, for that matter how it is that morality affects us). It is enough that it does and the atheist cannot help but know this. What is more, it is precisely because morality is objectively real that Natural Law Theory can serve as a viable approach to issues of public morality in the midst of religious or philosophical diversity.

### Objective Morality Exists Without God

#### If free will exists, then a world with an Objective Morality can exist as the two are diametrically opposed

**Howe, Richard G. Ph.D.** “Does Morality Need God in Order to Be Objective? The "Yes and No" Answer of Thomism.” Emeritus Professor of Philosophy and Apologetics Southern Evangelical Seminary, Does Morality Need God in Order to Be Objective? The "Yes and No" Answer of Thomism, https://catholichawaii.org/media/646947/110-catholic-morality.pdf

Last, if Aquinas is right that free will is a necessary condition for morality, then any philosophy of human action that includes a sufficiently rich notion of free will can have morality, at least in principle. It should be noted that Aristotle's god, despite the fact that his arguments for god's existence are picked up by Aquinas almost verbatim, bears little resemblance to the God of Christianity. Thus, for all intents and purposes regarding the current project, Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics is an ethics without God, or at least without a god that any classical Christian would recognize.16 To suggest that the Nicomachean Ethics is not an objective morality in any sense of the term seems, to me, to be clearly false.

### Objective Morality Needs God

#### An Objective Morality needs God as God gives everything means and a standard to which it is evaluated

**Howe, Richard G. Ph.D.** “Does Morality Need God in Order to Be Objective? The "Yes and No" Answer of Thomism.” Emeritus Professor of Philosophy and Apologetics Southern Evangelical Seminary, Does Morality Need God in Order to Be Objective? The "Yes and No" Answer of Thomism, <https://catholichawaii.org/media/646947/110-catholic-morality.pdf>

One way in which morality would need God in order to be objective is the way anything would need God in order to have any attribute. It needs God before it can even exist. Morality has to do with human actions. Being a morally good person includes choosing those actions that perfect the human along the trajectory of and towards his proper telos. The human only has that telos because of his nature and he only has that nature because it was created by God. Without God's creation, there would not exist any humans to be morally good. In so many words, a discussion about whether morality needs God in order to be objective amounts to a discussion of cosmological argument, specifically Aquinas's Secunda Via—his Second Way

### Objective Morality Exists- Friendship

#### The concept of having friends and building personal connections is proof of an Objective morality

**Alasdair MacIntyre,** After Virtue, 1981, p. 156

"Friendship of course, on Aristotle's view, involves affection. But that affection arises within a relationship defined in terms of a common allegiance to and a common pursuit of goods. The affection is secondary, which is not in the least to say unimportant. In a modern perspective affection is often the central issue; our friends are said to be those whom we like, perhaps whom we like very much. 'Friendship' has become for the most part the name of a type of emotional state rather than a type of social and political relationship. E.M. Forster once remarked that if it came to a choice between betraying his country and betraying his friend, he hoped that he would have the courage to betray his country. In an Aristotelian perspective anyone who can formulate such a contrast has no country, has no polis; he is a citizen of nowhere, an internal exile wherever he lives. Indeed from an Aristotelian point of view a modern liberal political society can appear only as a collection of citizens of nowhere who have banded together for their common protection. They possess at best that inferior form of friendship that is founded on mutual advantage. That they lack the bond of friendship is of course bound up with the selfavowed moral pluralism of such liberal societies. They have abandoned the moral unity of Aristotelianism, whether in its ancient or medieval forms"

### Subjectivity Bad

#### Lack of Objectivity leads to a state of nature

**Comte-Sponville, professor of Philosophy at the Sorbonne and author of numerous books, ‘91**

[Andre, *The Brute, the Sophist, and the Aesthete: Art in the Service of Illusion*, Why We Are Not Nietzscheans, edited by Luc Ferry and Alain Renaut, p. 33-36]

This is what Nietzsche calls his "Fundamental Innovations: In place of 'moral values,' purely naturalistic values. Naturalization of morality" *(WP,* 462.).These "naturalistic values" are, of course, of vi­talist inspiration:

Every naturalism in morality—that is, every healthy morality—is dominated by an instinct of life . . . *Anti-natural* morality—that is, almost every morality which has so far been taught, revered, and preached—turns, conversely, *against* the instincts of life. *(TI,* "Morality as Anti-Nature," 4)

We can see here that Nietzsche was right to feel himself singular: all phi­losophers, more or less, have affirmed that morality should conquer the instincts or, at the very least, dominate them; Nietzsche teaches that the instincts should conquer morality. Spinoza would have said: *Ultimi bar­barorum!*

#### Turns and outweighs their impact – natural law leads to the worst forms of moral calculation and oppression

**MacSaorsa, ‘7** [Iain, “The Myth of Natural Law,” [www.spunk.com](http://www.spunk.com), <http://www.spunk.org/texts/otherpol/critique/sp001283.txt>]

Rights, far from being fixed, are the product of social evolution and human action, thought and emotions. What is acceptable now may become unacceptable in the future. Slavery, for example, was long considered "natural". In fact, John Locke, the "father" of "Natural Rights" was heavily involved in the slave trade. He made a fortune in violating a "natural law". Many claimed slavery was a "Natural Law". Few would say so now. The "Natural Law" cult desires to stop this evolutionary process and fix social life into what \*they\* think is good and right and use a form of argument which tries to raise their ideology above critique or thought. This denies the fundamental nature of liberty, the ability to think for yourself. Michael Bakunin writes "the liberty of man consists solely in this: that he obeys natural laws because he has \*himself\* recognised them as such, and not because they have been externally imposed upon him by any extrinsic will whatever, divine or human, collective or individual" [Bakunin on Anarchism, page 227]. The case for liberty and a free society is that every individual is unique, that all can contribute something which no other individual has noticed or thought about. It is this interaction of individuals which allows individuals, society, social customs and rights to evolve, change and develop. "Natural Law", like the state, tries to arrest this evolution. It replaces individuality with cold dogma, **placing the individual under yet another God,** destroying critical thought with a new rule book. In addition, as these "Natural Laws" are the product of human as humans, they \*must\* be applicable to \*all\* humanity. Hence the "Natural Law" cult desires to see \*one\* moral code dominate society, all other codes \*must be\* (by definition) "against nature". That the Dogma of Natural Law was only invented a few hundred years ago, in one part of the planet, does not seem to bother them. Nor the fact that for the vast majority of human existence people have lived in societies which violated almost \*all\* aspects of their "Natural Law". If "Natural Law" did exist, then all people would have discovered this "true" law years ago. As it is, the debate is still going on, with (for example) fascists and "Libertarians" each claiming "the laws of nature" (and sociobiology) as their own.

### Objectivity Necessary

#### A world without objectivity means we are constantly being judged by a thousand different moral systems. This allows us to place others into the space of the “other” because they don’t fit our morals

**Deleuze 83** (Gilles, Prof of Philosophy @ U of Lyon, Paris, and Lycees, Nietzsche and Philosophy, p. 120-123, AD: 7/9/09)

"I am good, therefore you are evil": in the mouths of the masters the word therefore merely introduces a negative conclusion. And this latter is merely advanced as the consequence of a full affirmation: "we the aristocrats, the beautiful, the happy" (GM I 10). In the master everything positive is in the premises. He must have premises of action and affirmation, and the enjoyment of these premises in order to conclude with something negative which is not the main point and has scarcely any importance. It is only an "accessory, a complementary nuance" (GM I 11). **Its only importance is to augment the tenor of the action and the affirmation, to content their alliance and to redouble the corresponding enjoyment: the good "only looks for its antithesis in order to affirm itself with more joy"** (GM I 10). This is the status of aggression: it is the negative, but the negative as the conclusion of positive premises, the negative as the product of activity, the negative as the consequence of the power of affirming. The master acknowledges himself in a syllogism where two positive propositions are necessary to make a negation, the final negation being only a means of reinforcing the premises — "You are evil therefore I am good." Everything has changed: the negative passes into the premises, the positive is conceived as a conclusion, a conclusion from negative premises. The negative contains the essential and the positive only exists through negation. The negative becomes "the original idea, the beginning, the act par excellence" (GM I 11). **The slave must have premises of reaction and negation, of ressentiment and nihilism, in order to obtain an apparently positive conclusion.** Even so, it only appears to be positive. This is why Nietzsche insists on distinguishing ressentiment and aggression: they differ in nature. **The man of ressentiment needs to conceive of a non-ego, then to oppose himself to this non-ego in order finally to posit himself as self. This is the strange syllogism of the slave: he needs two negations in order to produce an appearance of affirmation**. We already sense the form in which the syllogism of the slave has been so successful in philosophy: the dialectic. The dialectic, as the ideology of ressentiment. "**You are evil, therefore I am good**." In this formula it is the slave who speaks. It cannot be denied that values are still being created. But what bizarre values! They begin **by positing the other as evil. He who called himself good is the one who is now called evil. This evil one is the one who acts, who does not hold himself back from acting, who does not therefore consider action from the point of view of the consequences that it will have for third parties**. And the one who is good is now the one who holds himself back from acting: **he is good just because he refers all actions to the standpoint of the one who does not act**, to the standpoint of the one who experiences the consequences, or better still to the more subtle standpoint of a divine third party who scrutinises the intentions of the one who acts. "**And he is good who does not outrage, who harms nobody, who does not attack, who does not requite, who leaves revenge to God, who keeps himself hidden as we do, who avoids evil and desires little from life, like us, the patient, humble and just**" (GM I 13 p. 46). This is how good and evil are born: ethical determination, that of good and bad, gives way to moral judgment. The good of ethics has become the evil of morality, the had has become the good of morality. Good and evil are not the good and the bad but, on the contrary, the exchange, the inversion, the reversal of their determination. Nietzsche stresses the following point: "**Beyond good and evil**" does not mean: "Beyond the good and the bad", on the contrary ... (GM I 17). Good and evil are new values, but how strangely these values are created! They **are created by reversing good and bad.** They are not created by acting but by holding back from acting, not by affirming, but by beginning with denial. This is why they are called un-created, divine, transcendent, superior to life. But think of what these values hide, of their mode of creation. They hide an extraordinary hatred, a hatred for life, a hatred for all that is active and affirmative in life. No moral values would survive for a single instant if they were separated from the premises of which they are the conclusion. And, more profoundly, no religious values are separable from this hatred and revenge from which they draw the consequences. The positivity of religion is only apparent: they conclude that the wretched, the poor, the weak, **the slaves, are the good since the strong are "evil" and "damned". They have invented** the good wretch, the good weakling: there is no better revenge against the strong and happy. What would Christian love be without the Judaic power of ressentiment which inspires and directs it? Christian love is not the opposite of Judaic ressentiment but its consequence, its conclusion and its crowning glory (GM 1 8). Religion conceals the principles from which it is directly descended to a greater or lesser extent (and often, in periods of crisis, it no longer conceals anything at all); **the weight of negative premises, the spirit of revenge, the power of ressentiment.**

### Objective Morality leads to Freedom

#### Maintaining proper moral values is the only way to obtain a free society, which outweighs nuclear extinction

**Shue 89** (Henry, Professor of Ethics and Public Life, Princeton University, “Nuclear Deterrence and Moral Restraint, pp. 134-5)

But is it realistic to suppose that American citizens would risk not just their own lives but their families and their nation in using nuclear weapons to save Western Europe and other free societies from Soviet domination, especially if the United States’ allies are not willing to risk nuclear destruction themselves? According to one 1984 poll, 74 percent of Americans queried believe “the U.S. should not use nuclear weapons if the Russians invade Western Europe.” Nuclear Protectionists, however, would reply that further public debate might convince more Americans that deterrence cannot be had on the moral cheap. If the United States is determined to deter a Soviet attack on Europe, it must have a moral nuclear strategy that it is willing to implement. Without effective population defenses, such a strategy could require that the United States accept an unequal risk of nuclear destruction to ensure the survival of free society. In the extreme, this could mean that the United States must be willing to sacrifice itself for values higher than its own national survival. Thus, Nuclear Protectionism views both Just War morality and national “self-centered” as unworkable foundations for U.S. security policy.

