

B.A.(Hons) Part -II Philosophy, Paper-III

CONTENTS

Sl. No.	Title	Unit	page
1.	Nature of Ethics	1	2
2.	Moral Actions	2	8
3.	Non-moral Actions	3	12
4.	Analysis of Voluntary Actions	4	18
5.	Personality and Reason as the Postulate of Morality	5	23
6.	Freedom of Will as the Postulate of Morality	6	28
7.	Nature of Moral Judgment	7	32
8.	Motive as the Object of Moral Judgment	8	37
9.	Intention as the Object of Moral Judgment	9	42
10.	External Law as the Standard of Morality	10	47
11.	Hedonism as the Standard of Morality	11	52
12.	Egoistic Hedonism as the Standard of Morality	12	57
13.	Altruistic Hedonism as the Standard of Morality	13	62
14.	Regorism as the Standard of Morality	14	67
15.	Intuitionism as the Standard of Morality	15	73
16.	Perfectionism as the standard of Morality	16	78
17.	Theories of Punishment	17	84
18.	Varnashrama Dharma and Purushartha	18	90
19.	Nishkama Karma, Pravrtti-Nivrtti	19	97
20.	Daiva and Purushkara	20	102

Nature of Ethics

Lesson Structure

- 1.1 **Objective**
- 1.2 **Introduction**
- 1.3 **Explanation of the main theme**
 - 1.3.1 **Definition of Ethics**
 - 1.3.2 **Ethics is a Science**
 - 1.3.3 **Ethics is a Normative Science**
 - 1.3.4 **Ethics is not a Practical Science**
 - 1.3.5 **Ethics is not the Art of Conduct**
 - 1.3.6 **Ethics is not a Science but a Philosophy of Life or Conduct**
- 1.4 **Summary**
- 1.5 **Key Words**
- 1.6 **Questions for Exercise**
 - 1.6.1 **Objective Questions**
 - 1.6.2 **Short Answer Type Questions**
 - 1.6.3 **Long Answer Type Questions**
- 1.7. **Suggested Readings**

1.1 Objective

The main objective of this lesson is to explain the nature of ethics. Ethics is a scientific study of the Ideal involved in human life. It is a normative science of conduct. It seeks to set up or formulate the moral Ideal.

1.2 Introduction

Ethics is the normative science of the conduct of human-beings, living in a society. Ethics, thus aims to give a systematic account of our judgments about moral

conduct or moral life from the point of view of right or wrong, good or bad. It discusses men's habits and customs or in other words, their character or principles on which they habitually act and tries to find out what it is that constitutes the rightness or wrongness of these principles, the good or evil of those habits.

1.3 Explanation of the maqin Theme

Before discussing the nature of ethics, let us first consider the definition of ethics.

1.3:1 Definition of Ethics

The word 'Ethics' is derived from the Greek adjective 'ethica' which come from the substantive 'Ethos'. Ethos means customs, usages or habits. Ethic is also called 'Moral Philosophy'. The word 'moral' is derived from the Latin substantive 'mores' which also means customs or habits. Custom means ways approved by the society, hence, literally ethics means the science of customs or habits of men or in other words, their character or principles on which they habitually act and tries to find out what it is that constitutes the rightness or wrongness of these principles, the good or evil of those habits. Mackenzie defines ethics, "Ethics discuses Men's habits and customs or in other words their characters, the principles on which they habitually act, and consider what it is that constitutes the rightness or wrongness of those principles, the good or evil of those habits," (A Manual of Ethics, P-1)

In the words of Prof. P. B. Chatterjee, "Ethics may be briefly defined as the "Science of Morality" or the "study of right conduct or duty". It is the science which explains the facts of moral life and indicates the course in which human life should be directed. It is essentially an investigation into the notions of good and bad, right and wrong and the connected notion of duty as applied to conduct or voluntary actions".

(Principles of Ethics,— P-1)

According to William Lillie, "Ethics is the normative science of the conduct of human-beings living in a society, as science which judges this conduct to be good or bad or in some similar way."

(An Introduction to Ethics,—P-2)

Thus we find that Ethics is concerned with the rightness or wrongness of conduct. It may also be defined as, "the science of moral character as expressing itself in right or wrong conduct or action or as the "science which deals with the goodness or badness of human character and seeks to determine the ideally perfect type of character which is the duty of all men to strive to realise within themselves.

Having discussed the definition of Ethics we are now in a position to outline the nature of Ethics.

1.3.2 Ethics is a Science

A Science is a systematic study of a particular department of the universe or of a particular group of natural phenomenon aiming at the attainments of knowledge or Truth. Ethics is also a science because it is also a systematic study of human conduct and for this study it depends on observation, classification and explanation of human conduct with reference to an ideal or standard. Therefore, Ethics investigates the standard or ideal by reference to which conduct is pronounced to be good or evil. Now, there are two types of sciences—Positive and Normative. Positive Sciences are concerned with the origin, nature and growth of the Phenomena. It deals with what is and tries to discover the actual order such as Physics, Chemistry, Biology, or Psychology. All these belong to the class of Positive, natural or descriptive sciences.

The other class of sciences called the Normative Sciences'. These are also called the regualtive or appreciative science. Unlike the science of the former group, the normative science seeks to transcend the actual and to Judge its value in terms of the ideal. The Positive Sciences deal with the judgments of fact or judgments of what is (factual judgments). The normative science deals with judgments of worth or value or judgment of what ought to be (critical judgments)

1.3.3 Ethics is Normative Science

Sciences are either natural (Positive or Normative). Ethics is normative Science of the conduct of human beings. There are three ideals of human life— truth, beauty and good. These are the three supreme values of human experiences. They correspond to the three aspects of our conscious life-knowing, feeling and willing. Logic is concerned with knowing the general conditions involved into pursuit of truth Aesthetics is concerned with feeling i.e. the appreciation of truth and beauty. Ethics is concerned with willing what is right in human conduct in pursuit of the highest good. Ethics, therefore, is a normative science which is not concerned so much with what the nature of conduct or voluntary action is, as with the question of what "ought to be" the nature of our actions in order that they may be conducive to our highest good.

1.3.4 Ethics is not a Practical Science

Some scientific studies are practical others are only theoretical or speculative. Practical Sciences are directed towards the realization of a definite result. They are of great practical importance in the every day life of the people. But theoretical

Sciences are concerned with the general knowledge about things, without their bearing on practice. Thus, medicine, engineering and architecture are practical, whereas Physics, Chemistry are theoretical. Ethics, Logic and Aesthetics, are likewise, theoretical according to Mackenzie. Thus, Prof. Mackenzie who holds that Ethics is a normative science, says that it is not to be called "a Practical Science". (Manual of Ethics—P.9-10)

But according to James Seth, Ethics is both practical and theoretical in as much as Ethics has to deal with practice or activity and not only abstract thought or theory. Ethics, according to him, is the Philosophy or Theory of Practice. The function of Ethics, according to Seth, being two-fold-discovery of the end of life and the discovery of means for the realisation of this end, the former being purely theoretical and the latter a purely practical question. Ethics is both practical and theoretical- a theory of the ideal and a practical science of the means of the attainment of this end.

1.3.5 Ethics is not the Art of Conduct

Science is theoretical, art is practical. Science is acquired by study and Art by practice. Science teaches us to know and an Art to do. Art is thus the general knowledge or theory formulated by a Science applied to practice or practical activity. In between the extremes of Science and Art stands the Practical Science. It steers a middle course and teaches us to know how to do. Thus, Chemistry is a science, soapmaking is an art and medicine and industrial chemistry are Practical Sciences.

Ethics as the general study of the Ideal involved in human life is not art at all. Just as Logic cannot be described as an art of thinking nor can aesthetics be identified with any of the art by which beautiful objects are created, similarly, it does not appear to be right to describe Ethics as the art of conduct. In art we acquire the power of dealing with some particular class of objects but in Ethics we rather seek for an insight into the nature of the supreme values of goodness to which particular modes of action are only subsidiary.

Mackenzie gives the following reasons against characterizing Ethics as an art of conduct :—

Virtue exists only in activity. The good painter is one who can paint beautifully but a good man is not one who can but one who does act rightly. Conduct is not a capacity but a habit—a habit of rational choice.

An artist may practice his art at sometimes and completely neglect it at other times but the good man must practice goodness at all times.

William Lillie, on the other hand shows some similarities between Ethics and Art.

Good Conduct and the fine art both directly inspires cause of changes in the outside world. Their aim is action and not knowledge.

We learn to do what is right as the artists learns art not so much by a study of theory as by long practice Thus we find that a Science teaches us to know and an art to do but this does not mean that they are contradictory because doing depends on knowing and knowing affects our doing. But Ethics is considered to be a Science because there is much similarity between ethics and Science as compared to ethics and art. So we can conclude that ethics is a Science.

1.3.6 Ethics is not a Science but a Philosophy of Life or Conduct

Science is a partially unified knowledge and Philosophy as a completely unified knowledge. By science we understand the study of some limited portion of our experience, whereas philosophy deals with experience as a whole. In a way Ethics is concerned with the whole of our experience from one particular point of view, i.e., from the point of view of activity or in other words, from the point of view of the pursuit of end or Ideal. It is that some writers describe Ethics as moral or ethical Philosophy rather than as a science of Ethics, for it is the business of philosophy rather than of a science to deal with experience as a whole. Ethics is a Science in the sense that it employs the same method as is employed by other natural Sciences.

But apart from those considerations. Ethics is not a Science, it is a part of Philosophy It is ethical or moral Philosophy.

1.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we can say that Ethics is a Scientific study of the Ideal involved in human life. It is a normative science of conduct. It seeks to set-up or formulate the moral Ideal. Ethics is not a practical Science though according to some it is both theoretical and practical. It is not the art of conduct, strictly speaking, Ethics is a part of philosophy rather than a science, though it is scientific in method and treatment.