### Morality Good

#### Morality maximizes good to its fullest extent while utilitarianism is indifferent to distribution of good

**Freeman 94** – Avalon Professor in the Humanities at the University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. Harvard University, J.D. University of North Carolina (Samuel, “Utilitarianism, Deontology, and the Priority of Right,” Philosophy and Public Affairs, Vol. 23, No. 4, Autumn, pp. 313-349, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2265463)

It is perhaps a moral truism to say that people ought to do what they can to make the world as good a place as possible. But construed in a certain way, this becomes a highly controversial thesis about morality: that the right act in any circumstance is one most conducive to the best overall outcome (as ascertained, say, from an impersonal point of view that gives equal weight to the good of everyone). This is Consequentialism.' More simply, it holds Right conduct maximizes the Good. G. E. Moore held this thesis self-evident. Non-consequentialists argue nothing could be further from the truth. So far as they do, it appears (to consequentialists at least) they are committed to the indefensible idea that morality requires us to do less good than we are able to. John Rawls’s teleological/deontological distinction is different. Teleo logical views affirm the consequentialist thesis that the Right maximizes the Good. But they hold an additional thesis: "the good is defined independently from the right" (TJ, p. 24), or, as Rawls often says, independ ent of any moral concepts or principles.2 To see how this view differs from consequentialism, consider a thesis once proposed by T. M. Scanlon.3 A standard objection to consequentialist views like utilitarian ism is that they are indifferent to the distribution of the good; this is purportedly a necessary feature of such views, since they define right and justice as what maximizes overall, or aggregate, good. Scanlon argued there should be a way to incorporate distributive concerns into a two-level consequentialist view. If we treat fairness or distributive equality as a good in itself, then it must be considered along with other goods like net aggregate satisfaction in determining the value of overall outcomes that are to be maximized. Rights could then be introduced at the level of casuistry, to promote the good of equitable states of affairs. The two-level consequentialist view Scanlon suggests would not be teleological on Rawls’s account; it would be deontological. As Rawls says: If the distribution of goods is also counted as a good, perhaps a higher-order one, and the theory directs us to produce the most good (including the good of distribution among others) we no longer have a teleological view in the classical sense. The problem of distribution falls under the concept of right as one intuitively understands it, and so the theory lacks an independent definition of the good.

### Objective Morality leads to Rights

#### Evaluating morality through rights and justice is intrinsically good while utilitarianism denies humans of their basic rights

**Freeman 94** – Avalon Professor in the Humanities at the University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. Harvard University, J.D. University of North Carolina (Samuel, “Utilitarianism, Deontology, and the Priority of Right,” Philosophy and Public Affairs, Vol. 23, No. 4, Autumn, pp. 313-349, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2265463)

Rawls's thought may be this: in order to define the distributions (e.g., equal states of affairs) that are intrinsically good, and then practically apply this definition to determine what we ought to do, we must appeal to some process of distribution that can only be described by antecedent principles of right or justice. But once we do that, then it is no longer the case that the right is exclusively defined in terms of what maximizes the good. For example, suppose fairness or the equal capacity of persons to realize their good is among the intrinsic goods in a consequentialist view: we are to act in whatever ways best promote fairness or equality of capacity for all persons. It is difficult to see how such vague ends can be specified for practical purposes without appealing to principles or procedures defining peoples' equal basic rights, powers, and entitlements. But once this specification is incorporated into the maximand, the right is no longer simply a matter of maximizing the good. For the concept of the good itself, in this instance, cannot be described without an antecedent nonmaximizing moral principle of right: that people ought to be treated fairly, afforded certain basic rights and powers, and so on. Not only is such a view by Rawls's definition nonteleological; it is also not consequentialist if by this is meant that to maximize the good is the sole fundamental principle of right. Incorporating rights or other moral dictates into the maximand is incompatible with this very idea.4

### Objective Morality leads to Individualism

#### Morality promotes individualism, protecting humans from utilitarian obligations to society

**Stelzig 98 –** Masters degree in philosophy from the University of Illinois at Chicago, obtained J.D. from University of Pennsylvania and is currently an attorney for the FCC (Tim, “Deontology, Governmental Action, and the Distributive Exemption: How the Trolley Problem Shapes the Relationship between Rights and Policy,” University of Pennsylvania Law Review, Vol. 146, No. 3, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3312613)

Deontology is the theory of moral obligation, and, by connotation, encompasses moral theories that emphasize rights and duties. Put another way, deontological theories are those moral theories of a vaguely Kantian stripe. Kant held that one should "[a]ct in such a way that [one] always treat[s] humanity, whether in [one's] own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end."22 It was not always so. When Jeremy Bentham, one of utilitarianism's founders, first coined the word in 1814, "deontology" referred to the marshaling of self-interested reasons for agents to act for the general good. Essentially, this was a utilitarian theory of obligation, and was quite distinct from modern use. Modern-day deontologists focus much attention on rights.26 It might be thought that this focus is merely a preference, for rights are often taken to be correlative with duties. For example, where this relation holds, if I have a right not to be punched, you are under an obligation not to punch me, and conversely. Thus, deontology may be articulated through either related element. More generally, in theories holding that rights and duties are correlative, one may give an account of rights and then define duties by reference to rights; one may define rights in terms of an antecedent theoretic account of duties; or one may give separate theoretic accounts of rights and duties.27 Rights need not be completely correlative with duties.28 For example, take the notion of privileges, understood here as a subspecies of rights. The lone occupant of a small and isolated island presumably possesses a privilege to sing show-tunes at the top of her voice.2 This right, however, has no correlative obligation. It is not just that the island, being otherwise deserted, has no one in whom the obligation inheres. Rather, it is a structural feature of the example that no obligation not to interfere can exist. Introducing another person onto the island would destroy the privilege, for it would be immoral for the singer to subject another person to her showmanship without the other person's consent. Likewise, there may be obligations for which correlative rights do not exist. For example, one may be under an obligation to write letters to her grandfather without her grandfather having the right to receive letters written by his granddaughter.30 "Omissions" may also be understood as obligations for which there are no corresponding rights. If you may easily save somebody from great harm or death without substantial risk to yourself, a moral obligation exists to so help them.3l Most people, however, do not think that the victim has a right to your efforts.32 Although more could be said, my point is that whether or not one takes rights to be correlative with duties has implications for other aspects of moral theory. For the purposes of this Comment, there is no need to trace the contours of deontology with precision. Thus, although it is a simplification, this Comment will focus only on rights. The ultimate goal, again, is to discover when we may appeal to rights as a way of protecting ourselves against the demands of society. The next Part examines the nature of rights more closely.

### Objective Morality leads to Self Determination

#### Owning oneself is a moral imperative – utilitarianism imposes interpersonal obligations to society, which destroys morality

**Freeman 94** – Avalon Professor in the Humanities at the University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. Harvard University, J.D. University of North Carolina (Samuel, “Utilitarianism, Deontology, and the Priority of Right,” Philosophy and Public Affairs, Vol. 23, No. 4, Autumn, pp. 313-349, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2265463)

Kymlicka distinguishes two interpretations of utilitarianism: teleological and egalitarian. According to Rawls's teleological interpretation, the "fundamental goal" (LCC, p. 33) of utilitarianism is not persons, but the goodness of states of affairs. Duty is defined by what best brings about these states of affairs. " [M] aximizing the good is primary, and we count individuals equally only because that maximizes value. Our primary duty isn't to treat people as equals, but to bring about valuable states of affairs" (LCC, p. 27). It is difficult to see, Kymlicka says, how this reading of utilitarianism can be viewed as a moral theory. Morality, in our everyday view at least, is a matter of interpersonal obligations-the obligations we owe to each other. But to whom do we owe the duty of maximizing utility? Surely not to the impersonal ideal spectator . . . for he doesn't exist. Nor to the maximally valuable state of affairs itself, for states of affairs don't have moral claims." (LCC, p. 28-29) Kymlicka says, "This form of utilitarianism does not merit serious consideration as a political morality" (LCC, p. 29). Suppose we see utilitarianism differently, as a theory whose "fundamental principle" is "to treat people as equals" (LCC, p. 29). On this egalitarian reading, utilitarianism is a procedure for aggregating individual interests and desires, a procedure for making social choices, specifying which trade-offs are acceptable. It's a moral theory which purports to treat people as equals, with equal concern and respect. It does so by counting everyone for one, and no one for more than one. (LCC, p. 25)

### Objective Morality best- Utility Bad

#### Utilitarianism promotes inequity and inherently discriminates against minority like slavery

**Odell, 04** – University of Illinois is an Associate Professor of Philosophy (Jack, Ph.D., “On Consequentialist Ethics,” Wadsworth, Thomson Learning, Inc., pp. 98-103)

A classic objection to both act and rule utilitarianism has to do with inequity, and is related to the kind of objection raised by Rawls, which I will consider shortly. Suppose we have two fathers-Andy and Bob. Suppose further that they are alike in all relevant respects, both have three children, make the same salary, have the same living expenses, put aside the same amount in savings, and have left over each week fifteen dollars. Suppose that every week Andy and Bob ask themselves what they are going to do with this extra money, and Andy decides anew each week (AU) to divide it equally among his three children, or he makes a decision to always follow the rule (RU) that each child should receive an equal percentage of the total allowance money. Suppose further that each of his children receive five degrees of pleasure from this and no pain. Suppose on the other hand, that Bob, who strongly favors his oldest son, Bobby, decides anew each week (AU) to give all of the allowance money to Bobby, and nothing to the other two, and that he instructs Bobby not to tell the others, or he makes a decision to follow the rule (RU) to always give the total sum to Bobby. Suppose also that Bobby gets IS units of pleasure from his allowance and that his unsuspecting siblings feel no pain. The end result of the actions of both fathers is the same-IS units of pleasure. Most, if not all, of us would agree that although Andy's conduct is exemplary, Bob's is culpable. Nevertheless, according to both AU and RU the fathers in question are morally *equal.* Neither father is more or less exemplary or culpable than the other. I will refer to the objection implicit in this kind of example as (H) and state it as: ' (H) Both act and rule utilitarianism violate the principle of just distribution. What Rawls does is to elaborate objection (H). Utilitarianism, according to Rawls, fails to appreciate the importance of distributive justice, and that by doing so it makes a mockery of the concept of "justice." As I pointed out when I discussed Russell's views regarding partial goods, satisfying the interests of a majority of a given population while at the same time thwarting the interests of the minority segment of that same population (as occurs in societies that allow slavery) can maximize the general good, and do so even though the minority group may have to suffer great cruelties. Rawls argues that the utilitarian commitment to maximize the good in the world is due to its failure to ''take seriously the distinction between persons."· One person can be forced to give up far too much to insure the maximization of the good, or the total aggregate satisfaction, as was the case for those young Aztec women chosen by their society each year to be sacrificed to the Gods for the welfare of the group.

### Moral obligation to help others

#### We have a duty to assist others as we do no sacrifice anything morally significant of our own

**Singer, Peter.** [Prof. Bioethics at Princeton] “Famine, Affluence, and Morality” Philosophy and

Public Affairs, vol. 1, no. 1 Spring 1972

My next point is this: if it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without

thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, to do it. By

"without sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance" I mean without causing anything

else comparably bad to happen, or doing something that is wrong in itself, or failing to promote

some moral good, comparable in significance to the bad thing that we can prevent. This principle

seems almost as uncontroversial as the last one. It requires us only to prevent what is bad, and to

promote what is good, and it requires this of us only when we can do it without sacrificing

anything that is, from the moral point of view, comparably important. I could even, as far as the

application of my argument to the Bengal emergency is concerned, qualify the point so as to

make it: if it is in our power to prevent something very bad from happening, without thereby

sacrificing anything morally significant, we ought, morally, to do it. An application of this principle would be as follows: if I am walking past a shallow pond and see a child drowning in it, I ought to wade in and pull the child out. This will mean getting my clothes muddy, but this is insignificant, while the death of the child would presumably be a very bad thing. The uncontroversial appearance of the principle just stated is deceptive. If it were acted upon, even in its qualified form, our lives, our society, and our world would be fundamentally changed. For the principle takes, firstly, no account of proximity or distance. It makes no moral difference whether the person I can help is a neighbor's child ten yards from me or a Bengali whose name I shall never know, ten thousand miles away. Secondly, the principle makes no distinction between cases in which I am the only person who could possibly do anything and cases in which I am just one among millions in the same position.

#### A moral duty to protect others creates unity

**Singer, Peter.** [Prof. Bioethics at Princeton] “Famine, Affluence, and Morality” Philosophy and

Public Affairs, vol. 1, no. 1 Spring 1972

A third point raised by the conclusion reached earlier relates to the question of just how much we

all ought to be giving away. One possibility, which has already been mentioned, is that we ought

to give until we reach the level of marginal utility - that is, the level at which, by giving more, I

would cause as much suffering to myself or my dependents as I would relieve by my gift. This

would mean, of course, that one would reduce oneself to very near the material circumstances of

a Bengali refugee. It will be recalled that earlier I put forward both a strong and a moderate

version of the principle of preventing bad occurrences. The strong version, which required us to

prevent bad things from happening unless in doing so we would be sacrificing something of

comparable moral significance, does seem to require reducing ourselves to the level of marginal

utility. I should also say that the strong version seems to me to be the correct one. I proposed the

more moderate version - that we should prevent bad occurrences unless, to do so, we had to

sacrifice something morally significant -only in order to show that, even on this surely undeniable principle, a great change in our way of life is required. On the more moderate principle, it may not follow that we ought to reduce ourselves to the level of marginal utility, for one might hold that to reduce oneself and one's family to this level is to cause something significantly bad to happen.