1.5 Key Words

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| (i) Conduct | (ii) Moral Philosophy |
| (iii) Voluntary Action | (iv) Normative Science. |
| (v) Natural Science | (vi) Judgment |
| (vi) Practical Science and Theoretical Science. | |
| (vii) Is' Judgment | (viii) 'ought' Judgment. |

1.6 Questions for Exercise

1.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Ethics is a
- (a) Positive Science
 - (b) Normative Science
 - (c) Both a and b
 - (d) None of these

Answer — (b)

- (ii) The normative science deal with
- (a) The judgment of fact.
 - (b) The judgment of value.
 - (c) Both a and b.
 - (d) None of those.

Answer — (b)

1.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) Is Ethics a normative science ? Discuss.
- (ii) Define Ethics.
- (iii) Is Ethics an art ? Discuss.

1.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions

- (i) What is the nature of Ethics ? Discuss.
- (ii) Explain the utility of Ethics.

1.7. Suggested Readings

- (i) Mackenzie : **A Manual of Ethics.**
- (ii) P. B. Chatterjee : **Principles of Ethics.**
- (iii) William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics.**
- (iv) Prof. Seth : **Ethical Principles.**
- (v) Prof. Muirhead : **The Elements of Ethics.**



Moral Actions

Lesson Structure

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 2.1 | Objective |
| 2.2 | Introduction |
| 2.3 | Explanation of the Main Theme |
| 2.3.1 | An analysis of Voluntary Action |
| 2.3.2 | Habitual Actions are Also to be Regarded as Moral Actions |
| 2.4 | Summary |
| 2.5 | Key Words |
| 2.6 | Questions For Exercise |
| 2.6.1 | Objective Questions |
| 2.6.2 | Short Answer Type Questions |
| 2.6.3 | Long Answer Type Questions |
| 2.7 | Suggested Readings |

2.1 Objective

The main objective of this lesson is to explain about moral actions' Ethics being "the Science of Morality" or "the study of right conduct or duty" is especially interested in discussing human actions. As we know, Ethics is concerned with the rightness and wrongness of conduct. By, moral actions we mean in Ethics, those actions in which moral quality (rightness or wrongness, goodness or badness) is present. Such actions are thus the objects of moral judgment as distinguished from non-moral actions which mean those actions that are devoid of moral quality and thus excluded from the scope of moral judgment.

2.2 Introduction

The aim of Ethics is to discover the ideal of human conduct so that it can compare human actions with it and judge it to be right or wrong, good or bad. Lillie

According to William Lillie, "Ethics is the normative science of the conduct of human being living in a society, a science which judges the conduct to be right or wrong, to be good or bad or in some similar way." (An Introduction to Ethics, P-2). It is not possible to give moral judgment on all kinds of actions. In other words it is not possible to judge each and every action of a person to be right or wrong, good or bad. Ethics is concerned with passing judgments on voluntary actions of men.

2.3 Explanation of the main theme

The main topic or theme of this lesson "Moral Actions". Those actions on which moral judgment can be passed or those actions which can be pronounced to be good or bad, right or wrong are 'moral actions'. Now, the question is what are these 'moral actions'. on which moral judgment can be given.

Moral judgment can be given only in such actions where the question regarding moral quality of goodness, badness, rightness, wrongness can be raised.

All things donot have all kinds of qualities, For example wood cannot have the quality of human being hence if such a question is raised about wood it will become meaningless, similarly, moral quality is also not present in all actions. In fact, good-bad, right wrong are relative terms. They can be applied only in such cases where there are possible alternatives for a person to choose from.

Now, by moral actions we mean in Ethics, those actions in which moral quality (rightness or wrongness, goodness or badness) is present. Such actions are thus the objects of moral judgment-as distinguished from non-moral actions which mean those actions that are devoid of moral quality and thus excluded from the scope of moral judgment. The word 'moral' is used in two senses— in wider sense and in narrow sense.

In wider sense, the word 'moral' means that in which, moral quality (rightness or wrongness, goodness or badness) is present, i.e., Whether it is right or wrong, good or bad. In this sense 'moral' is opposed to 'non-moral' (i.e. what is devoid of moral quality and cannot be characterised as right or wrong.)

In narrow sense it means what is right or morally good and is thus opposed to immoral, i.e., what is wrong or morally bad. Thus there is a sense in which what is 'immoral' may be 'moral' for it expresses a moral quality and thus comes within the moral sphere.

In Ethics, 'moral' term has been taken in the wider sense. A question arises what are the actions that are moral in the wider sense ? As we have seen earlier, all actions are not objects of moral judgment. We cannot speak of the phenomena of

nature, e.g. hurricanes, floods, famine: etc. Inanimate things and events of nature are beyond the place of moral judgment. The actions of animals also are neither moral nor immoral. Among human beings also actions of children, insane person's actions done under hypnotic suggestions are also not moral actions. What, then, are moral actions' taken in the wider sense. It can be said that 'Voluntary or intentional action are moral in the wider sense. By a voluntary or intentional action we mean an action that is performed by rational agent, not through blind impulse, but knowingly and intelligently with provision, desire and free choice of means and ends.

2.3.1 Analysis of a voluntary action

We find the following important characteristics of voluntary action. The doer of voluntary action or a moral action, must be a rational being who are capable of using his reason. But the actions of persons who can not use their reason, e.g. children or insane persons are not moral actions.

Voluntary or moral actions are one which are performed by a person not under any pressure but by using his freedom of will. Actions done under pressure or under hypnotic suggestions are non-moral actions.

Such actions should be performed knowingly and intelligently. Therefore, spontaneous or random actions, reflex actions, instinctive actions, ideomotor actions are not voluntary or moral actions. Such actions come under the class of non-voluntary and therefore are devoid of moral quality and excluded from the scope of moral judgment. Hence, non-voluntary actions can not be judged, as right or wrong, good or bad.

2.3.2 Habitual actions are also to be regarded as moral actions .

When voluntary actions are repeated they become habits of an individual. They become automatic and irresistible. they are the objects of moral judgments, because they also involve free choice, determination and mental conflicts are formed by repeated actions of will, e.g, a person starts taking wine knowingly and willingly with his own desire, but later on when takes it repeatedly, it becomes his habit. This habitual actions of his (i.e. taking wine) is a voluntary actions and hence a moral action on which moral judgment can be given. So, habits are the results of repeated voluntary actions.

2.4 Summary

In conclusion it can be said that moral actions are the voluntary and habitual actions of men. Voluntary actions are the subject matter of Ethics. Ethics is concerned with passing judgments on voluntary actions. of men . Such actions can

either be good or bad, right or wrong. The Word 'moral' in Ethics, is used in the wider sense meaning that in which moral quality like goodness, badness, rightness, wrongness is present.

2.5 Key Words

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| (i) The Science of morality | (ii) Moral actions |
| (iii) Non-moral actions | (iv) Voluntary action |
| (v) Freedom of will | (vi) Habitual actions |

2.6 Questions for Exercise

2.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Moral actions are
- (a) only the voluntary actions
 - (b) only the habitual actions
 - (c) Both a and b
 - (d) None of these
- (ii) The habitual action of taking wine is
- (a) Moral action
 - (b) Non-moral action
 - (c) Non-voluntary action
 - (d) None of these

Answer — (c)

Answer — (a)

2.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain voluntary actions as a moral action
- (ii) Is habitual action regarded as moral action ?

2.6.3 Long Answer Type Question

- (i) What do you mean by moral actions ? Discuss.

2.7 Suggested Readings

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| (i) William Lillie | : | An Introduction to Ethics. |
| (ii) Mackenzie | : | A Manual of Ethics |
| (iii) J. N. Sinha | : | A Manual of Ethics |



Non-Moral Actions

Lesson Structure

- 3.1 Objective
- 3.2 Introduction
- 3.3 Explanation of the Main Theme
 - 3.3.1 Instinctive Actions
 - 3.3.2 Reflex Actions
 - 3.3.3 Random Actions
 - 3.3.4 Automatic Actions
 - 3.3.5 Accidental Actions
 - 3.3.6 Ideo-motor Actions
 - 3.3.7 Actions done under hypnotic suggestions
 - 3.3.8 Actions done under pressure
 - 3.3.9 Actions of insane persons
 - 3.3.10 Actions, of a child
- 3.4 Summary
- 3.5 Key Words
- 3.6 Questions for Exercise
 - 3.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 3.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 3.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions
- 3.7 Suggested Readings

3.1 Objective

The main aim of this lesson is to explain the concept of non-moral actions. Human conduct and human actions make the subject-matter of Ethics. But it is not possible to give moral judgments on all kinds of actions. Those actions on which

moral judgment can be passed or those actions which can be pronounced to be good or bad, right or wrong are moral actions. Thus, non-moral actions are not objects of moral judgment.

3.2 Introduction

Ethics as the science of morality makes a distinction between moral actions and non-moral actions. The word 'moral' in Ethics is used in the wider sense meaning that in which moral quality like goodness, badness, rightness, wrongness is present. Non-moral actions are those actions which are opposed to moral actions. Non-moral actions are those in which moral quality is not present or which are devoid of moral qualities. But non-moral actions does not mean immoral. Non-moral actions are non-voluntary actions or actions performed through blind impulse unknowingly and unintelligently, without provision, desire and free choice of means and end. Actions of inanimate things are also non-moral actions.

3.3 Explanation of the Main Theme

Now the question is what are these 'non-moral actions'. It will become clear by considering examples of non-moral actions.

3.3.1 Instinctive Actions

Instinctive actions are non-moral actions. They are marvellous adjustments of movements to unforeseen or unanticipated and yet definite ends. According to Prof. Dewey, "An instinctive act may be defined as one to which an individual feels himself impelled without knowing the end to be accomplished, yet with ability to select the proper means for its attainment." In the words of Prof. H. Stephen, "An insitinctive action consists in the performance of a connected series of acts co-ordinated and adoped as means to a distant end which lies outside the individuals present field of consciousness and often beyond the range of its life" These tendencies are found most explicitly in lower animals and are expressed in the activities displayed by them in seeking food, in self defence on attack of enemies, in the construction of dwelling and in providing for the young. In human beings these tendercies are concealed or transformed by reason to a considerable extent.

3.3.2 Reflex Actions

Reflex actions are also non-moral actions. A reflex action is a prompt, muscular or glandular response to a sensory stimulus. It is an immediate response to a stimulus. Now the stimuli may be either external objects or organic disturbances for example — we close our eyes at the sight of a dazzling light. This reflex act is excited by an external stimulus. We sneeze when some thing obstructs or irritates

our nasal membrane. We cough when something obstructs our thjroat. These reflex acts are evoked by organic disturbances. All these reflexes are muscular reactions to sensory stimuli either extra-organic or intra-organic. Some reflexes are glandular reactions to sensory stimuli. For example when something irritating falls into our eyes we shed tears. There are two kinds of reflex actions-psychological reflexes and sensational reflexes. Because reflex actions may be performed with or without consciousness. The reflexes of which we are entirely unconscious are called psychological reflex. For example the pupillary reflex is a psychological reflex. When there is a bright light the pupil contracts and when there is a dim light the pupil expands. We are not conscious of the change in the size of the pupil. The reflex of which we are conscious is called sensation reflex For example, we are conscious of winking, sneezing, coughing, etc.

3.3.3 Random or Spontaneous Actions

Random or spontaneous action is non-moral action. Random movements are the spontaneous expression of every accumulated in the organism. These actions are the result of the spontaneous outflow of energy from nerve centress. Movement of an infant such as stretchinjg out the arms and legs are random or spontaneous actions. These actions are prompted by a feeling of uneasiness, produced by an accumulation of unused energy in the motor centres of the brain. Spontaneous or random actions are also non-moral actions because they are devoid of moral quality and cannot be characterised as right or wrong.

3.3.4 Automatic Actions

Automatic actions are also non-moral actions. Respiration circulation, digestion are known as automatic actions. We are under normal conditions entirely uncorscious of these acts. We become conscious of these acts only when anything goes wrong with them because they are attended with painful sensations. For example we become conscious of hard-breathing, indigestion etc. Such actions are also non-moral actions.

3.3.5 Accidental Actions

Such acts are also non-moral actions because they are the ressults of accident. An accident does not require choice or reflection Such actions are the results, not of choice or desire, but of accident, are therefore, not objects of moral judgment, that is, they cannot be characterised as right or wrong. If for instance, a person accidentally breaks a gold watch belonging to another, his action cannot be regarded as wrong and blameworthy, of course, in such a case he may be blamed for carelessness, for carelessness of disposition which a man forms in himself by his own previous conduct. Nevertheless, it is well known fact that even the most careful persons may commit, accidental acts. Hence, such an acts are to be regarded as non-moral acts.

3.3.6 Ideo-Motor Actions

An ideo-motor action is a non-voluntary action which is induced by motor representation or the idea of the movement without the co operation of will and sometimes against the will. In an ideo motor action first there is an idea of the movement; then this idea is converted at once into a movement. Now the idea of movement is so impulsive that it carries itself out into the actual movement at once. For example, a person witnessing a football game automatically kicks the ground when a player is expected to kick the ball. Now it is different from a sensation reflex in which a sensation is immediately followed by a response. In an Ideo-motor action an idea and not a sensation of an action is directly followed by the action. The movements, for example, in case of a football match, the movement of players excites the motor-ideas in the mind of spectators and these ideas automatically pass into movement. The ideo-motor actions are more explicit in a child.

3.3.7 Actions done under hypnotic suggestions

Such actions are also non-moral actions because when a person is hypnotised he does not have the self-consciousness, nor free-will or choice. Hence the actions which he does will be regarded as no-moral actions.

3.3.8 Actions done under pressure

Such actions are also non-moral actions because they do not involve choice or free will. The agent is compelled to do such actions and hence is under pressure to do it. For example, if a person is pressurised by a person to do certain act which he does not want to do, that action of a persons will be a non-moral action.

3.3.9 Actions of insane persons

Such actions are also non-moral actions because an insane person is incapable of differentiating between right and wrong. We cannot, for insstance blame an insane person who tries to set a house on fire as a source of danger to society and keep him in confinement. Even the Indian penal code states, "Nothing is an offence which is done by a person who at the time of doing it by reason of unsoundness of mind is incapable of knowing the nature of the act or that he is doing what is either wrong or contrary to law.

3.3.10 Actions of a child

Such actions are also non-moral actions. A child does not have the full knowledge of means and end of an action. If, for instance, a child having no idea of property and without knowing the distinction between 'mine' and 'thine' takes Some sweetmeats from a shop and puts them into his month or burns something rare and valuable to enjoy the fun of seeing it burnt, his conduct cannot be blamed morally,

We can quote from the Indian Penal Code where it is said, "Nothing is an offence which is done by a child under seven years of age."

3.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we can say that non-moral actions cannot be judged as right or wrong, good or bad the ten types of actions discussed above considered to be non-moral actions because those actions are not performed knowingly and intelligently by self-conscious and self-determining being with desire, prevision and free-choice of means and ends. Hence, such actions, come under the class of non-voluntary and, therefore, are devoid of moral quality and excluded from the Scope of moral judgment.

3.5 Key Words

- | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| (i) Non-Moral | (ii) Non-Voluntary |
| (ii) Immoral | (iv) Moral quality |
| (iv) Moral action | (v) Accidental |

3.6 Questions for Exercise

3.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Non-moral action is
- Voluntary action.
 - Non-Voluntary action.
 - Immoral action
 - None of these
- Answer — (b)**
- (ii) Non-Moral actions are those in which
- moral quality is present.
 - Moral quality is not present.
 - Both a and b
 - None of these

Answer — (b)

3.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) What do you mean by non-moral actions ? Discuss.

- (ii) Make distinction between moral and non-moral actions.

3.6.3 Long Answer Type Question

- (i) Explain the different kinds of non-moral actions.

3.7 Suggested Readings

P. B. Chatterjee	:	Principles of Ethics.
William Lillie	:	An Introduction to Ethics.
J. N. Sinha	:	A Manual of Ethics.
Mackenzie	:	A Manual of Ethics.



4.1 Objective

4.2 Introduction

Analysis of Voluntary Actions

Lesson Structure

- 4.1 Objective
- 4.2 Introductions
- 4.3 Explanation of the Main Theme
 - 4.3.1 Mental Stage
 - 4.3.2 Bodily Stage
 - 4.3.3 Extra-organic Stage
- 4.4 Summary
- 4.5 Key Words
- 4.6 Question for Exercise
 - 4.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 4.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 4.6.3 Long Answer Type Question
- 4.7 Suggested Readings

4.1 Objective

The main objective of this lesson is to see a detailed analysis of voluntary actions. Voluntary actions are the moral actions and also the objects of moral judgment. Voluntary actions are the subject matter of Ethics. Ethics is concerned with passing judgments on voluntary actions of men. Such actions can be either good or bad, right or wrong.

4.2 Introduction

Voluntary actions are moral actions. By a voluntary or intentional action we mean an action that is performed by rational agent not through blind impulse, but knowingly and intelligently with provision, desire and free choice of means and ends. For example, if a person voluntarily speaks the truth and the other voluntarily steals, the actions of both of them will be called 'moral actions' though their moral judgments shall be different.

4.3 Explanation of the Main Theme

Every complete voluntary action begins with certain states and processes within the mind then it passes from the mind to the body and manifests itself in certain bodily movements and finally it completes itself in certain external results, effects or consequences. In other words we can say that it passes through three stages :

4.3.1 Mental stage

- (i) **The Spring of Action** : Every voluntary action is accentuated by a spring of action. Every physical action springs out of some want, need or imperfection. Now, this feeling of want or imperfection is always painful and disagreeable. So we want to remove this feeling. In case of a voluntary action this feeling of want is not necessarily present or actual. It may be and often is ideal or anticipated, that is, some future want or need. Secondly, this feeling of want is not necessarily the self's own want. It may be some fellow being's which the self makes his own by love or sympathy.
- (ii) **The end and motive** : A motive may mean either that which impels or that which induces us to act in a particular way. The feeling of want or need soon leads the rational self to think out or infer from past experience something or some appropriate object that is necessary to relieve the want or remove the imperfection and the means of attaining that thing or object. Now, the object necessary to remove the want is said to be the end of the action or the idea or thought of the object or end which excites the agent to act in a particular way is called the motive of the action.
- (iii) **Desire** : The disagreeable feeling of want and the thought of the object needed to remove the feeling of want together give rise to the mental state called desire which may be defined as "a peculiar state of craving, longing or yearning for the attainment of the object or end." In desire there is the idea of the object or end which will satisfy the feeling of want and vague idea of the means for the realization of the end and a craving for the attainment of the object.
- (iv) **Conflict of Desires** : Sometimes all desires can not be fulfilled. One desire comes in conflict with another desire. As there are always many wants demanding satisfaction there are always many ends, motives or objects of desire simultaneously before the mind. All ends or objects of desire can not be attained at one and the same time. Thus, there arises in the mind a competition or conflict of desires. Now, motives are not the external sources acting on self from without. These are the states of the

self according to Prof. Dewey, "It is a strife or conflict which goes in the man himself with himself. It is not a conflict of himself with something external to him, nor of one impulse with another. He is meanwhile remaining a passive spectator awaiting the conclusion of the others. What gives the conflict of desire its whole meaning is that it represents the man at strife with himself. He is the opposing contestant as well as the battle field."

(v) **Deliberation** : When there is a conflict of desires the self arrests action and deliberates upon the merits and demerits of the different courses of actions suggested by different motives. It considers all the means and consequences of the alternative actions and judges them to be right or wrong according to the standards of utility and moral rightness. Thus, deliberation is the mental process of considering the merits and demerits of the different courses of action suggested by different desires on the part of the self in order to choose one and reject the rest.

(vi) **Decision or choice** : After deliberation the self chooses a particular desire and identifies it self with it. It chooses or decides a particular course of action and rejects the rest. Their selection of one motive to the exclusion of the others is called choice or decision. Now, when the decision is formed. The chosen motive becomes the actual motive for an action.