Whether this is so I shall not discuss, since, as I have said, I can see no good reason for holding

the moderate version of the principle rather than the strong version. Even if we accepted the

principle only in its moderate form, however, it should be clear that we would have to give away

enough to ensure that the consumer society, dependent as it is on people spending on trivia

rather than giving to famine relief, would slow down and perhaps disappear entirely. There are

several reasons why this would be desirable in itself. The value and necessity of economic

growth are now being questioned not only by conservationists, but by economists as well. [5]

There is no doubt, too, that the consumer society has had a distorting effect on the goals and

purposes of its members. Yet looking at the matter purely from the point of view of overseas aid,

there must be a limit to the extent to which we should deliberately slow down our economy; for it might be the case that if we gave away, say, 40 percent of our Gross National Product, we would slow down the economy so much that in absolute terms we would be giving less than if we gave 25 percent of the much larger GNP that we would have if we limited our contribution to this smaller percentage.

#### “Fair Share” arguments do not matter in a moral obligation. What matters is the obligation to assist

**Singer, Peter.** [Professor of Bioethics, Princeton University], “Famine, Affluence, and Morality,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, vol. 1, no. 1 (Spring 1972), pp. 229-243 [revised edition]

There may be a greater need to defend the second implication of my principle - that the fact that

there are millions of other people in the same position, in respect to the Bengali refugees, as I

am, does not make the situation significantly different from a situation in which I am the only

person who can prevent something very bad from occurring. Again, of course, I admit that there is a psychological difference between the cases; one feels less guilty about doing nothing if one can point to others, similarly placed, who have also done nothing. Yet this can make no real

difference to our moral obligations. [2] Should I consider that I am less obliged to pull the

drowning child out of the pond if on looking around I see other people, no further away than I am, who have also noticed the child but are doing nothing? One has only to ask this question to see the absurdity of the view that numbers lessen obligation. It is a view that is an ideal excuse for inactivity; unfortunately, most of the major evils - poverty, overpopulation, pollution - are problems in which everyone is almost equally involved. The view that numbers do make a difference can be made plausible if stated in this way: if everyone in circumstances like mine gave ￡5 to the Bengal Relief Fund, there would be enough to provide food, shelter, and medical care for the refugees; there is no reason why I should give more than anyone else in the same circumstances as I am; therefore I have no obligation to give more than ￡5. Each premise in this argument is true, and the argument looks sound. It may convince us, unless we notice that it is based on a hypothetical premise, although the conclusion is not stated hypothetically. The argument would be sound if the conclusion were: if everyone in circumstances like mine were to give ￡5, I would have no obligation to give more than ￡5. If the conclusion were so stated, however, it would be obvious that the argument has no bearing on a situation in which it is not the case that everyone else gives ￡5. This, of course, is the actual situation. It is more or less certain that not everyone in circumstances like mine will give ￡5. So there will not be enough to provide the needed food, shelter, and medical care. Therefore by giving more than ￡5 I will prevent more suffering than I would if I gave just ￡5.

It might be thought that this argument has an absurd consequence. Since the situation appears to

be that very few people are likely to give substantial amounts, it follows that I and everyone else

in similar circumstances ought to give as much as possible, that is, at least up to the point at

which by giving more one would begin to cause serious suffering for oneself and one's

dependents - perhaps even beyond this point to the point of marginal utility, at which by giving

more one would cause oneself and one's dependents as much suffering as one would prevent in

Bengal. If everyone does this, however, there will be more than can be used for the benefit of the

refugees, and some of the sacrifice will have been unnecessary. Thus, if everyone does what he

ought to do, the result will not be as good as it would be if everyone did a little less than he ought

to do, or if only some do all that they ought to do.”

### Truth Good

#### Truth is essential for autonomy

**Chemerinsky, Erwin.** Legion Lex Professor of Law at the University of Southern California Law Center, CASE WESTERN RESERVE LAW REVIEW, 1991, P. *750.*

More importantly, Professor Schauers analysis ignores the values of autonomy and choice. Truthful information allows individuals to make their own decisions about what to believe and how to act. A person should be able to decide whether to admire George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Franidin Roosevelt, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton based on accurate portrayals. Similarly, people should be able **to** decide whether **to** smoke or drink based on correct information concerning the health effects and where to place their money based on truths about the stability of banks. Professor Schauer also argues that information yields power. False information disempowers; it denies individuals the ability to make choices about the decisions in their lives. Professor Schauer simply ignores the importance of truth for individual autonomy. Honest, open public dialogue, dialogue that might help individuals and society discover their best interests, is prevented by the falsehoods.

#### Truth is key to knowledge and freedom

**Teson, Fernando R.** Professor of Law at Arizona State University, VIRGINIA JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW ASSOCIATION, Spring, 1993, p. 680.

In contrast, liberals regard free intellect as the engine of human progress, and intellectual integrity as an unconditional ethical commitment - rather than a political value to be weighed against others. Honesty for the Kantian is part of the categorical imperative to respect other rational beings by not using them manipulatively as means to other ends. The liberal commitment to rational discourse encompasses both science and morality. If we abandon it, as radicals urge, we jeopardize not only the path to knowledge and scientific progress, but also our most precious freedoms.

#### Truth is necessary for informed decision making

**Chemerinsky, Erwin.** Legion Lex Professor of Law at the University of Southern California Law Center, CASE WESTERN RESERVE LAW REVIEW, 1991, pp. *750-751.*

The same arguments can be made against Professor Schauer~s contention that ignorance is often better than knowledge. Although at times ignorance may be bliss, Professor Schauer gives no weight **to** the right of the people to know about government and other matters of public concern. Professor Schauer also fails to recognize the importance of knowledge **to** people who wish **to** exercise their autonomy by making informed choices about their lives. For example, it might be better if the government did not acknowledge that airport metal detectors cannot identify plastic explosives. In fact, terrorists might be best deterred if the Federal Aviation Administration falsely publicized the technical ability to detect such weapons. This, however, would deny the right of people to decide whether **to** fly based on an accurate appraisal of the risks. As argued earlier, the ultimate exposure of the truth might undermine the credibility of all government declarations concerning airplane safety.

#### Truth has inherent value

**Bjorhum, Eric.** Boston College Law School, GEORGETOWN JOURNAL OF LEGAL ETHICS, Summer, 1996, p. 1121.

Before launching into an analysis of my next maxim, I would like to offer a “proof” for the inherent value of truth in law. This simple proof follows from some of my earlier comments about skepticism. Assume that truth has no inherent value in law. Then we must accept one of two conclusions: either truth is instrumentally good, or it has no value whatsoever -- not even instrumentally. This second conclusion is easy to refute, because we have already seen that some belief about truth is necessary for the legal system to function, e.g., the legal system must claim to assign blame, not arbitrarily, but for things that happen in the world. The first conclusion is more difficult. Yet if we accept it, we must accept that lack of truth, or lying, could be just as good instrumentally (depending on the circumstance), and this I do not think we are ready **to** accept. We have already seen that lying is logically and empirically flawed. Thus, the original premise was wrong, and therefore its opposite must be true -- truth is at least its own inherent good. In the legal system, much of the apparatus is constructed around the search for truth.

### Falsehoods Bad

#### Falsehoods cause harm when the truth is found

**Chemerinsky, Erwin.** Legion Lex Professor of Law at the University of Southern California Law Center, CASE WESTERN RESERVE LAW REVIEW, 1991, p. 749.

If people falsely are encouraged to believe that the bank has their money on hand in reserves, there is a real risk of a bank run when depositors learn that they have been deceived. Similarly, there is a potential for serious backlash if people learn that they have been misled regarding the race of prominent Americans. Indeed, people will come **to** distrust anything said by those attempting **to** advance racial equality. If people learn that they were deceived concerning the effects with regard **to** baldness of smoking and drinking, they rnigbt then distrust all information concerning the adverse health effects of these practices. Spreading falsehoods to serve greater truths risks undermining those truths once the falsehoods are uncovered.

#### Truth overrides all other concerns like protecting feelings

**Marshall, William P.** Galen J. Roush Professor of Law at Case Western Reserve University Law School, GEORGIA LAW REVIEW, Fall, *1995,* p. 21.

A second potential argument in support of the truth justification rests upon the contention that transcendent truth might exist, and therefore, the search for truth is not necessarily futile. Certainly, if truth does exist, its importance is, virtually by definition, ultimate. Thus, even if the search for truth holds almost no possibility of success, the importance of truth is so great that its pursuit may still be seen as invaluable.

#### Promoting falsehoods is paternalistic

**Chemerinsky, Erwin.** Legion Lex Professor of Law at the University of Southern California Law Center, CASE WESTERN RESERVE LAW REVIEW, 1991, p. *750.*

There is a tremendous paternalism to this argument: believing he knows what the greater truths are, Professor Schauer decides that others would benefit by believing falsehoods. This view, that deception is permissible to serve a greater good, is frightening. There are no standards **to** guide the implementation of this utilitarian analysis or the determination of which falsehoods are justified. Professor Schauer seems to say little more than that falsehoods are permissible whenever they might make people better off in some way. His argument provides no stopping point for these lies and fails to recognize the dangers of deception.

#### No official agent should sell falsehoods

**Chemerinsky, Erwin.** Legion Lex Professor of Law at the University of Southern California Law Center, CASE WESTERN RESERVE LAW REVIEW, 1991, pp. *75 1-752.*

Thus, the question has to be faced as to who should decide when others are better served by lies or ignorance. Professor Schauer attempts to avoid this question by recognizing the dangers in creating an institution that would determine this for society. Even if no such institution is established, the question still has to be faced as to who shall decide when deception is acceptable. Should the government be able to decide when the people are better off with lies about its activities? History shows that government officials often will lie or suppress information to serve their own self-interest and rationalize their behavior by saying it serves the publics good. Should corporations or professionals be able to decide when we are better off being deceived? Again, history and experience teach that we are better off insisting on truth than trusting others to protect our interests through lies.

### Violence Does Not Disprove Objective Morality

#### The belief that humans are inherently violent is flawed and has been disproven by experts multiple times. It’s our environment and raising which produces violent behavior-continuation of the belief that we are born with violent tendencies allows for extinction

**Kohn 88** (Alfie, writes and speaks widely on human behavior, education, and parenting, “Human Nature Isn’t Inherently Violent,” <http://salsa.net/peace/conv/8weekconv1-4.html>, AD: 7-11-09) JN

Peace activists can tell when it's coming. Tipped off by a helpless shrug or a patronizing smile, they brace themselves to hear the phrase once again. "Sure, I'm in favor of stopping the arms race. But aren't you being idealistic? After all, aggression is just" - here it comes - "part of human nature." Like the animals, -- "red in tooth and claw," as Tennyson put it - human beings are thought to be unavoidably violent creatures. Surveys of adults, undergraduates, and high school students have found that about 60 percent agree with this statement. "**Human nature being what it is, there will always be war." It may be part of our society's folk wisdom, but it sets most of the expert's heads to shaking**. **Take the belief**, popularized by Sigmund Freud and animal researcher Konrad Lorenz**, that we have within us, naturally and spontaneously, a reservoir of aggressive energy. This force, which builds by itself, must be periodically drained off -** by participating in competitive sports, for instance - lest we explode into violence. **It is an appealing model because it is easy to visualize. It is also false**. John Paul Scott, professor emeritus at Bowling Green State University in Bowling Green, Ohio, has written: "**All of our present data indicate that fighting behavior among higher mammals, including man, originates in external stimulation and that there is no evidence of spontaneous internal stimulation."** Clearly, **many individuals - and whole cultures - manage quite well without behaving aggressively, and there is no evidence of the inexorable buildup of pressure this "hydraulic" model would predict**. The theory also predicts that venting aggressive energy should make us less aggressive - an effect known as "catharsis," which follows Aristotle's idea that we can be purged of unpleasant emotions by watching tragic dramas. But one study after another has shown that we are likely to become more violent after watching or participating in such pastimes. Although the hydraulic model has been discredited, the more general belief in an innate human propensity for violence has not been so easily shaken. Among the arguments one hears is these: Animals are aggressive and we cannot escape the legacy of our evolutionary ancestors; human history is dominated by takes of war and cruelty, and certain areas of the brain and particular hormones are linked to aggression, proving a biological basis for such behavior. First, **we should be cautious in drawing lessons from other species to explain our own behavior, given the mediating force of culture and our capacity for reflection. But even animals are not as aggressive as some people think** - unless the term "aggression" includes killing to eat. Organized group aggression is rare in other species, and the aggression that does exist is typically a function of the environment in which animals find themselves. **Scientists have discovered that altering animals' environment, or the way they are reared, can have a profound impact on the level of aggression found in virtually all species.** Furthermore, animals cooperate both within and among species far more than many of us may assume on the basis of watching nature documentaries. **When we turn to human history, we find an alarming number of aggressive behaviors, but we do not find reason to believe the problem is innate**. Here are some of the points made by critics of biological determinism: **Even if a given behavior is universal, we cannot automatically conclude that it is part of our biological nature. All known cultures may produce pottery, but that does not mean that there is a gene for pottery-making**. Aggression **is no where near universal**. Many hunter-gatherer societies in particular are entirely peaceful. And the cultures that are "closer to nature" would be expected to be the most warlike if the proclivity for war were really part of that nature. Just the reverse seems to be true. While it is indisputable that wars have been fought, the fact that they seem to dominate our history may say more about how history is presented than about what actually happened. Many people have claimed that human nature is aggressive after having lumped together a wide range of emotions and behavior under the label of aggression. While cannibalism, for example, is sometimes perceived as aggression, it might represent a religious ritual rather than an expression of hostility. It is true that the presence of some hormones or the stimulation of certain sections of the brain has been experimentally linked with aggression. But after describing these mechanisms in some detail, K.E. Moyer, a physiologist at Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh, emphasizes that "**aggressive behavior is stimulus-bound. That is, even though the neural system specific to a particular kind of aggression is well activated, the behavior does not occur unless an appropriate target is available (and even then) it can be inhibited**." **Regardless of the evolutionary or neurological factors said to underlie aggression, "biological" simply does not mean "unavoidable." The fact that people voluntarily fast or remain celibate shows that even hunger and sex drives can be overridden**. **All this concerns the matter of aggressiveness in general**. **The idea that war in particular is biologically determined is even more far-fetched**. To begin with, we tend to make generalizations about the whole species on the basis of our own experience. "**People in a highly warlike society are likely to overestimate the propensity toward war in human nature,**" says Donald Greenberg, a sociologist at the University of Missouri. The historical record, according to the Congressional Research Service, shows the United States is one of the most warlike societies on the planet, having intervened militarily around the world more than 150 times since 1850. Within such a society, not surprisingly, the intellectual traditions supporting the view that aggression is more a function of nature than nurture have found a ready audience. The mass media also play a significant role in perpetuating outdated views on violence, according to Jeffrey Goldstein, a psychologist at Temple University. Because it is relatively easy to describe and makes for a snappier news story, reporters seem to prefer explanations of aggression that invoke biological necessity, he says. **An international conference of experts concluded in 1986 that war is not an inevitable part of human nature.** When one member tried to convince reporters that this finding was newsworthy, few news organizations in the United States were interested. One reporter told him, "Call us back when you find a gene for war." Leonard Eron, a psychologist at the University of Illinois in Chicago, observes, "**TV teaches people that aggressive behavior is normative, that the world around you is a jungle when it is actually not so."** In fact, research at the University of Pennsylvania's Annenberg School of Communications has shown that the more television an individual watches, the more likely he or she is to believe that "most people would take advantage of you if they got the chance." The belief that violence in unavoidable, while disturbing at first glance, actually holds a curious attraction for some people. It also allows individuals to excuse their own acts of aggression by suggesting that they have little choice. "In order to justify, accept, and live with war, we have created a psychology that makes it inevitable," says Dr. Bernard Lown, co-chairman of International Physicians for th4e Prevention of Nuclear War, which received the Nobel peace Prize in 1985. "It is a rationalization for accepting war as a system of resolving human conflict." **To understand these explanations for the war-is-inevitable belief is to realize its consequences. Treating any behavior as inevitable sets up a self-fulfilling prophecy: By assuming we are bound to be aggressive, we are more likely to act that way and provide evidence for the assumption. People who believe that humans are naturally aggressive may also be unlikely to oppose particular wars. The evidence suggests, then, that humans do have a choice with respect to aggression and war.** **To an extent, such destructiveness is due to the mistaken assumption that we are helpless to control an essentially violent nature. "We live in a time**," says Lown, "**when accepting this as inevitable is no longer possible without courting extinction."**

**Violence isn’t intrinsic to human nature – it’s a result of unfortunate circumstances**

**Dime 7 (Jamin, “Are Humans Inherently Violent?”, Newsvine, 11-20-7, http://jamindime.newsvine.com/\_news/2007/11/20/1110479-are-humans-inherently-violent)**

**Humans are creatures of circumstance**. However, **there are those** respected voices in the anthropological world such as Richard Wrangham and Dale Peterson that contend we are not. Instead, we are slaves to our biological makeup. According to their essay, Demonic Males: Apes and the Origins of Human Violence, it is difficult to escape our evolutionary past and we are, as a result, forced to act according to our inherent nature. Both Peterson and Wrangham believe **that war and human violence exist because of inherited behavioral tendencies**. These tendencies are the result of sexual selection where aggressive males typically dominant less-aggressive males, preventing them from mating and passing on their traits. Sure, we can see evidence of this in the Guido tribes of the northeastern United States, but due to rampant steroid use the chances for reproductive success are slim. In order to understand why certain people tend to be more prone to violence than others, it is crucial to understand that humans tend to move towards the simplest method of accomplishing a goal. The constant advancement of technology is proof of this, and while certain products of technology might be difficult to understand or learn at first, they prove to make whatever task they are designed for much easier and quicker to complete. In regards to violence, the same concept can be applied. People prone to violence see violence as the easiest method for acquiring what they want. Nevertheless, **violence is not an inherent trait of human beings** or primates. Despite the guarantee of reading or hearing about a dozen or more violent acts in the media**, violence is not the default response for the average person**. While Sussman's argument that violence is the result of culture and society is a credible one, **culture is not the sole cause for violence. Innate tendencies such as competition and pride mixed with the way in which a society functions can bring about the need for violent action due to the circumstances of a situation. After all, we are creatures of circumstance. We adapt and react to the world around us, and because of this there are times when we must engage in violent activity. However, we can use culture as a means to create a situation where competitive means for survival are unneeded, but until there is a united effort to reform the way we interact with the world, violence is just an unfortunate consequence.**

**Violence is not an inherent human quality**

**Clark 2** (Mary E., “In Search of Human Nature, AD: 7/11/9)

In fact, as Grossman argues throughout his book, **soldiers  must be thoroughly trained, through repeated drills and simulated battle-field conditions, to act reflexively in combat without conscious awareness, before they are able to shoot at an enemy up close**. This was part of the Vietnam soldiers’ training, and led to such massacres as that at My Lai. Only when soldiers were both pretrained to kill and given specific commands on sites “to neautralize everything” were they sufficiently desensitized to carry out the slaying of old men, mothers, children and babies. My point is that **human beings, male or females, are not born killers of other people**. Aggressive **violence is not automatic. It is contextural; it requires meaning**, a “justifiable” reason. As Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, and other advocates of nonviolent action recognized, it is easy to harm or kill face-less strangers at a distance; it is almost impossible to do so (with some significant exceptions to be taken up in later chapters) when face-to-face. It is far easier to hurt someone you trusted, who has broken that trust, or to kill an enemy whom you have seen blow up your buddy. But, as Lt. Col. Grossman says: **“Killing comes with a price, and societies must learn that their soldiers will have to spend the rest of their lives living with what they have done.”** **Violent aggression always has a social cause. It is not a “natural drive.”**

### Human Nature Doesn’t Create Reality

#### Claims of human nature are backward – it’s theory that creates reality. Arguments that say human nature overrides morals are false

**Saurette 96** (Paul, Prof of political theory/science at John Hopkins University, “I mistrust all Systematizers and Avoid Them: Nietzsche, Arendt and the Crisis of the Will to Order in International Relations Theory.” Millenium Journal of International Studies. Vol. 25, number 1. pp. 3-6, AD: 7/6/09) jl

What is startling about this strategy is not so much its circular logic, nor even its contradictory tendencies, but rather what they suggest about the direction, origin, and function of realist assumptions. **It has** always **been understood** that **the theories of Hobbes and Rousseau,** and thus Morgenthau and Waltz, **flow logically from their a priori assumptions about human nature**. But **what if the relationship is backwards** in this understanding? **What if their assumptions of human nature flow logically from their theories of political action?** The importance of Hobbes might not be that he theorised the emergence of a new mode of political action after the demise of Christianity, but rather that he preserved the traditional understanding of politics-as-making by endowing it with a new absolute: **human nature**, From this perspective, Hobbes **conserves the traditional interpretation of political action by simply substituting the Truth of' eternal human nature for the declining ideal of God**. In other words, Hobbes' **thought takes as natural the instrumental nature of politics and merely creates a new anchor for the means-end calculation**, Thus, while Hobbes can be viewed as innovative and indicative of the emergence of a modern resolution of spatial politics,' I would suggest that the continuity manifested in his understanding of politics-as-making is perhaps the more remarkable of the two tendencies. In this sense, the normative foundation and limitations of realism lie not merely in the Hobbesian assumption of human nature, but rather in the tradition of politics­as-making which remains intact despite Hobbes' `revolutionary' strategy.

## Negative Evidence

**Human nature feels good, not objectivity**  
  
**Walsh, James and Shapiro, Henry.** Aristotle's Ethics: Issues and Interpretations, 1967, p. 1-2

"Aristotle is fundamentally a 'naturalist; because he treats man as a natural creature--the most highly developed of the animals but still an animal rather than a supernatural soul temporarily sojourning here below. Although Aristotle invites man to become godlike, his appeal is to reason and experience--not to divine commands or sanctions. The rule s which the good man obeys stem from his own reason, not from religious revelation or a vision of transcendental ideals; and the satisfactions of the good life are natural elements of the situation, not divinely bestowed rewards. Consequently, man, like other animals, can act only through the activation of appetites; moral motivation thus cannot be reduced to the struggle of reason as such against appetites as such. Similarly, since pleasure naturally accompanies the successful completion of characteristic animal and human.

**MacIntyre, Alasdair.** After Virtue, 1981, p. 148

"What then does the good for man turn out to be? Aristotle has cogent arguments against identifying that good with money, with honor or with pleasure. He gives to it the name of eudaimonia--as so often there is difficulty in translation: blessedness, happiness, prosperity. It is the state of being well and doing well in being well, of a man's being well-favored himself and in relation to the divine. But when Aristotle first gives this name to the good for man, he leaves the question of the content of eudaimonia largely open."

### Objectivity does not exist in humans

#### There is no such thing as objectivity in human inquiry

**Arendt, Hannah.** Social Philosopher, BETWEEN PAST AND FUTURE, 1954, p. 49.

In other words, the experiment “being a question put before nature” (Galileo), the answers of science will always remain replies to questions asked by men; the confusion in the issue of objectivity was to assume that there could be answers without questions and results independent of a question-asking being. Physics we know today, is no less a man-centered inquiry into what is than historical research. The old quarrel, therefore between the subjectivity of historiography and the objectivity of physics has lost much of its relevance.

#### There is no objective truth or values

**Tse-Tung, Mao.** Former Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, FOUR ESSAYS ON PHILOSOPHY, 1969, p. 18.

The Marxist-Lenin theory of knowledge, characterized as it is by scientific social practice, cannot but resolutely oppose these wrong ideologies. Marxists recognize that in the absolute and general process of development of the universe, the development of each particular process is relative, and that hence, in the endless flow of absolute truth, man’s knowledge of a particular process at any given stage of development is only relative truth. The sum total of innumerable relative truths constitutes absolute truth.

### Objectivity Does Not Exist-Self Defense Theory

#### Self-defense necessitates immoral acts at times

**O'Keefe 2002** (Michael O'Keefe, Research Fellow at the ARC Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics., Terrorism and justice : moral argument in a threatened world, , 2002 p. 119)

Bomb-throwing Russian anarchists of the nineteenth century, who gave themselves up for execution after they had murdered, arguably showed a kind of respect for human life even when they deliberately killed civilians. The 'softening up' operations that bombed tens of thousands of Iraqi soldiers into the desert sands of Iraq and Kuwait, and which apparently provoked contempt for the United States in much of the Arab world, showed a brutal lack of regard for human life. It is hard to see how one could show such contempt for the humanity of combatants and at the same time show respect for the humanity of civilians by carehl (and much publicised) attempts to minimise 'collateral damage'. Respect for the humanity of others is not so easily divisible. The frequent attempt to make it so is one of the reasons why George Orwell was scornful of the sometimes hypocritical importance we attach to the distinction between combatants and civilians.6 'Do you think our enemy will lay down its arms just because we insist on being nice!'