(vii) **Determination or Resolution** : Generally, when a decision is made, it is carried out at once. Resolution means the power of sticking to a decision already made or the mental determination to do after wards what has already been decided to follow in future a course of action already chosen or selected. It is in fact the determined attitude of mind to stick to a decision. It presupposes firmness or strength of mind.

4.3.2 Organic or Bodily stage

When choice has been made and kept up by resolution, it is converted into bodily action. In volition we have a clear idea of the nature of bodily movement which will execute the volition. This clear idea of the movement is automatically followed by muscular movement. The idea of movement carries itself out into actual movement by its impulsive nature. This muscular movement is necessary for realizing the intention.

4.3.3 Extra-organic or the Final stage

Through the medium of organic movements the action passes over into the final stage of completion. The bodily movement produces change in the external world and this change is called the result or consequence of the action. These consequences

include-the realization of chosen end or motive, realization of the chosen or intended means desirable or undesirable, certain foreseen consequences and certain unforeseen, unintended accidental consequences.

4.4 Summary

Conclusively, it may be said that this analysis of voluntary actions is a psychological analysis and is called the psychological basis of Ethics. Having discussed the different stages in the analysis of a voluntary action we can now have an illustration to understand it better. To take an example of a voluntary action which begins with the spring of action or the feeling of want. Suppose a student has a strong feeling of thirst during his class time having developed this feeling of want he thinks of ways and means to relieve the want. His motive or end is water and his desire is to drink water so as to quench his thirst. A number of conflicting desires arise in his mind, whether to ask permission from the teacher and go out of the classroom in between to drink water or whether to go out only when the class gets over. He deliberates on the different alternative desires and decides to go out in between the class and quench his thirst. He makes the resolution to do so. This is mental stage. After this, the student gets up takes the permission of his teacher and goes out of the classroom and quenches his thirst. This is the bodily stage. His action finds completion in realizing its, consequence which is satisfaction which arises on drinking water.

4.5 Key Words

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (i) Voluntary action | (ii) Non-Voluntary action |
| (iii) Freedom of will | (iv) Psychological analysis |
| (v) Determination | (vi) Deliberation |
| (vii) Conflict of desires | |

4.6 Questions for Exercise

4.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Voluntary actions are
- (a) Non-moral actions
 - (b) Moral actions
 - (c) Both a and b
 - (d) None of these

Ans. (b)

- (ii) Stages of voluntary actions are
 - (a) Physical, spritual, and extra-organic
 - (b) Mental, spiritual and organic
 - (c) Mental, organic and a stage of completion
 - (d) None of these.

Ans. (c)

4.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (a) What do you mean by voluntary actions ? Discuss.
- (b) Make distinction between voluntary and non-Voluntary actions.

4.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions

- (i) Give a psychological analysis of voluntary action.

4.7 Suggested Readings

- (i) P. B. Chatterjee : **Principles of Ethics.**
- (ii) William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics.**
- (iii) J. N. Sinha : **A Manual of Ethics.**



Personality and Reason as the Postulate of Morality

Lesson Structure

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 5.1 | Objective |
| 5.2 | Introduction |
| 5.3 | Explanation of The Main Theme |
| | 5.3.1 Personality. |
| | 5.3.2 Reason |
| 5.4 | Summary |
| 5.5 | Key Words |
| 5.6 | Question For Exercise |
| | 5.6.1 Objective Questions |
| | 5.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions |
| | 5.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions |
| 5.7 | Suggested Readings |

5.1 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain personality and reason as the postulate of morality. These postulates are the basis of morality and occupy a very important place in Ethics. A postulate is a necessary assumption taken for granted in order to explain a phenomenon.

5.2 Introduction

Every Science has some postulates which enable it to reach its goal. Ethics being a science also has some postulates. In other words, if we donot accept these postulates no question of morality will arises. Whenever a moral judgment is given its basis are these postulates only. If these postulates are falsified then there shall be no value of moral judgment.

5.3 Explanation of the Main Theme

The main theme of this lesson is 'Personality and Reason as the postulates of morality' But the postulates of morality are three in number :

- (i) Personality
- (ii) Reason
- (iii) Self-determination or freedom of will.

Now in this lesson we shall examine 'Personality' and 'Reason' separately to understand their meaning, as to why they are necessary for signing a moral judgment.

5.3.1 Personality

Personality is an important postulate of morality. The central fact of morality is called personality. It is the basis of moral life. Moral Judgment presupposes the existence of an agent or person endowed with the power of apprehending moral principles and acting according to such knowledge as we have seen. Voluntary actions or intentional actions are the object of moral judgment. By a voluntary action we mean an action that is performed by a rational agent not through blind impulse, but knowingly and intelligently with prevision, desire and free choice of means and end. This knowledge of good and bad, right and wrong is possible only when one is conscious of moral principles and possesses the capacity to act according to it. Animals do not have such knowledge hence their actions are not voluntary actions. Such a knowledge is the characteristic of a personality. That is why Calderwood has said, personality is the basis of morality. Where there is no knowledge of self, as the intelligent source of action, there is no discrimination of motive, act and end, and when such discrimination does not exist, there is no morality. The knowledge of moral distinctions and the practice of morality and in such a case it is equally impossible (Handbook of Moral Philosophy, P.14)

Without a personality there is no value of morality. The question is what is meant by a 'person' or what is involved in the conception of 'personality'. The conception of personality involves that of self-conscious and self controlled reality what makes a person to be a person is self-consciousness and self-controlled activity. A person is a being who is conscious of himself in and through his own mental states and processes who is aware of them as his own and of himself as the subject of them, and who has the power of freely and rationally determining his own actions. According to Calderwood, "self is known, not merely as intelligence, but also as power. I am a self-conscious, intelligent, self-determining power..... Personality, thus, involves self-conscious being self-regulated intelligence and self-determined intelligence and self-determined activity (Ibid-P.12)

With regard to the nature of the self, the sensationists or the empirical psychologists are of the view that the self or personality is a mere aggregate of inner experiences a conglomeration of conscious states and processes. Every moment man is performing conscious activities as a result of which he is having experiences. Man is nothing but the mere aggregate or totality of all experiences. This view of sensationistic or emperical psychology about the self takes away all meaning from morality. In fact experience itself becomes impossible without a permanent self-conscious reality as the experiencing subject. A true psychology tells us that the human self is an individual personal reality a repository of power, a centre of rational activity and is the ground of all experience. we cannot think of states and activites without thinking of something that feels, thinks and wills and gives to these processes their unity and connection as functions of one reality.

The self is not a mere epiphenomenon of the material organism or an occasional by-product of the friction if the brain-product of the friction of the brain-cells as materialism holds. It is also not a mere mode or appearance of the one eternal universal consciousness as pantheism holds. It cannot be merged in other finite centres of consciousness, in the infinite and universal centre of consciousness.

Each finite self is a unique centre of consiouchness. It is a self-conscious and self-controlled agent conscious of its end or destiny and capable of fulfilling its functions in the universe and realising its ultimate destiny. It is because of this that a person distinguishes between good actions and bad actions and is held responsible for his actions. Thus, personality is the basis of our mental and moral life. According to P.B.Chatterjee "The central fact of morality is called personality"

5.3.2 Reason

Reason is also a postulate of morality. There are two important qualities in men-reason and sensibility. Both are the necessary organs of human nature. But among both 'reason' is the special quality of men. It is because of reason that a man is distinguished from an animal. The quality of sensibility is to be found in animal also. But man with the aid of reason controls his sensibility and guides it in the right direction.

All moral judgments presuppose. 'Reason' which in the form of 'conscience' and 'understanding' enables us to determine the rightness and wrongness of actions and thereby our duties in particular cases. Reason means 'rational capacity'. It is the power of interpreting, apprehending or understanding. The self-control, regulates and transforms feeling and desires, instincts and impulses into a unity of rational life by the activity of reason.

We have seen that moral judgments are passed upon voluntary actions which include deliberation and decision which is not possible without the help of reason because reason deliberates on the merits and demerits of different courses of action and chooses a particular course of action to the exclusion of others. Secondly, an action is judged be right or wrong, good or bad with the help of reason. As we know moral judgment is inferential in nature and inference is not possible with the help of reason. Thus, voluntary actions which alone have moral worth presuppose reason.

5.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we have seen that personality are reason are two important postulates of morality. Without the assumption of a personality and a reason it is not possible to explain morality. Moral judgment presuppose a self with a rational capacity to distinguish betwvwn right and wrong, good or bad. Thus, personality and reason arise the basis of moral life.

5.5 Key Words

- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| (i) Personality | (ii) Reason |
| (iii) Morality | (iv) Postulates |
| (v) Empiricists | (vi) Sensationists |
| (vii) Self-determination | (viii) Understanding |

5.6 Questions for Exercise

5.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) The postulates of morality are
- (a) only reason
 - (b) only personality
 - (c) only freedom of will
 - (d) All of the above

Answer — (b)

- (ii) "The central fact of morality is called personality"—This statement is of
- (a) Calderwood
 - (b) P.B.Chatterjee
 - (c) J.N. Sinha
 - (d) Mill

Answer — (b)

5.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain 'Personality' as a postulate of moral judgment.
- (ii) Explain 'Reason' as a postulate of moral judgment.

5.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain briefly the postulates of moral judgment.

5.7 Suggested Readings

1. Calderwood : **Handbook of moral Philosophy.**
2. P.B.Chatterjee : **Principles of Ethies.**
3. Urban : **Fundamental of Ethies.**



Freedom of Will as the Postulate of Morality

Lesson Structure

- 6.1 Objective
- 6.2 Introduction
- 6.3 Explanation of the Main Theme
 - 6.3.1 Freedom of Will
- 6.4 Summary
- 6.5 Key Words
- 6.6 Questions for Exercise
 - 6.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 6.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 6.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions
- 6.7 Suggested Readings

6.1 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain freedom of will as the postulate of morality. A postulate is necessary assumption or phenomenon taken for granted in order to explain a phenomenon. Postulates are the basis of morality. Freedom of will is an important postulate of morality.