That is how one former US general put his objection to what he regarded as the childish constraint’s moralists would place on the conduct of war. Crude though his expression of it was, the thought he expressed was not crude. Ever since Socrates claimed that it is better to suffer evil than to do it, the same thought has been invoked to remind us that in politics one has sometimes to decide whether one will adopt the only means available for one's defense or renounce them because they are unjust. Nothing in morality can save us from the ~possibility at we will face an enemy who is cunning enough to ensure that the only available means for our self-defense are evil. It is mere whistling in the dark to believe, as a distinguished Catholic moralist put it, that though morality may lead us to tragedy, it can never lead us to disaster.

### Static Values Flawed

#### No fundamental standard for values exists

**Maclntyre, Alasdair.** Professor of Social Philosophy at the University of Essex, THREE RIVAL VERSIONS OF MORAL ENQUIRY, 1990, p.4.

On the one hand are those who hold that in certain cases where two large-scale systems of thought and practice are in radical disagreement—such various examples have been cited as the disagreements between the physics of Aristotle and the physics of Galileo or Newton, those between the beliefs in practice of witchcraft by some African peoples and the cosmology of modem science, and those between the conceptions of right action characteristic of the Homeric world and the morality of modem individualism— there is and can be no independent standard of measure of appeal to which their rival claims can be adjudicated, since each has internal to itself its own fundamental standard of judgment. Such systems are incommensurable, and the terms in and by means of which judgment is deliberated in each are so specific and idiosyncratic to each that they cannot be translated into the terms of the other without gross distortion.

### Objectivity kills Autonomy

#### The call to an objective morality kills sovereignty and autonomy

**Conway**, **Daniel.** Professor and Department Head 19th Century Philosophy at Texas A&M, **1997**, *Nietzsche and the Political,* pg. 19

For all of his enthusiasm, however, the cultural production of sovereign individuals is simply incompatible with the diminished resources at the disposal of his age. What modernity calls an “individual,” the pride of the Enlightenment, is nothing more than a “moral milksop,” a domesticated animal that has internalized the demands of culture and consequently operates under the illusion of self-legislated freedom. Even the sovereign individual,” who possesses “the right to make promises,” owes his ”rare freedom” to his “conscience,” which, Nietzsche shows, is itself an implant of socially enforced heteronomy (GM 2: 2). The conscience, a fiercely vigilant homunculus responsible for reckoning one’s debts and obligations, represents the final-and most forbidding-barrier to genuine sovereignty.

Nietzsche snickers at the idea that the right to make promises stands as sufficient evidence of one’s sovereignty, for he views the conscience as the internalized, mnemonic distillation of socially enforced punitive and carceral practices. Whereas the noble savage and blond beast require sturdy cages or constant external surveillance, “men of conscience” are sufficiently docile to police themselves. Even Nietzsche himself, the self-styled immoralist and Antichrist, continues to wear this “venerable long pigtail,” which makes him “seem old-fashioned and grandfatherly-honorable” (BGE 214).

The closest thing we know to genuine, supramoral sovereignty is not the debt-paying, promise-keeping, originally positioned author of the social contract, but the criminal, the monster devoid of conscience, who personally shoulders the entire burden of his existential suffering. Nietzsche thus defines “the criminal type” as “the type of strong human being under unfavorable circumstances: a strong human being made sick” (TI 1X: 45).

Under the influence of Christianity, the institutions of Western civilization have for the most part implemented what Nietzsche calls “moralities of taming” (TI VII: 3). Social practices of self-formation have succeeded in sickening (and thus domesticating) those individals whose “virtues are ostracized by society.” The conscience thus prevents individuals from straying far from the internalized norm, while the institutions of modernity marginalize or stamp out those singular, exotic plants that do manage to blossom. On a rare occasion, however, “a man proves stronger than society: the Corsican, Napoleon, is the most famous case” (TI 1X: 45).

### No justification for moral actions

#### There is no justification for moral action

**Warner, Richard.** NQA, FREEDOM, ENJOYMENT, AND HAPPINESS AN ESSAY ON MORAL PSYCHOLOGY, 1987, p. 178.

One might hope for more along these lines than just ‘a criticism of The Counter’s life. One might hope that the concept of the justification of action—the concept that every person has and employs—has the following property: a person never has a justification, or never an adequate one, for immoral action while always having a decisive justification for moral action.

#### Morality cannot have external justifications

**Maclntyre, Alasdair.** Professor of Social Philosophy at the University of Essex, A SHORT HISTORY OF ETHICS, 1966, p. 85.

For to justify justice is to show that it is more profitable than injustice, that it is to our interest to be just. But if we do what is just and right because it is to our interest, then, so Prochard takes almost for granted, we are not going to because it is just and right and all. Morality indeed cannot have any justification external to itself; if we do not do what is right for its own sake, and whether it is to our interest or not, then we are not doing what is right.

### Human Actors

#### We must act as our own moral agents – we are only responsible for taking our own moral actions and not for those of intervening actors.

**Gewirth, prof. of philosophy at the University of Chicago, 1982** (Alan, “Human Rights: essays on justification and applications”, p. 229)

The required supplement is provided by the principle of intervening action. According to this principle, when there is a casual connection between some person A’s performing some action (or inaction) X and some other person C’s incurring a certain harm Z, A’s moral responsibility for Z is removed if, between X and Z, there intervenes some other action Y of some person B who knows the relevant circumstances of his action and who intends to produce Z or who produces Z through recklessness. The reason for this removal is that B’s intervening action Y is more direct of proximate cause of Z and, unlike A’s action (or inaction), Y is the sufficient condition of Z as it actually occurs. An example of this principle may help to show its connection with the absolutist thesis. Martin Luther King Jr. was repeatedly told that because he led demonstrations in support of civil rights, he was morally responsible for the disorders, riots, and deaths that ensued and that were shaking the American Republic to its foundations. By the principle of intervening action, however, it was King’s opponents who were responsible because their intervention operated as the sufficient conditions of the riots and injuries. King might also have replied that the Republic would not be worth saving if the price that had to be paid was the violation of the civil rights of black Americans. As for the rights of the other Americans to peace and order, the reply would be that these rights cannot justifiably be secured at the price of the rights of blacks.

### Practice cannot be separated from action

#### We cannot separate our actions from ourselves

**Tse-Tung, Mao.** Former Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, SELECTED WORKS OF MAO TSE-TUNG, VOLUME ONE: 1926-1936, 1954, p. 284.

The theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism raises practice to the first place, holds that human knowledge cannot be separated the least bit from practice, and repudiates all incorrect theories which deny the importance of practice or separate knowledge from practice. Thus Lenin said, Practice is higher than (theoretical) knowledge because it has not only the virtue of universality, but also the virtue of immediate reality.

#### Theory is worthwhile if it guides practice

**Tse-Tung, Mao.** Former Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, FOUR ESSAYS ON PHILOSOPHY, 1966, p. 14.

But Marxism emphasizes the importance of theory precisely and only because it can guide action. If we have a correct theory but merely prate about it, pigeonhole it and do not put it into practice, then that theory, however good, is of no significance. Knowledge begins with practice, and theoretical knowledge is acquired through practice and must then return to practice.

### Objectivity is Circular Logic

#### Morality bases itself on a self-promoting truth- that good is good because its useful and bad is bad because it is stupid to do wrong.

**Nietzsche, Friedrich.** 1886, *Beyond Good and Evil*

There is something in the morality of Plato which does not really belong to Plato, but which only appears in his philosophy, one might say, in spite of him: namely, Socratism, for which he himself was too noble. “No one desires to injure himself, hence all evil is done unwittingly. The evil man inflicts injury on himself; he would not do so, however, if he knew that evil is evil. The evil man, therefore, is only evil through error; if one free him from error one will necessarily make him—good.”—This mode of reasoning savours of the POPULACE, who perceive only the unpleasant consequences of evil−doing, and practically judge that “it is STUPID to do wrong”; while they accept “good” as identical with “useful and pleasant,” without further thought. As regards every system of utilitarianism, one may at once assume that it has the same origin, and follow the scent: one will seldom err.— Plato did all he could to interpret something refined and noble into the tenets of his teacher, and above all to interpret himself into them—he, the most daring of all interpreters, who lifted the entire Socrates out of the street, as a popular theme and song, to exhibit him in endless and impossible modifications —namely, in all his own disguises and multiplicities. In jest, and in Homeric language as well, what is the Platonic Socrates, if not—[Greek words inserted here.]

### Objectivity forces Presumption

#### Morality forces the forcing of the presumption that morality must be good- leading to personal self-contempt.

**Nietzsche, Friedrich.** 1886, *Beyond Good and Evil*

221 “It sometimes happens,” said a moralistic pedant and trifle−retailer, “that I honour and respect an unselfish man: not, however, because he is unselfish, but because I think he has a right to be useful to another man at his own expense. In short, the question is always who HE is, and who THE OTHER is. For instance, in a person created and destined for command, self− denial and modest retirement, instead of being virtues, would be the waste of virtues: so it seems to me. Every system of unegoistic morality which takes itself unconditionally and appeals to every one, not only sins against good taste, but is also an incentive to sins of omission, an ADDITIONAL seduction under the mask of philanthropy—and precisely a seduction and injury to the higher, rarer, and more privileged types of men. Moral systems must be compelled first of all to bow before the GRADATIONS OF RANK; their presumption must be driven home to their conscience—until they thoroughly understand at last that it is IMMORAL to say that 'what is right for one is proper for another.'”—So said my moralistic pedant and bonhomme. Did he perhaps deserve to be laughed at when he thus exhorted systems of morals to practise morality? But one should not be too much in the right if one wishes to have the laughers on ONE'S OWN side; a grain of wrong pertains even to good taste.

222. Wherever sympathy (fellow−suffering) is preached nowadays— and, if I gather rightly, no other religion is any longer preached—let the psychologist have his ears open through all the vanity, through all the noise which is natural to these preachers (as to all preachers), he will hear a hoarse, groaning, genuine note of SELF−CONTEMPT. It belongs to the overshadowing and uglifying of Europe, which has been on the increase for a century (the first symptoms of which are already specified documentarily in a thoughtful letter of Galiani to Madame d'Epinay)—IF IT IS NOT REALLY THE CAUSE THEREOF! The man of “modern ideas,” the conceited ape, is excessively dissatisfied with himself−this is perfectly certain. He suffers, and his vanity wants him only “to suffer with his fellows.”

### Objectivity Bad

#### Embracing the values of objectivity denies self

**Arendt, Hannah,** Social Philosopher, BETWEEN PAST AND FUTURE, 1954, p. 49.

The modern historian as a rule is not yet aware of the fact that the natural scientist, against whom he had to defend his own scientific standards for so many decades, finds himself in the same position, and he is quite likely to state and restate in new, seemingly more scientific terms the distinction between a science of nature, and a science of history. The reason is that the problem of objectivity in the historical sciences is more than a mere technical, scientific perplexity. Objectivity, the “extinction of the self’ as the condition of “pure vision” (das reine Sehen der Dinge—Ranke ) meant the historian’s abstention from bestowing either praise or blame, together with the attitude of perfect distance with which he would follow the course of events as they were revealed in his documentary sources.

#### A person must not have a value system based on objectivity and truths

**Tse-Tung, Mao.** Former Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, FOUR ESSAYS ON PHILOSOPHY, 1969, p. 18-19.

The development of an objective process is full of contradictions and struggles, and so is the development of the movement of human knowledge. All the dialectical movements of the objective world can sooner or later be reflected in human knowledge. In social practice, the process of coming into being, developing and passing away is infinite and so is the process of coming into being, developing and passing away in human knowledge.

#### There is no distinction between fact and value

**Rorty, Richard.** Professor of Humanities at University of Virginia, PHILOSOPHY AND THE MIRROR OF NATURE, 1979, p. 364.

Only if we assume that there is a value-free vocabulary which renders these sets of “factual” statements commensurable can the positivist distinction between facts and values, beliefs and attitudes, look plausible. But the philosophical fiction that such a vocabulary is on the tips of our tongues is, from an educational point of view, disastrous. It forces us to pretend that we can split ourselves up into knowers of true sentences on the one hand and choosers of lives or actions or works of art on the other.