6.2 Introduction

Every science has some postulates which enable it to reach its goal. Ethics being a science also has some postulates. The postulates of morality are three in number. They are — Personality, Reason, and Freedom of will. If we do not accept these postulates no question of morality will arise. If these postulates are proved to be false then there will be no value of moral judgment.

6.3 Explanation of the Main Theme

We shall examine the nature of freedom of will as the postulate of morality here.

6.3.1 Freedom of will

Freedom of will is an important postulate of morality. As we have seen moral judgment presupposes a personality and a reason and finally freedom of will or self-determination. We know that the object of moral judgment is voluntary or intentional actions which involve as their essence an act of choice or self-determination. Self-determination means acting in a definite direction after due comparison of the rival claims of conflicting desires. Thus moral judgment presupposes that the self possesses the peculiar power of determining the direction of its own activities according to ideas of identifying itself with one particular idea and desire in preference to others and projecting its own vital energy into the activity of realising that chosen end.

In fact, the problem of freedom of will is vitally connected with the problems of our moral life. Moral judgment presupposes the power of free choice in man. As Dr. D. Argy says, "Morality cannot accept the theory of necessity because that theory destroys responsibility in all his actions, a man is controlled from without, praise and blame, approval and disapproval, reward and punishment, rest upon no real basis. But if will is self-determination, if every man must trace his actions to himself, ultimately, then, when he sins and suffers, he has no one to blame but himself. Responsibility resumes its meaning. Morality becomes possible." (A Short Study of Ethics, p.25) According to Martineau, "Moral judgment credits the ego with a selecting power between two possibilities and stands or falls with this." (Types of Ethical Philosophy, p.40) and he also said. "Either freedom of will is a fact or moral judgment is a delusion."

Ethical freedom implies both freedom and necessity. In other words freedom that is Ethical is freedom of self-determined by anything outside of himself, but he is only internally determined by his rational nature.

The problem of the freedom of will divides the Ethical thinkers into two opposing schools: Determinists and Indeterminists. Indeterminism holds that human will is absolutely free to act in any way it pleases while determinism means that each and every course of our action is always determined by other forces and circumstances beyond our control. The determinist maintains that the law of causality is as strictly applicable to the action of human beings as to the other phenomena and, therefore, given the character of an individual and also the inducements acting upon him, we can predict his conduct with accuracy. Self-determinism; on the other hand, is the theory urged to reconcile the two extreme theories of Indeterminism and Determinism and means that the human will is determined by nothing else but one self. Thus regarded the extremes of Determinism and Indeterminism are likewise.

untenable. The truth is represented by the idea of self-determination in as much as both necessity and freedom are essential for morals.

Freedom in the sense of self-determination is a necessary postulate or presupposition of the moral life. Freedom and responsibility go together. If a man is not free to act he can not be held responsible for his action. In a deterministic world there would be no responsibility on the part of the individual for any thing good or bad done by him. If e.g., a thief is not free in his action of stealing. He is not responsible for it and, therefore, deserves no punishment for it. In a deterministic world there would hardly be any justification for punishment.

In fact, without freedom, there will be no sense in an 'ought' and all moral distinctions, would disappear. A moral 'ought' implies 'can' and 'can' implies freedom. Freedom is, thus, at the root of all moral judgments. We never pass moral judgements on a man for what he was constrained or forced to do. Moral judgment implies the power of free choice in man. Again the absence of freedom renders a satisfactory explanation of the facts of moral life impossible.

Can conclude in the words of D. Arcy says, "If the freedom of will in every sense be given up and necessity prove victorious, the ethical 'ought' is left without meaning and morality becomes a polite fiction." (A short study of Ethics, —P.22)

6.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we may say that freedom of will is a necessary postulate or presupposition of the moral life. Here is involved in our moral consciousness the conviction that we ought to act in one way rather than in another, that one manner of action is good or right and another bad or evil. This implies freedom to choose one course of action in preference to the other. Ethics and morality would mean nothing without freedom. This shows either our will is free or morality is a delusion. Hence, freedom of will does not mean indeterminism and determinism but self-determinism.

6.5 Keys Words

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| (i) Freedom of will | (ii) Postulate of morality |
| (iii) Determinism | (iv) Indeterminism |
| (v) Self-determinism | |

6.6 Questions for Exercise

6.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) The meaning of freedom of will is
- (a) Indeterminism
 - (b) Determinism
 - (c) Self-determinism
 - (d) None of the above.

Answer — (c)

- (ii) 'Either freedom of will is a fact or moral judgment is a delusion. This statement is
- (a) William lillie
 - (b) P.B. Chatterjee
 - (c) Martineau
 - (d) Dr. D. Arcy

Answer — (c)

6.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain Self-determination.
- (ii) Make distinction between determinism and indeterminism.

6.6.3 Long Answer Type Question

- (i) Explain 'Freedom of will' as a postulate or moral judgment.
- (ii) Explain and discuss, "Either our will is free of morality is delusion."

6.7 Suggested Readings

- | | | | |
|----|------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. | D. Arcy | : | A Short Study of Ethics |
| 2. | Martineau | : | Types of Ethical Theory |
| 3. | P. B. Chatterjee | : | Principles of Ethics |
| 4. | William Lillie | : | An Introduction to Ethics |



Nature of Moral Judgment

Lesson Structure

7.1	Objective	
7.2	Introduction	
7.3	Explanation Of The Main Theme	
	7.3.1	Subject of the Moral Judgment
	7.3.2	Object
	7.3.3	Standard
	7.3.4	Faculty of Power of Judging
	7.3.5	Moral Judgment and Descriptive Judgment
7.4	Summary	
7.5	Key Words	
7.6	Questions For Exercise	
	7.6.1	Objective Questions
	7.6.2	Short Answer Type Questions
	7.6.3	Long Answer Type Questions
7.7	Suggested Reading	

7.1 Objective

The Objective of this lesson is to explain the nature of moral judgment. Moral judgment is not merely a judgment about but a judgment upon facts. Thus, moral judgments differ from the logical judgment and other judgments.

7.2 Introduction

The moral judgment is thus regulative and appreciative in nature. It is the judgment of worth or value rather than of facts, or in other words it is the judgment of what ought to be rather than of what is. It does not merely state the nature of some object but compares it with a standard and by means of the standard pronounces it

to be good or evil, right or wrong. Dr. Stephen defines Moral Judgment as, "the mental act of discerning and pronouncing a particular action to have the quality or predicate of rightness and obligatoriness or its opposite of which a general idea or standard is already before the mind." Thus, moral judgment is a judgment upon facts.

7.3 Explanation of the Main Theme

Moral Judgment implies as necessary postulates :

7.3.1 Subject of the moral judgment

An agent or personality or self is one who judges. By the subject of the moral judgment is meant the point of view from which an action is judged to be right or wrong, good or bad. An action which is judged to be right from one point of view may be wrong from another point of view. Thus, even the same individual may judge the same action differently, with the change of his point of view. What is it that judges the one point of view to be preferable to another at any particular moment ?

Shaftsbury, the most notable exponent of the moral sense school, says that it is the moral connoisseur that judges. Just as the artist appeals to the judgment of the skilled and sympathetic critic, while Judging a poem or a play or a novel we in the same way appeal to the moral connoisseur while dealing with conduct. Moral connoisseur is a critical judge and his judgments are not necessarily from the point of view of the individual, who is acting.

But this view is not sound. It is based on the false analogy of art and morals. In art the work is judged by the results achieved and a skilled critic is the only judge, whether such a result has been achieved or not. But in case of morals, it is the action itself, its motive etc, that are judged and not the result so much. A real action or conduct is a willed action and has, therefore, been deliberately chosen and judged to be good by the agent himself.

Adam Smith urges that the subject of moral judgment is an Impartial Spectator, who passes judgment on our own action. This impartial spectator is a kind of 'second self' whose judgment influences our actions by the force of sympathy. In criticizing my own conduct, I divide myself into two persons, The Impartial Spectator, who is the judge and the agent who is judged. The judge is described by Smith as 'the man within the heart', or conscience.

However, conscience is not an infallible guide, even though a demi-god, yet it is liable to err. It is based on sympathy and sympathy can not be an infallible guide.

Mackenzie urges that the subject of the moral judgment is an Ideal self, i.e, our

judgments involve a certain reference to a point of view higher than that of the individual, who acts on appeal, so to say, from 'Philip drunk to Philip Sober'. At an early stage of development, the Ideal Self corresponds to the tribal Self. With development, the nature of the ideal self also becomes more complicated. At any rate, in a moral judgment there is an appeal from the universe of individual consciousness to a higher or more comprehensive universe, i.e., at the time of passing moral judgment we place ourselves at a universal and rational point of view and try to be impartial and disinterested in our judgment.

7.3.2

An object that is judged to be right or wrong, good or bad etc. The object of moral judgment is conduct or voluntary activity from the point of view of his motive, intention or consequences. The object of moral judgment is the person doing his character rather than the act done.

7.3.3

A standard by which we judge the rightness or wrongness of acts or the goodness or badness of the motives of actions etc.

7.3.4

A faculty by which we discern the moral quality of acts or persons judged.

Moral judgments according to the Intuitionists are Intuitive but according to the Hedonists they are discursive or inferential in nature. Though the Intuitionists maintain that the moral knowledge is of the character of perception yet the truth is that such a knowledge is of the nature of judgment. "Perception", Says Calderwood, "gives knowledge of an extended surface but not of its measure, knowledge of a signal, but not of its meaning, knowledge of an action but not of its moral character. The knowledge of the measure of a surface, of the meaning of a signal and of the character of an action implies the application of a standard to particular situations. Thus it is that we say that the Ethical point of view is normative or that the moral judgments are regulative or appreciative in nature. The knowledge of this standard, norm or ideal is often implicit but sometimes it becomes explicit as well. But the knowledge of the moral principles is involved necessarily in all moral judgments.

7.3.5 Moral Judgments and Descriptive Judgments

Judgments are of two kinds : Judgment of worth or value and judgment of facts. There are accordingly two types of Sciences. (i) The type, which seeks to organize into a rational system the chaotic mass of is-judgments, and (ii) the type which seeks to organise into a rational system the no less chaotic mass of ought

judgments. To the former type belong the natural or descriptive sciences and to the latter the normative sciences of Logic, Ethics and Aesthetics.