### Objectivity Bad-Culpability

#### An Objective Moral view allows for people to ignore the impacts of action as long their morals are sound

**Nielsen 1993** (Kai, Phil. Prof @ U. Calgary, Absolutism and It Consequentialist Critics,

ed. Joram Graf Haber, p. 170-2)

Blowing up the fat man is indeed monstrous. But letting him remain stuck while the whole group drowns is still more monstrous. The consequentialist is on strong moral ground here, and, if his reflective moral convictions do not square either with certain unrehearsed or with certain reflective particular moral convictions of human beings, so much the worse for such commonsense moral convictions. One could even usefully and relevantly adapt here-though for a quite different purpose-an argument of Donagan's. Consequentialism of the kind I have been arguing for provides so persuasive "a theoretical basis for common morality that when it contradicts some moral intuition, it is natural to suspect that intuition, not theory, is corrupt." Given the comprehensiveness, plausibility, and overall rationality of consequentialism,

it is not unreasonable to override even a deeply felt moral conviction if it does not square with such a theory, though, if it made no sense or overrode the bulk of or even a great many of our considered moral convictions that would be another matter indeed Anticonsequentialisfs often point to the inhumanity of people who will sanction such killing of the innocent but cannot the compliment be returned by speaking of the even greater inhumanity, conjoined with evasiveness, of those who will allow even more death and far greater misery and then excuse themselves on the ground that they did not intend the death and misery but merely forbore to prevent it? In such a context, such reasoning and such forbearing to prevent seems to me to constitute a moral evasion. I say it is evasive because rather than steeling himself to do what in normal circumstances would be a horrible and vile act but in this circumstance is a harsh moral necessity he **[fo**llows. when he has the power to prevent it, a situation which is still many times worse. He tries to keep his 'moral purity' and [to] avoid 'dirty hands' at the price of utter moral failure and what Kierkegaard called 'double-mindedness.' It is understandable that people should act in this morally evasive way but this does not make it right.

### Morality Not Objective- Localized

#### Moral obligation to protect those close to us and there is no duty to assist the stranger

**Aberson, Raziel.** Philosophy Professor, THE PHILOSOPHICAL FORUM, Spring 2005, pp. 31-8

Peter Unger, in *Living High and Letting Die,* seems to agree with what he calls “Libertarianism” (and I call “common sense morality”) that we have moral obligations to aid those who are emotionally close to us which **take precedence over our obligations to unknown strangers:** Very briefly, here’s a fallible formulation of a fair bit of Libertarianism’s substantive side. Insofar as they need her help to have a decent chance for decent lives, a person must do a great deal for those few people, like her dependent children, to whom she has the most serious sort of special obligation. Insofar as it’s compatible with that, which is often very considerable indeed, and sometimes even when it’s not so compatible, she must do a lot for other innocent folks in need [. . .]5 Setting aside Unger’s tantalizing next-to-last clause: “and sometimes when it’s not so

compatible,” he does recognize the relevance of emotional closeness to degree of responsibility to aid. Yet throughout his thoughtful study, he argues persuasively for a position very similar to that of Peter Singer, whom he frequently quotes with approval to the effect that, if we do not contribute all we have except the necessities of life to famine relief, we are guilty of severe moral callousness in letting people die whom we could have, and should have saved: [. . .] we can conclude that, if it’s needed for there to be as much (sic) as three fewer children dying soon, it’s seriously wrong for you (not) to impose a *non*serious loss on yourself, however large*.* Now as we all know, by imposing on yourself as large a financial loss as you can, and easily aiming the fund toward efficient vital programs, you will lessen serious suffering to a far greater extent than that. So it’s seriously wrong not to send to the likes of Unicef and Oxfam, about as promptly

as possible, nearly all your worldly wealth. In drawing these utilitarian conclusions, Unger seems to have overlooked his initial agreement with Libertarianism, as quoted above, to the effect that those emotionally close to us have a prior moral claim on our assistance.

**The closer we are to someone, the greater the obligation to** aid

**Aberson, Raziel.** Philosophy Professor, THE PHILOSOPHICAL FORUM, Spring 2005, pp. 31-8

Generalizing, it seems fair to say that we normally develop a general commitment to the principle that our moral obligations to aid vary in strength with the emotional closeness to us of our fellows. When we know whom we are aiding, that very fact brings our beneficiaries closer to us than unknown strangers, and we therefore feel more responsible for their well being. This should not be brushed aside as an irrational prejudice. It is a matter of moral obligation grounded in our fundamental commitments. Having engendered in those who are emotionally close to us the expectation that we will place their needs and interests ahead of strangers, it would be wrong for us to violate those expectations, providing, of course, that they are not grossly disproportionate, like those of a demanding parent or a spoiled child, in which case we are indeed at fault for having encouraged such excessive expectations*.* I have argued at some length elsewhere, for the reasonableness of the principle of covariance of degree of responsibility for wellbeing with the emotional closeness to us of the beneficiaries of our actions, but whether reasonable or not, the fact that we are committed to it and that others depend on our commitment makes it morally obligatory that we act accordingly.

### Truth Bad

#### Truth is too incomprehensible to be obtained

**Marshall, William P.** Galen J. Roush Professor of Law at Case Western Reserve University Law School, GEORGIA LAW REVIEW, Fall, 1995, P. 21-22.

For example, even if truth does exist, it will be of little utility in serving as a meaningful direction for human conduct unless it is also comprehensible to human understanding. The possibility and importance argument, therefore, depends not only on truth’s existence, but also upon its accessibility--a factor that, although not undercutting truth’s importance, makes the search potentially even less likely to achieve fruition.

#### Truth is all relative to the individual

**Higgins, Tracy E.** Associate Professor of Law - Fordham University, HARVARD WOMEN’S LAW JOURNAL, Spring, 1996, p. 94.

Central to postmodernism is its critique of the claim that scientific knowledge is universal and can be justified in a noncontextual way. Postmodernists contend that standards of truth are context-dependent.... Postmodernists tend to favor forms of social inquiry which incorporate an explicitly practical and moral intent, that are contextual and restricted in their focus (local stories are preferred over general ones), and that are narratively structured rather than articulating a general theory.

#### Truth is not necessarily preferable. Sometimes ignorance is better

**Schauer, Frederick.** Professor of the First Amendment at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, CASE WESTERN RESERVE LAW REVIEW, 1991, pp. 708.

When the question is so rephrased, it then appears that what is at issue is not whether it is better (for you? for me?) that you believe (correctly) that I am an academic rather than (falsely) that I am a professional wrestler, but whether it is better that you believe (correctly) that I am an academic than that you have no beliefs at all about me. And what if I were in fact a professional wrestler? Or a religious fundamentalist? In these cases I might be better off if you had no knowledge at all. And maybe so would you, and so would society. Think of what it means to say, “I wish I hadn’t known that.” It is possible that in most cases it is better to have a true belief than a false one. It is also possible, however, that in a nontrivial number of cases it is no better to have a true belief as opposed to no belief whatsoever.

#### Truths are valueless and the quest to find them causes harm to others

**Schauer, Frederick.** Professor of the First Amendment at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, CASE WESTERN RESERVE LAW REVIEW, 1991, pp. 710-711

As a number of the examples above were designed to suggest, it is clear that many increases in someone s knowledge come at the expense of someone else’s well-being or dignity. I find it wildly implausible to suppose that in every case the well-being of the recipient of the new information is increased by more than the well-being of the subject is decreased as a result of the disclosure. Here, however, it is important to distinguish those activities that are, on balance, undesirable from those that have no value at all. Under one view, all increases in knowledge are valuable, but some may also cause disvalues outweighing the value produced. Yet under another view, some increases in knowledge simply have no value at all.

### Truth does not exist

#### Transcendent truth does not exist

**Marshall, William P.** Galen J. Roush Professor of Law at Case Western Reserve University Law School, GEORGIA LAW REVIEW, Fall, 1995, p. 3.

Contemporary philosophical thought, it is said, does not believe in truth, at least in the “objective” or “transcendent” sense of the word. To the contemporary mind, objective or transcendent truth is seen as nonsensical or, at best, unintelligible. The Enlightenment claim that the powers of reason could lead humanity **to** a knowledge of truth has been savaged. Beliefs in religious revelation, while still accepted by some, are seen as too idiosyncratic and too faith-laden for constructing universal notions of truth. Human cognitive powers fare no better. Humanity has yet to recover from the empirical skepticism of Hume or the scathing attack on the capabilities of human knowledge and reason leveled by Nietzsche.

### Truth not desirable

#### Truth does not exist and is not obtainable

**Kreyche, Gerald F.** philosophy professor, USA TODAY MAGAZINE, September, 1996, p. 82.

.

Perhaps Plato was right in holding that Iruth does not exist in this world, but only in a higher one. Or wa.~ German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche correct in stating that there are no facts, only interpretations? David Hume, the Scottish philosopher, might have summed it up best, maintaining that ‘The truth is, there is no truth.”

#### Truth is not inherently deiserable

**Schauer, Frederick.** Professor of the First Amendment at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, CASE WESTERN RESERVE LAW REVIEW, 1991, pp. 706-707.

Given the deep-seeded racism in the United States, I would consider it an open-question whether the United States would be better off if everyone in the country believed (falsely) that George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Franidin Roosevelt, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton were African-Americans. I am not convinced that the country would be, on balance, hurt if American men believed (falsely) that cigarettes and alcohol cause baldness. I am also willing to entertain the possibility that the (false) belief of most Americans that their banks have well in excess of fifty percent of deposits available for immediate withdrawal is an essential condition for the successful operation of the banking system in the United States, which is in turn (possibly) instrumental to economic stability, which is in turn (possibly) instrumental to the general welfare of the people of the United States. At the very least, therefore, it appears that if truth is instrumental, then more truth, or even less falsity, is not in every case instrumental to what it is that truth is instrumental to.

#### Lack of truth creates human freedom

**Marshall, William P.** Galen J. Roush Professor of Law at Case Western Reserve University Law School, GEORGIA LAW REVIEW, Fall, 1995, p. 22-23.

Arguably, humanity is free precisely because truth is not known. It is only because of the absence of discernible divine or natural law that humanity is free to create its own rules of conduct. Truth, on the other hand, presumably binds humanity to its precepts. Thus, as Leonard Levy notes, neither freedom of speech nor freedom of press could “become a civil liberty until the truth of men’s opinions, especially their religious opinions, was regarded as relative rather than absolute.” If there were only one “true religion,” there could be no toleration of dissent because everyone would “be compelled to accept it for their own salvation as well as for the good of God and the nation.”

#### “Who decides?” is an inadequate response to the critique of truth

**Schauer, Frederick.** Professor of the First Amendment at the John F. Kennedy School of Govermnent at Harvard, CASE WESTERN RESERVE LAW REVIEW, 1991, pp. 705.

Of course, the benefits of falsity might be overwhelmed by the harms consequent upon establishing some institution to determine which falsehoods are socially desirable, but this does not defeat the point in the text that falsity is not necessarily bad, and truth is not necessarily good. As to the latter, consider whether to disabuse a dying person of her false belief, which now brings her great happiness, that her son has never been in trouble with the law. Thus, my concern, not just here but in general, is that the lawyers typical “Who’s to decide?” challenge is a rhetorical device that conflates two distinct questions. The first question is whether some distinction can be drawn between alternatives, at least within the discursive context in which the distinction is offered. That is, do you, the reader, and I, the writer, agree that there is a distinction between x and y? In some cases we may not, or we may agree that there is no distinction. But, if we agree that there is a distinction, then the next but distinct question is about the circumstances, if any, under which some institution might be empowered to draw x/y distinctions. It is a mistake to conclude from the inadvisability or impossibility of creating such institutions that there is no drawable distinction. Similarly, it is equally inappropriate to infer from the putative undesirability of a governmental institution established to determine truth, or to determine the value of truth, that distinguishing truth from falsity or determining the value of truth is impossible.