Ethical or moral judgments, like the logical ones, are appreciative or regulative in nature, whereas those of Psychology and Physics and other natural Sciences are descriptive or natural. Moral Judgments deal with what ought to be, whereas the descriptive judgments with what is. Moral Judgments are judgments of worth and value; whereas the descriptive judgments are judgments of facts. Moral Judgments refer to an Ideal or Norm whereas descriptive judgments are merely the uniformities of our experience. The appreciative moral judgments can however, be broken, though they cannot be changed. We ought to speak the truth but most of us do otherwise. A moral judgment states something that ought to be, not something that necessarily is or does happen. Mackenzie says, "The moral Judgment is not simply of the nature of what is called a judgment in Logic. It is not merely a judgment about, but a judgment upon. It does not merely state the nature of some object, but compares it with a standard and by means of the standard pronounces it to be good or evil, right or wrong. This is what is meant by saying that the moral point of view is normative. (A Manual of Ethics)

7.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we may say that the moral judgment is intellectual inferential, practical regulative, and appreciative in nature. Moral judgment implies as necessary postulates : Subject object, standard and faculty of power of judging. Moral Judgments are judgments of value. Moral judgment differ from factual judgment, Logical judgment, aesthetic judgment and legal judgment.

7.5 Key Words

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| (i) Moral judgment | (ii) Standard |
| (iii) Subject or Agent | (iv) Object |
| (v) Judgment of Fact | (vi) Judgment of Value |
| (vii) Descriptive | (viii) Appreciative |
| (ix) Normative | |

7.6 Questions for Exercise

7.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Moral Judgment is

- (a) Judgment of Fact
- (b) Judgment of Value
- (c) Both a and b
- (d) None of the above

Answer — (b)

(ii) Moral judgment implies as necessary postulates

- (a) Subject and object
- (b) Standard
- (c) Both a and b
- (d) None of the above

Answer — (d)

(iii) Moral judgment is

- (a) Intellectual
- (b) Moral
- (c) Both a and b
- (d) None of the above

Answer — (a)

7.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) What do you understand by the subject of the moral judgment.
- (ii) Distinguish Moral judgment from factual judgment.

7.6.3 Long Answer Type Question

- (i) Explain the nature of moral judgment. How is it different from factual and other judgments ? Discuss.

7.7 Suggested Readings

1. Mackenzie : **A Manual of Ethics**
2. Muirhead : **The Elements of Ethics**
3. William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics**



Motive as the Object of Moral Judgment

Lesson Structure

- | | | |
|-----|-------|--------------------------------------|
| 8.1 | | Objective |
| 8.2 | | Introduction |
| 8.3 | | Explanation of The Main Theme |
| | 8.3.1 | Definition of Motive |
| | 8.3.2 | Are moral judgment passed on motives |
| 8.4 | | Summary |
| 8.5 | | Key Words |
| 8.6 | | Questions for Exercise |
| | 8.6.1 | Objective Questions |
| | 8.6.2 | Short Answer Type Questions |
| | 8.6.3 | Long Answer Type Questions |
| 8.7 | | Suggested Readings |

8.1 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain 'motive' as the object of moral judgment. The Intuitionists maintain that moral judgment is passed on the motive. An action is said to be right if it is done with a good motive and not otherwise.

8.2 Introduction

Moral judgments are passed not upon all sorts of things, not even upon all sorts of activities, but only upon conduct. Conduct is the habitual mode of action based upon character and will. The object of moral judgment is, therefore, voluntary action. whatever is not willed has no moral quality. This is why we do not blame an earthquake which destroys so often or praise a shower which saves so often. In like manner, we do not pass moral judgments on the instinctive acts of animals. Moral judgment is not properly passed upon a thing done but upon a person doing i.e, a fully developed moral judgment is always pronounced, directly or indirectly, on the

character of the agent. Even when we pass judgment on particular actions we think of the action not as an isolated event but as a part of a system. We judge its significance not in the abstract but for the person who does it. The charity of a king who comes to the throne through dishonest means is hardly commendable. The morality of an action depends upon the motive from which it is done and not so much upon the result it achieves. There is nothing good in this world but the good will. This means we pass moral judgments not on the acts, as such, but on the persons doing or on their character and motives, etc.

8.3 Explanation of The Main Theme

Before we start discussing 'motive' as the object of moral judgment, it is desirable to know the exact meaning and implication of the term 'motive'.

8.3.1 Definition of Motive

The word motive means what moves us or causes us to act in a particular way. William Lillie defines it as follows: "A motive may be defined as a conscious mental process which moves a man to act in a particular way, and with the possible exception of actions done from a sense of duty, actions done with a conscious process of willing have as their motives desire." (An Introduction to Ethics, p.32)

In the former sense, feeling or emotion like anger, jealousy, fear, pity, pleasure of pain is the motive to action some writers have even maintained that pleasure and pain are the only motives. But a morally good man is never solely moved by feeling. If a man is entirely carried away by feeling anger or fear, he cannot properly be said to act at all, any more than a stone acts when a man throws it at an object. Moral activity is purposeful activity and purposeful action is never moved by feeling but by the thought of some end to be attained.

This leads us to the second view of the term motive. Motive is what induces us to act. This inducement to act consists of the conception of an end to be attained. A man, e.g., is moved by pity to give assistance to a fellow creature in distress. The mere feeling of pity is evidently not sufficient to move us to action. It can at the most move a man to tears. To help a man in his distress, he must perceive the fellow-creature in a wretched plight and see that by a certain effort, he can put the man in a more favourable condition. Thus the putting of the man in this more favourable condition presents itself to his mind as a desirable end and the thought to this desirable end induces him to act in a particular way.

8.3.2 Are Moral Judgment Passed on Motives

The intuitionists maintain that the moral judgment is concerned entirely with the

motives of our actions, that our actions are to be pronounced good or bad in proportion to the goodness or badness of the motives by which we are actuated to do. "The morality of an action," said Doctor Johnson, "depends upon the motive from which we act. If I fling half a crown to a beggar with the intention to break his head and he picks it up and buys victuals with it, the physical effect is good but with respect to me the action is very wrong" "Similarly, if a competent surgeon performs an operation to cure a patient and the patient dies the act of the surgeon is judged as right and not wrong. This implies that no action is right unless it is done from a good motive, whatever its consequences may be i.e., an action that produces the best possible results may be wrong and that an action may be right, in spite of failing to produce them. Kant maintains the same view when he says, "There is nothing in the world, and even out of it, that can be called good without qualification, except a goodwill," A good will is good not because of what it performs or effects. Even if it achieves nothing it is the only jewel that shines by its own light. Martineau, Mackenzie and many others hold the same view. Moon also admits that in our moral judgments we actually do and ought to take account of motives and indeed it makes a great advance in morality, when men do begin to attach importance, to motives and are not guided exclusively in their praise and blame by the consequences of an act.

But are consequences or results wholly irrelevant to our judgments on conduct? No, certainly not. A truly benevolent man is not one who indulges in indiscriminate charity, but one, who considers the effect of his charity upon his recipient and upon the society, as a whole.

This is admitted by Kant even when he said that good will is not merely a good intention but determined effort to produce a good result. It is clear that a good motive may not produce a good result. A man, for example a fanatic, may act wrongly from the best of motives. However, while taking consequences into consideration, we should note that a man cannot be held responsible for consequences, which he did not foresee, except in so far as he is responsible for not foreseeing them.

8.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we may say that the utilitarians hold that not motive but intention is the sole basis of moral judgment whereas as opposed to this intuitionists hold that the motive determines the moral quality of an act, irrespective of the consequences. Ideal utilitarianism holds that right action is always that which produces the greatest amount of good of the whole. Thus, both the motive and the consequences of an act are relevant to a valid judgment upon it,

because motive and intention are often inseparably though distinguishably connected. This is way the judge, while deciding a law suit takes account of both the motive and the intention. Thus, in theory as well as in practice, the motive, the intention and even the consequences of an action are relevant. Hence, it is misleading to say that we pass judgment either on the Intention or on the Motive. we judge the motive both positively and negatively and in so doing judge the whole intention which includes motive as well as the consequences in a way.

8.5 Key Words

- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| (i) Consequence | (ii) Motive |
| (iii) Means | (iv) Intention |
| (v) Intuitionists | (vi) Utilitarians |
| (vii) Voluntary action | |

8.6 Questions for Exercise

8.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) According to Intuitionists, 'the object of moral judgment is
- Consequences
 - Motive
 - Intention
 - None of the above.

Answer — (b)

- (ii) According to Hedonists, "The object of moral judgment is
- Consequences
 - Motive
 - Intention
 - None of the above

Answer — (a)

8.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- Are moral judgment passed on motive ? Discuss.
- Explain the meanings of motive and discuss their ethical significance.

8.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions

- (i) What is the object of moral judgment ? Does the moral quality of an act depends on the motive ? Discuss.

8.7 Suggested Readings

- 1. Kant : **Metaphysics of Morals**
- 2. William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics**
- 3. Mackenzie : **A Manual of Ethics**



Intention as the Object of Moral Judgment

Lesson Structure

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 9.1 | Objective |
| 9.2 | Introduction |
| 9.3 | Explanation of The Main Theme |
| | 9.3.1 Definition of intention |
| | 9.3.1 Are moral judgment passed on intention |
| | 9.3.3 Motive and Intention |
| 9.4 | Summary |
| 9.5 | Key Words |
| 9.5 | Questions For Exercise |
| | 9.6.1 Objective Questions |
| | 9.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions |
| | 9.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions |
| 9.7 | Suggested Readings |

9.1 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain 'Intention' as the object of moral judgment. The followers of the Utilitarian School maintain that Moral judgment is passed not on the motive but on the intention. The intention is the sole object of moral judgment.