### Subjectivity Good

#### Concealing your own subjectivity is dangerous

**Frazer 6** (Michael, Ph.D in political philosophy from Princeton, postdoctoral research associate in the Political Theory Project at Brown University. Proferssor of Enlightenment polyphi @ Harvard, “On Nietzschean Ethnic: The Compassion of Zarathuras: Nietzsche of Sympathy and Strength,” <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=421638>) Zanezor

Something resembling the traditional ethical appeal to an objective teleology embedded in human nature is the most likely candidate for such a foundation. Yet it is precisely such an objective ethics which those who describe Nietzsche as a “genealogist” insist that the author cannot provide. This impossibility is often attributed to Nietzsche’s “perspectivism”—the doctrine that an objective ethics, like any objective knowledge, is **unattainable** because “there is only a perspective seeing, only a perspective ‘knowing’” (GM III:12, p. 555).13 Yet perspectivism obviously does not rule out all critique or revaluation of our moral evaluations. Alexander Nehamas, for one, argues that the great crime of slave morality, the fundamental reason for its low valuation by Nietzsche, is a crime against perspectivism itself. The Christian morality of the weak, he claims, **seeks “to conceal and to deny its own interpretive status” by maintaining that it is true and authoritative for all, weak and strong alike, rather than a perspectival expression of the needs of the weak alone.**

### Nothing is Universal

#### Universal moralities are dangerous for all parties

**Wrisley No Date** (George, Prof of Philosophy @ U Iowa, “What Should Our Attitude Towards Suffering Be,” Nietzsche and Suffeirng- A Choice of Attitudes and Ideals, <http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&q=site%3Ageorgewrisley.com+What+Should+Our+Attitude+Towards+Suffering+Be&aq=f&oq=&aqi>=) Zanezor

None of these ponderous herd animals with their unquiet consciences (who undertake to advocate the cause of egoism as the cause of the general welfare) wants to know or even sense that “the general welfare” is **no ideal**, no goal, no remotely intelligible concept, but only an emetic—that **what is fair for one cannot by any means for that reason alone also be fair for others; that the demand of one morality for all is detrimental for the higher man**; in short, that there is an order of rank between man and man, hence also between **morality and morality.**

There is a great deal going on in this passage. Nietzsche is arguing against the idea that English utilitarianism should be viewed as right for humanity as a whole. Nietzsche wants to make clear that a desire for a universal morality is not only a bad idea—because of the order of rank—**but also a dangerous one**. The morality of the ascetic priest is dangerous to the higher type of man, for it is the morality of the meek and those that do not suffer well. And a morality that would be appropriate for the higher type would be dangerous for the lower type. Those in the lower ranks **could not bear** the burden of responsibility and suffering that comes with the higher type. This is, in part, why Nietzsche says that a further difference among people, one that further differentiates the order of rank, is their table of goods (what they take to be good) and what they take to be having something good. The higher type, for example, takes strength, self-reverence, and the ability to bear heavy responsibility as goods; the lower type takes timidity, humbleness, and altruistic ideals as goods (or poverty, humility, and chastity).

### Values Should Not Be Objective

#### Values are important but they shouldn’t be moralized or objectified.

**Wolf, Susan.** Moral Saints,î The Journal of Philosophy, Vol. 79:8 (August, 1982), page 438.

The role morality plays in the development of our characters and the shape of our practical deliberations need be neither that of a universal medium into which all other values must be translated nor that of an ever-present filter through which all other values must pass. This is not to say that moral values should not be an important, even the most important, kind of value we attend to in evaluating and improving ourselves and our world. It is to say that our values cannot be full

### Objective Morality kills self determination

#### People deserve to be ends unto themselves. An Objective Morality says that people are means to an end

**Kant, Immanuel.** Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals in Critique of Practical Reason and Other Writings in Moral Philosophy, trans. Lewis White Beck. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949, page 86-87.

Every rational being exists as an end in himself and not merely as a means to be arbitrarily used by this or that will. In all his actions, whether they are directed to himself or to other rational beings, he must always be regarded at the same time as an end. . . . Such beings are not merely subjective ends whose existence as a result of our action has a worth for us but are objective ends, i.e., beings whose existence in itself is an end. Such an end is one for which no other end can be substituted, to which these beings should serve merely as means. For, without them, nothing of absolute worth could be found, and if all worth is conditional and thus contingent, no supreme practical principle for reason could be found anywhere.

### Alternative to Objective Morality-consequences

#### Moral rights and wrongs are based on the evaluation of consequences

**Johnson, 85** (Conrad D. Johnson, 'The Authority of the Moral Agent', Journal of Philosophy 82, No 8 (August 1985), pp. 391)

If we follow the usual deontological conception, there are also well-known difficulties. If it is simply wrong to kill the innocent, the wrongness must in some wav be connected to the consequences. That an innocent person is killed must be a consequence that has some important bearing on the wrongness of the action; else why be so concerned about the killing of an innocent? Further, if it is wrong in certain cases for the agent to weigh the consequences in deciding whether to kill or to break a promise, it is hard to deny that this has some connection to the consequences. Following one line of thought, it is consequentialist considerations of mistrust that stand behind such restrictions on what the agent may take into account.3 But then again it is hard to deal with that rare case in which the agent can truly claim that his judgement about the consequences is accurate, or, in that last resort of the philosophical thought experiment, has been verified by the Infallible Optimizer.

#### A moral duty exists to those that would be killed or die, not based on an objectivity of morals

**Cumminsky, David.** philosophy professor, Bates, GEWIRTH: CRITICAL ESSAYS ON ACTION, RATIONALITY, AND COMMUNITY, p. 135

Indeed, the Principle of the Intervening Action simply asserts what must be shown. As Gewirth emphasizes, all agents have a right not to be killed. The question at issue is whether it is sometimes obligatory to kill to prevent more killings. If one responds that it is not because the other agent is doing the killing, then one is simply assuming that he duty in question is an agent-relative restriction. This unargued assumption, however, conflicts with the basic PGC requirement to respect the rights of all persons affected by one’s

choice. Since the person’s being killed have a right not to be killed, and since they are going to be killed as a result of my refusal, they are indeed recipients of my action in the sense that is decisive as far as morality is concerned. Since the fewer people killed the more objective basic needs are protected, it appears that the right of the many not to be killed may outweigh the right of the one not to be killed.

#### Policy making requires a consequentialist framework, not a philosophical

#### one- morality cannot be evaluated in policy decisions

**Brock**, Professor of Philosophy Brown University, 87 (Dan W., Ethics, July p. 787, MM24) (PDCL1074)

My point is rather that the different goals of academic scholarship and public policy call in turn for different virtues and behavior in their practitioners. Philosophers who steadfastly maintain their academic ways in the public policy setting are not to be admired as islands of integrity in a sea of messy political compromise and corruption. Instead, I believe that if philosophers maintain the academic virtues there they will not only find themselves often ineffective but will as well often fail in their responsibilities and act wrongly. Why is this so? The central point of conflict is that the first concern of those responsible for public policy is, and ought to be, the consequences of their actions for public policy and the persons that those policies affect. This is not to say that they should not be concerned with the moral evaluation of those consequences—they should; nor that they must be moral consequentialists in the evaluation of the policy, and in turn human, consequences of their actions—whether some form of consequentialism

is an adequate moral theory is another matter. But it is to say that persons who directly participate in the formation of public policy would be irresponsible if they did not focus their concern on how their actions will affect policy and how that policy will in turn affect people.

### Alternative to Objective Morality- Self Interest

#### Morals are based on what is best for the individual and self interests

**Kennan 86** — George F. Kennan, Professor Emeritus at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, served as U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union (1952) and Yugoslavia (1961-1963), 1985 (“Morality and Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs*, Winter 1985/1986, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via JSTOR, p. 216)

Second, let us recognize that the functions, commitments and moral obligations of governments are **not the same** as those [end page 205] of the individual. **Government is an agent, not a principal**. Its primary obligation is to **the interests of the national society** it represents, **not to** the **moral impulses** that individual elements of that society may experience. No more than the attorney vis-a-vis the client, nor the doctor vis-a-vis the patient, can government attempt to insert itself into the consciences of those whose interests it represents. Let me explain. The interests of the national society for which government has to concern itself are basically those of its military security, the integrity of its political life and the well-being of its people. These needs have **no moral quality**. They arise from **the very existence of the national state** in question and from the status of **national sovereignty** it enjoys. They are **the unavoidable necessities** of a national existence and therefore **not subject to classification as either "good" or "bad."** They may be questioned from a detached philosophic point of view. But the government of the sovereign state **cannot make such judgments**. When it accepts the responsibilities of governing, implicit in that acceptance is the assumption that it is right that the state should be sovereign, that the integrity of its political life should be assured, that its people should enjoy the blessings of military security, material prosperity and a reasonable opportunity for, as the Declaration of Independence puts it, the pursuit of happiness. For these assumptions the government **needs no moral justification**, nor need it accept any moral reproach for acting on the basis of them.

### Alternative to Objective Morality-Utility

#### Conflicting moral claims necessitate utilitarianism

**MULHOLLAND, Leslie.** philosophy professor, Newfoundland, JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY, June, 1986, p. 328

For many, the persuasiveness of utilitarianism as a moral theory lies in its power to provide a way out of difficulties arising from the conflict of moral principles. The contention that utilitarianism permits people to override rights in

case of conflict of principles or in those cases where some recognized utility requires that a right be disregarded, is then not an internal objection to utilitarianism. Nor does it even indicate a plausible alternative to the convinced utilitarian. For him, utilitarianism has its force partly in the coherence and simplicity of the principle in explaining the morality of such cases.

### Objective Morality Based on subjectivity

#### Disputes in interpretations with religion means that all calls to objectivity are still grounded in subjectivity

**Borjas, PhD, 15** (George, Economics@Harvard, Immigration and Globalization: A Review Essay Journal of Economic Literature 2015, 53(4), 961–974 http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jel.53.4.961)

Before concluding, let me point out that I have assiduously avoided the ethical issues surrounding the relaxation of immigration restrictions throughout the essay. I am certainly not qualified to comment on the morality of the restrictions that countries enact to restrict population flows across international borders. Although these ethical issues are often alluded to (both Collier and Ruhs offer lengthy discussions of these issues), the moral argument is often far too ideological and too steeped in an author’s value system to be very convincing. Moreover, I suspect that the axioms one postulates about the foundations of a just society are very likely to influence the ending point regarding the morality of immigration restrictions—one need look no further than the different systems of distributive justice proposed by Nozick and Rawls for evidence that assumptions drive conclusions. Abstracting from these ethical issues, there is a clear message for anyone examining the link between immigration and globalization: beware of social engineers who promise the existence of trillion-dollar bills on a mythical sidewalk at the end of the rainbow; those promises are often based on flimsy modeling and inadequate evidence. (973)

### Objective Morality is Violent

#### In the quest to promote an Objective Morality, people resort to violent systems of oppression to quiet resistance

**CHENG Rockefeller Fellow – UVA 2003** Cardozo Law Review 24 1108-9

"Morality, when it is formal, devours," observes Camus. n42 As both Camus and Lacan point out, morality alone does not lead to terror. It is only when morality asserts itself as absolute and inflexible that it becomes sadistic. For both Camus and Lacan, terror arises from the failure to set a limit to any action or practice. Morality is necessary because it sets a limit on what the subject is allowed to do, but morality itself can become terror when it asserts unlimited authority. In fact, Nietzsche himself might not be too far from the position taken by Camus and Lacan. Even though Nietzsche appears to be more ready to dismiss morality in toto, the kind of morality he has in mind is one that seeks absolute control - driven as it is by the spitefulness and vengefulness of ressentiment. In Beyond Good and Evil, for example, he calls the human need for morality "the worst of all tastes," because it is "the taste for the unconditional." In other words, it is the unconditional character of morality that Nietzsche finds objectionable. Absolute virtue leads to absolute crime because "absolute" virtue can exist only as a formal, rational idea, unresponsive to empirical and human reality. Since it cannot operate in sync with reality, to reaffirm its status as the absolute Truth, it must persecute and even eliminate reality until its sovereignty reigns unchallenged. Revolutionaries are often susceptible to the temptation of

"absolute virtue," because they see themselves and the old regime in terms of absolute good versus absolute evil. They are impatient to implement their vision of the "new society" and anxious to demonstrate the differences between the old society and the new - between "the bad" and "the good." Convinced that a bad society corrupts its citizens, revolutionaries are eager to reform not only society but also humanity. Reforming necessitates shaping materials according to a certain idea. Revolutionaries thus often have a set of principles and virtues that they impose on the new society, be it liberty, equality, fraternity, or justice. Unfortunately, once these virtues have been formalized into inflexible laws which increasingly deviate from human reality, Saint-Just's conclusion that "no one is virtuous innocently" becomes inevitable: "From the moment that laws fail to make harmony reign, or when the unity which should be created by adherence to principles is destroyed, who is to blame? Factions. Who compose the factions? Those who deny by their very actions the necessity of unity."