9.2 Introduction

Moral judgment are passed not upon all sorts of things not even all sorts of activities, but only upon conduct. Conduct is the habitual mode of action based upon character and will. The object of moral judgment is, therefore, voluntary action, whatever is not willed has no moral quality. We donot pass moral judgments on the instinctive acts of animals. Moral judgment is not properly passed upon a thing done but upon a person doing, i.e., a fully developed moral judgment is always pronounced,

directly or indirectly on the character of the agent. This means we pass moral judgments not on the acts, as such, but on the persons doing or on their character and motives, etc. The Utilitarians have held that the morality of an action depends entirely upon the intention, i.e., what the agent wills to do.

9.3 Explanation of The Main Theme

Before we start discussing 'Intention' as the object of moral judgment, it is desirable to know the exact meaning and definition of the term 'Intention'.

9.3.1 Definition of Intention

Intention means the end towards which the mental activity is directed or anything which we propose to bring about. Intention or purpose, is like a cause, not a simple phenomenon, but a very complex one. Ordinarily when we speak of intention, we generally mean some conspicuous change that we aim at bringing about. But in reality intention is much more complex than this. We say e.g., that it is our intention to go there. But this intention includes a good deal more than mere going. we not only intend to go there but also to do something when we get there.

The intention is complicated in a number of different ways. Some of them are :

- (i) **Immediate and the Remote Intention** : Two men have the immediate intention of saving a third from drowning, but the one may wish to save him from drowning simply in order that his life may be saved, whereas the other may wish to save him in order that he may be reserved for hanging. Here the immediate intention is the same but the remote intentions are very different.
- (ii) **Outer and Inner Intention** : The story of Abraham Lincoln and the pig that he helped out of the ditch well illustrates this distinction. The outer intention was to remove the uncomfortable feeling of his own mind, for he rescued the pig, not for the sake of the pig but rather to rid his mind of the uncomfortable feeling caused by the animal's distress.
- (iii) **Direct and Indirect Intention** : A Nihilist seeks to blow up a train containing an emperor and others. His direct intention may be simply the destruction of the emperor, but indirectly he intends also the destruction of others, who are in the train.
- (iv) **Conscious and Unconscious Intention** : Unconscious intention is one which the agent does not definitely avow to himself. The conscious intention may be that of promoting the well-being of mankind, while in reality he may be much more strongly, but unconsciously, influenced by that of advancing his own reputation.

- (v) **Formal and Material Intention** : Material Intention means the particular result as a realized fact, the formal intention means a principle embodied in the fact. Two men may both aim at an overthrow of a government. Their material intention are the same. But one aims at its overthrow because one thinks, it is too progressive, the other, because he thinks it is too conservative. The formal intentions are thus very different.

Intention, in the broadest sense, means any aim that is definitely adopted as an object of will and such intentions are of many kinds.

9.3.2 Are Moral Judgments passed on Intention?

The Utilitarians have held that not motive but intention is the sole object of moral judgment. Mill urges that the morality of an action depends entirely upon the intention i.e., what the agent wills to do. But the motive i.e., the feeling which makes him will to do so, when it makes a great difference in our moral estimation of the agent. Murder will be nonetheless a murder, even if the killer were filled with the sentiments of a drowning man would be nonetheless approvable, even if we happened to know that the rescues were irritable or grumpy while rescuing. In judging the morality of an act, it is the intention, not the feeling or motive that counts. Similarly, if one man is animated by compassion and the other by fear but both are led to perform the same act, their actions must be regarded as equally good or bad, though we may think the former a more amiable man and the latter a more cowardly one. But if their actions are different in consequences then our moral judgments upon their actions will be different. The question of motive, therefore, is totally irrelevant. The action is good or bad according to its effects for "from one and the same motive and form every kind of motive." says Bentham, "may proceed actions that are good, others that are bad and others that are indifferent." Curiosity, for example, may move a boy in order to divert himself, (a) to read an inspiring book, or (b) to set his top spinning or (c) to let loose a mad ox in a crowd. The same motive of curiosity leads to good, indifferent or bad results. Thus from the Utilitarian point of view, the morality of the act depends entirely upon the intention, i.e., upon what the agent wills to do.

But the Utilitarian point of view is erroneous. The motive is not the feeling by which our actions are accompanied. It is rather that which induces us to act in a particular way and consequently we must hold that it is on the motive that the moral judgment is passed. Mill's error seems to arise from this, that he supposes the moral judgment to be passed on things or acts done, whereas the moral judgment is not properly passed upon a thing done but upon a person doing. If it were not so, we should pass moral judgments on the instinctive acts of animals and even on the movements of rocks and clouds. What we judge is conduct and this means not merely

an overt activity but the attitude of the person is acting and this must include his motive. Mill himself admits that the motive makes a difference in our estimation of the agent's moral worth. It is true, indeed, that in a moral judgment upon a particular act, we need not take account of the whole character of the man who does it. If for example a man tells a lie or defrauds his neighbour, we can say that he has done wrong without enquiring whether he is otherwise a good or a bad man. But this does not mean that we judge his action simply from outside as a thing done. It is the man as the agent of the act, that we judge and the question what induced him to do (the motive) is not quite irrelevant.

9.3.3 Relation and Distinction between Motive and Intention

The motive of an act is that which induces us to perform it. The motive is included in the Intention, which is a broader term, but need not be, and generally is not, identical with the whole of it. What induces us to perform an act (motive) is always something that we hope to achieve by it (intention). But there may be much that we expect to achieve by it, which may not serve as an inducement to its performance and which might even serve as an inducement not to perform it. The motive, e.g., of a reformer may be to improve the state of mankind. But he may also be well aware that the result of his action will be for the time being not to send peace on earth but a sword. He may anticipate a certain amount of confusion and misery as the immediate result of his action and perhaps also a persecution for himself. If he clearly foresees that these results will ensue on his action, it can scarcely be said that he does not intend them. They are thus his intentions, though not his motives.

The motive, then, is a part of intention in the wide sense of the term. Motive is generally identical with the remote, direct and formal intentions and may be outer or inner, conscious or unconscious according to the sense.

9.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we may say that the Utilitarians hold that not motive but intention is the sole basis of moral judgment. The Intuitionism maintains that motive is the proper object of moral judgment. Ideal Utilitarianism holds that right action is always that which produces the greatest amount of good on the whole. Thus, both the motive and the consequences of an act are relevant to a valid judgment upon it, because motive and intention are often inseparably though distinguishably connected. In theory as well as in practice the motive, the intention and even the consequences of an action are relevant. So, we judge the motive both positively and negatively and in so doing, judge the whole intention which includes motive as well as consequences in a way.

9.5 Key Words

- (i) Motive
- (ii) Intention
- (iii) Consequence
- (iv) Utilitarians
- (v) Intuitionists

9.6 Questions for Exercise

9.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) According to Utilitarians the object of moral judgment is
 - (a) only motive.
 - (b) only consequences
 - (c) Intention
 - (d) None of the above

Answer — (c)

- (ii) The whole intention which includes
 - (a) only motive
 - (b) only consequence
 - (c) Both motive and consequence
 - (d) None of the above.

Answer — (c)

9.6.2 Short Answer Type Question

- (i) Distinguish between Motive and Intention
- (ii) Explain the meaning and definition of Intention.

9.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain the object of moral judgment. Are moral judgment passed on Intention ? Discuss.

9.7 Suggested Readings

- 1. Mackenzie : **A Manual of Ethics**
- 2. William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics**
- 3. J.N. Sinha : **A Manual of Ethics**



External Law as the Standard of Morality

Lesson Structure

- 10.1 Objective
- 10.2 Introduction
- 10.3 Explanation of The Main Theme
 - 10.3.1 The Moral Law as a Political Law
 - 10.3.2 The Moral Law as a Law of Nature
 - 10.3.3 The Moral Law as a Law of God
- 10.4 Summary
- 10.5 Key Words
- 10.6 Questions for Exercise
 - 10.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 10.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 10.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions
- 10.7. Suggested Readings

10.1 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain external law as the standard of morality. Man in the beginning of his moral life is usually guided by external laws in the form of either the laws of the state or the laws of nature or the laws of God.

10.2 Introduction

The moral judgment is expressed in two chief forms. On the one hand, we speak of conduct as 'right' and 'wrong' and on the other, as 'good' and 'bad'. Thus, moral judgment implies two standard ; The standard of right and the standard of good. Right means what is according to the rule or law and good means what is conducive to an end. Thus moral judgment involves a reference to a law or to an end which is regarded as the Ideal of human life.

The right as the standard emphasises the importance of law, External, at the various stages of the moral life. Man is in the beginning guided from outside, but, later on, he is guided by the internal law—the law of conscience or reason etc. In the beginning he is guided by the laws of state, or nature or God, but later on, he is guided by moral sense, conscience or the law of reason.

10.3 Explanation of The Main Theme

Morality is understood to have been externally enforced in the beginning of human development. As a matter of fact, moral laws states something that ought to happen. It is not concerned with what is but with what ought to be. This is why ethics dealing with such laws is called the normative science of human conduct. The moral law is the statement of an ideal which ought to be followed in conduct. The moral laws are made effective by certain sanctions, censure, dislike, etc., generally constitute moral sanctions. Though moral laws vary in many particulars in different nations and in different periods of time depending upon the climate, situation and the local circumstances but they bear broad resemblances. We will now consider how normal law has variously been conceived as political law or law of nature or divine law.

10.3.1 The Moral Law as a Political Law

Political laws or laws of state are issued by some sovereign authority or duly constituted government in the form of orders to its subjects. Such state laws are flexible and change from time to time, from country to country and even from tribe to tribe. The violation of these laws invites punishment. Punishment is a necessary accompaniment of any violation of political laws. It is through the sanction of punishment and fear that the political laws command obedience from the people. According to Hobbes, "The civil law alone is the supreme court of appeal in all cases right and wrong."

There are certain points of difference between the moral laws and the political laws. Political laws are enforced from without but moral law does not admit of such external enforcement. Morality implies free and willing obedience of the individual to the moral law. True morality rises from within and is not imposed from without. So the ideal of moral life does not lie in blind obedience to the state laws.