### Objective Morality Selfish

#### Objective Morality arguments are selfish and promote hierarchies

**COADY Professor of Philosophy – University of Melbourne 2005** Journal of Applied Philosophy v.22 n.2, p. 134

In conclusion, I hope to have shown that, properly understood, the doctrine of realism has something to teach about the role of morality in international affairs. Broadly that lesson is: beware of moralism. It is a salutary lesson, not of course restricted to foreign relations, but particularly significant there, because the stakes are often so high. What specific guidance will be drawn from such a warning will depend upon the particular circumstances involved. I have tried to show that some of the typical realist claims about what are actually moralistic policies and in what their moralism consists are highly debatable. Realist prescriptions for avoiding moralism are sometimes useful, sometimes not. It is folly, and sadly a folly to which realists are

prone to succumb, to see the only alternative to moralism to lie in some form of national egoism. We might compare this with a parallel reaction to moralism at the personal level. It would be absurd to think that a retreat into relentless selfishness was the only feasible response to the haughty unreality of Pecksniff’s smug assessments in Dickens’ *Martin Chuzzlewit* or the cruel and arrogant judgementalism of the Puritan townsfolk in Hawthorn’s *The Scarlet Letter*. Such moralizing stands exposed and condemned by morality itself, not by mere selfinterest. Similarly, a recognition of the dangers of moralism in the international (or national) arena is itself morally

driven and needs the response of a healthy, prudent moral understanding. It will of course need to take account of the realities of international interactions, including those generated by power relations and the duties of group representation. But these do not negate the moral categories underlying any form of moral response. A proper concern for national well-being will have a place in such a response, but only one place amongst others. The right replacement for moralism is not national self-interest, but a suitably nuanced and attentive international morality

### Moralization Lack of Concern

#### Moralization of values subjects those that disagree with the established system of the majority in their time of need

**COADY Professor of Philosophy – University of Melbourne 2005** Journal of Applied Philosophy v.22 n.2

Moralism of deluded power. This is less a distorted form of moral judgement or understanding, than a distorted belief in the power of moral utterances and moral stands, often accompanied by a sense of self-righteousness. Moralism of this sort is the mistaken, or at least overconfident, belief that appeals to moral standards, ideals, and principles will have by themselves powerful effects in altering behaviour. Realists oppose this belief and phenomena associated with it because they think that it ignores the realities of international behaviour, and in particular the realities of power and self-interest. It can also far too often provide a camouflage, wittingly or unwittingly,

for the promotion of interests that have little to do with morality. This can be seen vividly in George Kennan’s denunciations of the politics of moral rhetoric. The following is taken from Kennan’s *Morality and foreign* *policy* in which he calls for “the avoidance of what might be called the histrionics of moralism at the expense of its substance.” He continues: By that is meant the projection of attitudes, poses and rhetoric that cause us to appear noble and altruistic in the mirror of our own vanity but lack substance when related to the realities of international life. It is a sad feature of the human predicament, in personal as in public life, that whenever one has the agreeable sensation of being impressively moral, one probably is not This catches both the delusional belief in the efficacy of mere high-sounding words, and the self-deceptive element involved in the self-importance so often characteristic of moralism. Again, this realist emphasis is instructive and might usefully be brought to the attention of many of the world’s leaders today when overblown moral (and sometimes religious) rhetoric is so prominent. But Kennan is not denouncing sober moral talk or sensible moral judgement on world affairs, as is clear from his final point that the agreeable sensation of being moral is a bad indicator of the presence of true morality. His strictures are against a form of moralism, not morality.

### Morality kills real action

#### We can get lost in moral constraints rather than being moved by real

#### Concern

**Waldron, Jeremy, 1993** (Liberal Rights, Collected Papers: Cambridge Univ. Press)

I have some sympathy with this, but, as I also argue in Chapter 9, the insistence on absolutism does not make the conflicts go away; it doesn't make the situations that appear to call for trade-offs disappear. Those situations are not some-thing that consequentialists and their fellow travelers have perversely invented in order to embarrass moral absolutists. It is not the theorist's fault that there are sometimes several drowning people and only one lifeguard. As I said earlier, the world turns out not to be the sort of place to which absolute moral requirements are an apt response. If we insist on the absoluteness of rights, there is a danger that we may end up with no rights at all, or, at least, no rights embodying the idea of real concern for the individuals whose rights they are. At best, we will end up with a set of moral constraints whose absoluteness is secured only by the contortions of agent-relativity, that is, by their being understood not as concerns focused on those who may be affected by our actions but as concerns focused on ourselves and integrity.

### Objective Morality Wrong- Government Action

#### The government cannot evaluate moral claims because they are not

#### Universal

**Little,** Senior scholar in ethics and human rights at the U.S. Institute for Peace, 1991 (David, Morality and Foreign

Policy) (PDCL1073)

Even more explicitly, Kerman wrote in the Winter 1985/1986 issue of Foreign Affairs (in an article reprinted in the appendix to this volume) that the fundamental concerns of government, namely, the protection of its people, have no moral quality. He acknowledges that government will have to respond to the moral and other concerns of their citizens. However, such a response is a completely open-ended affair, subject to the vagaries and fluctuations of public opinion. There is no reason, he writes, to believe that morality can serve “as a general criterion for the

determination of the behavior of states and above all as a criterion for measuring and comparing the behavior of different states. Here other criteria, sadder, more limited, more practical, must be allowed to prevail.” According to Keenan, morality—understood here as a commitment to protecting human rights, raising living standards, and democratization-–is in the realm of subjective aspiration, a realm that varies to some extent from individual to individual, and to a great extent from society to society. The moral claims of one culture are inevitably doubted by another; there is nothing universal about such claims.

### Objective Morality False- Humans only species to feel morality

#### Human beings have morality separate from the biological necessity of reducing conflict – this makes us completely unique as all other forms of morality can be explained by evolution

Guldberg 11 <Helene, Ph.D., is the author of “Reclaiming Childhood: freedom and play in an age of fear” and “Just Another Ape?,” “Only Humans Have Morality, Not Animals,” https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/reclaiming-childhood/201106/only-humans-have-morality-not-animals>#SPS

Dale Peterson's aim in his new book The Moral Lives of Animals is to downplay what is unique about human morality. He argues that animals' moral systems are not merely ‘analogous to our own' - that is, superficially similar due to coincidental factors - but ‘homologous to our own' - that is, similar due to a ‘common origin'. He asks us to view morality as a ‘moral organ', ‘equivalent to the elephant's nose: enormous, powerful, multifaceted'. Our ‘moral organ' may have features that differ from that of other animals, Peterson tells us, but ultimately human morality is, like animal morality, an organ residing in the limbic system of the brain. Peterson proposes a functional definition of morality: ‘The function of morality, or the moral organ, is to negotiate the inherent serious conflict between self and others', he claims. But humans and animals negotiate ‘conflict' by fundamentally different means. Peterson is presenting us with examples not of animal morality, but of Darwinian evolution selecting for behaviours that minimise conflict and strengthen social ties among group-dwelling animals. Take his examples of ‘you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours' in the animal kingdom. Chimpanzees for instance spend an inordinate amount of time grooming each other. As Jeremy Taylor, author of Not a Chimp told me: ‘'Strong alliances between individuals in a group will almost certainly lead to a better prognosis for each individual who has successfully cultivated them. There is plenty of evidence, for instance, which shows that an individual that has a strong reciprocal grooming relationship with another will be more inclined to intervene on her behalf in an encounter'. Human beings, however, negotiate conflict through socially created values and codes of conduct. If one reduces everything to its simplest form then one can find parallels between humans and the rest of the animal kingdom. But this kind of philistinism does not deepen our understanding of human beings and human society or indeed of animal behaviour. For instance, Peterson's approach strips a concept like empathy of any deeper meaning. ‘I would prefer to consider empathy as appearing in two different but related forms, contagious and cognitive', he writes. Contagious empathy is ‘the process in which a single bird, startled by some sudden movement, takes off in alarm and is instantly joined by the entire flock'. Cognitive empathy ‘is contagious empathy pressed through a cognitive filter: a brain or mind'. In other words, these two types of empathy are just different forms of the same thing. But there is a world of difference between an instinctual connection between organisms - including some of our instinctual responses, such as yawning when others yawn - and human empathy involving a Theory of Mind, that is, the ability to recognise that one's own perspectives and beliefs can be different from someone else's. Once children are able to think about thoughts in this way, their thinking is lifted to a different level. Human beings, unlike other animals, are able to reflect on and make judgements about our own and others' actions, and as a result we are able to make considered moral choices. **We are not born with this ability.** As the developmental psychologist Jean Piaget showed, children progress from a very limited understanding of morality to a more sophisticated understanding - involving, for instance, the consideration of the motives and intentions behind particular acts. So, for pre-school children, a child who accidentally breaks several cups, when doing what he'd been asked to do by an adult, is ‘naughtier' than one who breaks one cup while trying to steal some sweets. Young children judge actions by their outcomes or consequences rather than by their intentions. Claiming that our morality is merely based on ‘gut instincts' ignores the transformations children go through in their moral understanding from infancy to adolescence. No doubt Peterson would accuse me of what he terms ‘false anthropo-exemptionalism' - that is, ‘an exaggerated insistence on discontinuity' between human beings and other species. His biological determinism prevents him from recognising that something new - something quite exceptional - emerged in the course of the evolution of humans. Human beings have something that no other animal has: an ability to participate in a collective cognition. Because we, as individuals, are able to draw on the collective knowledge of humanity, in a way no animal can, our individual abilities go way beyond what evolution has endowed us with. Our species is no longer constrained by our biology. Many scientists reject any notion that human beings have abilities that are profoundly different from other animals. To do so, they fear, will give ammunition to creationists and spiritualists. But we do not need spiritual or ‘magical' explanations to grasp that the difference between human beings and other animals is **fundamental** rather than one of degrees. There are some fascinating theories put forward in the last decade that go quite far in explaining the emergence, through evolution, of uniquely powerful human abilities. We don't know how or when, but there must have been some gene mutation or set of mutations tens of thousands of years ago that endowed us with the unique ability to participate in a collective cognition. A small difference in our innate abilities led to a unique connection between human minds - allowing us to learn through imitation and collaboration - leading to cumulative cultural evolution and the transformation of the human mind. As I argue in Just Another Ape?: ‘It is this unique ability to copy complex actions and strategies (even those that the individual doing the copying would never have been able to come up with on their own), along with unique forms of cooperation and an ability to teach, that creates the uniquely powerful "ratchet effect" in human culture, whereby gains are consolidated and built on rather than having to be rediscovered.' There are very many unanswered questions regarding how and why our human genetic make-up evolved. But even if we did have all the answers, we would not - as a result of these insights - be able to explain why we behave the way we do today, or the ethical codes by which we currently live. The evolution of the human genetic make-up is merely the precondition for the emergence of distinctly human cultural abilities. We need to look to cultural evolution, rather than genetic evolution, to explain the vast gulf that exists between the capabilities and achievements of humans and those of other animals. Human beings are not perfect and never will be, but we are special and unique among the animal kingdom. We are capable of making judgements about our own and other people's behaviour, and have the capacity consciously to change the way we behave and society as whole.

### Objective Morality Coopts Action

#### Morality co-opts ethical behavior because the focus falls on ideology, not action

**Moreh** Source: Erkenntnis (1975-), Vol. 37, No. 1 (Jul., **1992**), pp. 115-143 Published by: Springer Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20012427 Accessed: 22/07/2009 13:24

Moral rules are very stringent. Lying is allowed only in a small number of situations, e.g., in a crisis (if one's life or that of another person is endangered by a malevolent character, it is permitted to lie to the latter to protect the victim) or in certain market places where it is accepted that telling lies is part of the bargaining process. In the latter case, care should be taken that deceit does not spill over into other situations (Bok, 1980, Chap. 8 and p. 131). Moral philosophers generally agree that moral rules are severe. Some argue in favour of severity, e.g., Bok whose book (1980) is concerned mainly with lying and refers to many authorities favouring stringency of the rule forbidding lying. Bar-Elli and Heyd (1986) uphold the stringency of the rule against vengeance, though they grudgingly admit that it may be regarded as morally justified by the special kind of personal relationship in the particular situation (p. 85). Some philosophers criticize the severity of the demands made by some moral rules, because of the inconsistencies and asymmetries or even absurdity they are thought to lead to. I shall refer to two authors: Williams and Slote. Williams criticizes morality for attaching disproportionate importance to obligations and giving them priority over other ethical considerations. One may not break a promise even if what was promised was in itself of minor importance and keeping it would prevent one from furthering some important cause (Williams, 1985, pp.

118 J. MOREH 6-7, 180, 187 and 222, footnote 7). Slote (1985, Chap. 1) notes the asymmetry in the prescriptions of moral rules and permissions allowed by them between the moral agent and others. A moral agent is allowed to sacrifice a great deal of his3 welfare for the purpose of promoting the welfare of others by a much smaller amount, yet he is forbidden to do the reverse (i.e., promote his welfare by a great deal at the expense of someone else's welfare). Slote contends that if all people count equally, the latter action should be permitted. Nor is one entitled to sacrifice the life of one person in order to save the lives of several others. Such an exemption to the rule 'do not kill' is not allowed. Nevertheless, a person is permitted to sacrifice his own life for the sake of saving that of others. Slote mentions these examples to show that morality is not impartial between the self and others, as it should be. I am, however, using them to illustrate the austerity of moral rules.