Moral law is generally considered to be absolute and unchanging but political law varies from country to country and from time to time. According to William Lillie, "The fact that political codes vary from country to country and in the same country from time to time, separates them from the moral law which has been

generally considered to be absolute and unchanging." (An Introduction to Ethics p.155)

It is, therefore, certain that moral laws are not directly imposed by a political authority. They may have grown partly under the influence of religion, partly out of the necessities of existence and some other social factors.

10.3.2 The Moral law as a Law of Nature

According to some moral philosophers moral law is in one sense a law of nature. It is said that the law of nature provides the more important and universal moral rules for the governance of outward acts of mankind. Such a rule or command relating to overt acts of men are capable of being enforced by a political authority but their obedience is commanded by a deep-rooted public sentiment being dependent on public sentiment, they are called rules of morality.

Laws of nature are supposed to be objective, universal, unchanging, and inviolable, such laws are operative throughout the expanse of nature. It is binding all over the globe in all countries and at all times. They are necessary laws which necessarily do happen. The law of gravitation for example is one such law.

The moral law, however, is not the law of nature exactly in the same sense in which the law of gravitation is a law of nature. A moral law does not deal with observed facts but with standards which judge certain objects i.e. human conduct. Moral law is bound up with the laws of human nature, yet the moral fittingness of the conduct enjoined by the moral laws is a unique relation of the logical kind and not of the scientific kind like laws stating causal relations.

A moral law being normative tells what ought to be and not what always is. It also distinguishes between good mental tendencies and the bad ones. However, the view of the moral standard as the law of nature points out that the moral law takes into account the scientific law and is based upon the latter to same extent.

The difference between the scientific law and the political law is that if the former is a statement of fact, the latter is a command, consequently the former can never be disobeyed while the latter may often be disobeyed. Again scientific law cannot be changed though its applications may vary in different conditions. Political law, on the other hand change from time to time.

10.3.3 The Moral law as The law of God

Moral law is sometimes identified with the divine law. There are thinkers who believe that the universe is governed by a divine being and moral laws are commands of god to men. So moral law is referred to an external will of an almighty being. They are supposed to be the commands of god to us in the form of revelation.

Those who believe in the moral governance of the universe by God hold the above view. Rules imposed upon mankind by a God or Gods are rules set by a determinate authority and are direct revelations of the will of the super-natural power. Even such indirect intimations of the will of the supernatural power found in one's own conscience are also deemed laws of God. Violation of any of such divine laws is known as sin. Thus moral law is said to be the result of divine revelation and is found incorporated in the scriptures. This acceptance of moral law as divine command explains the obligatoriness on the part of his subjects to obey it. Obligatoriness is an essential factor in the moral judgment. This factor of obligatoriness is necessitated by the fact that what is right or good is decreed by god. This obligation has the effect of making those command of god valuable and morally significant.

But the law of God cannot be a standard or morality. By making the will of God the moral standard, morality tends to become arbitrary and dogmatic. It also makes the basic postulates of morality quite irrelevant. Besides, to obey moral law for fear of being punished by God in another life gives rise to a coercive morality based upon fear and wrath of God. It is never a proof of moral goodness of the laws as such. Thus, divine commandments as moral laws do not prove to be fundamental and virtuous.

10.4 Summary

Conclusively it may be said that in the beginning man is guided by the external laws. But external law cannot be satisfactory standard or morality. External laws are enforced from without but moral law does not admit of such external enforcement. Morality implies free and willing obedience of the individual to the moral law. True morality rises from within and is not imposed from without. Moral law is not concerned with what is but with what ought to be.

10.5 Key Words

- | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| (i) External Laws | (ii) Moral Standard |
| (iii) Natural Law | (iv) Political Law |
| (v) Divine Law | |

10.6 Questions for Exercise

10.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) External law is concerned

- (a) with what is
- (b) with what ought to be
- (c) Both a and b
- (d) None of the above

Answer — (a)

- (ii) political laws are
 - (a) unchanging
 - (b) objective
 - (c) Universal
 - (d) Changed from time to time

Answer — (d)

10.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) What do you understand by external law ? Discuss.
- (ii) Is external law a satisfactory theory ? Dissuss.

10.6.2 Long Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain and examine external law as a moral standard.
- (ii) Explain political law as a standard of morality.
- (iii) Explain Divine law as a standard of morality.
- (iv) Explain natural law as a standard of morality.

10.7 Suggested Readings

- 1. William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics**
- 2. J.N. Sinha : **An Manual of Ethics**
- 3. Mackenzie : **A Manual of Ethics**



Hedonism as the Standard of Morality

Lesson Structure

- | | |
|------|------------------------------------|
| 11.1 | Objective. |
| 11.2 | Introduction. |
| 11.3 | Explanation of The Main Theme |
| | 11.3.1 Psychological Hedonism |
| | 11.3.2 Ethical Hedonism |
| 11.4 | Summary |
| 11.5 | Key Words |
| 11.6 | Questions for Exercise |
| | 11.6.1 Objective Questions |
| | 11.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions |
| | 11.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions |
| 11.7 | Suggested Readings |

11.1 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain 'Hedonism' as the standard of morality. Hedonism is the general name for those theories that regard happiness or pleasure as the supreme end of life. In ethics, we attempt to determine the moral standard in order to judge human conduct as right or wrong, good or bad. Hedonism is one such theory about the moral standard. According to it happiness or pleasure is the sole criterion of evaluating conduct of human beings.

11.2 Introduction

◆◆◆

Hedonism is an empirical theory of the standard and it maintains that the moral value of an action is to be measured with reference to its consequences in the form of pleasure and pain. The term 'Hedonism' has Greek origin. It is derived from a Greek term 'hedone' meaning pleasure. The term hedonism, therefore, denotes the theory that pleasure is or should be the supreme end of life and all human conduct

should be directed to achieve it. Pleasure is an intrinsic good and it is the chief goal in life. Pleasure alone, according to hedonism, determines the moral value of an act or conduct. The greater weight of pleasure over pain makes an action morally good where as that of pain over pleasure makes it morally bad.

11.3 Explanation of the Main Theme

There are two chief forms of hedonism, namely, ethical hedonism and psychological hedonism. Ethical hedonism is a theory of the moral ideal whereas psychological hedonism is merely a theory of fact.

11.3.1 Psychological Hedonism

Psychological hedonism maintains that pleasure in same form is always the ultimate object of desire. Psychological hedonism is merely a theory of fact. Hedonism may be confined to the view that all men do in practice make pleasure the criterion of moral action. Pleasure is what men always seek actually as a matter of fact, though not necessarily, the greatest possible pleasure. This is the postulate of psychological hedonism. The theory denies that men aim at anything more than pleasure. It only emphasizes that the only motive working in human conduct is the desire to get pleasure and avoid pain. Man is by nature prone to seeking pleasure just in the same way as it is the nature of water to seek its own level. Every man normally acts with a view to attaining pleasure. So this theory believes in the Psychological fact that man by nature always seeks pleasure.

The Psychological hedonism is, thus, a theory of fact. It is of two kinds—gross and refined. The gross hedonism attach importance to sensuous pleasure as an end. The refined hedonism, on the other hand, decry the pure physical sensuous pleasure and say that the lower pleasures are transitory and are productive of so great an amount of consequent pain that the wise man cannot regard them as truly pleasurable. Such hedonists seek those so-called higher pleasures which are at once more lasting and less likely to be discounted by consequent pain.

Psychological hedonism gives rise to gross egoism. According to it, self is the succession of instincts sensations and feelings. As such, the highest goal of human life is sensuous pleasure, a pleasure which is immediate, intense and over durational. The theory, thus, makes man completely selfish. The attitude of the psychological hedonists is, therefore, said to be individualistic, immoral and anti-social.

This view of hedonism is also one sided and unnatural. Man is a rational being and, therefore, his life is not always regulated by instincts, sensations and impulses. He craves for a controlled and regulated life which is ignored in the psychological theory.

Man does not always or even usually seek things for the sake of pleasure but the things give pleasure in part because they are desired. Moreover, if a man suddenly rushes to save the life of another, there is no conscious thought or weighing of pleasure or pain involved.

11.3.2 Ethical Hedonism

Ethical hedonism is theory of the moral ideal which accepts pleasure as an ideal, a summum bonum. It maintains that men ought always to seek pleasure as the sole human good. According to ethical hedonism, to gain pleasure and avoid pain is not inherent in human nature. This theory holds that we ought to seek pleasure and avoid pain. Man should choose to act in such a way that it brings about the most happiness and the least unhappiness. A good action is recognized by its consequence which is pleasant and pleasant only. Pleasure or happiness is a value in itself and not the accompaniment of some other value. So it is right and reasonable for man so as to act to achieve the greatest possible pleasure or pleasures over pain for himself or for the whole of mankind.

Thus, psychological hedonism is a statement of fact where as ethical hedonism is theory of value. The former holds that man always do such actions which bear pleasant consequences. But the latter tells how man ought to act and what he ought to desire. The one, therefore, has no logical connection with the other. If we always seek our own greatest pleasure, it is superfluous and meaningless to tell us that we ought to attain maximum pleasure so unqualified psychological hedonism does not leave room for ethical injunctions. It is possible, therefore, to be a psychological hedonist without adopting ethical hedonism as an ethical principle. Similarly, one may adopt ethical hedonism without accepting psychological hedonism. However, many ethical hedonists have been at the same time psychological hedonists. It is generally said that the problems, the solution and the end of both kinds of hedonism are the same. The difference lies only in the method of their enunciation.

Psychological hedonism, however, ends in pessimism. It ultimately leads to indifference to pleasure and pain. But ethical hedonism, on the other hand, ends in optimism. It presents the positive side or aspect of pleasure before us. Its scope is not limited to individual standpoint only but opens up humanistic approach.

There are two chief forms of ethical hedonism, namely egoistic hedonism and altruistic hedonism. The theory of hedonism which emphasizes the pleasure of the individual is called egoistic hedonism while one which emphasizes the pleasure of all men is called altruistic hedonism. Thinkers like Aristippus, Epicurus, Hobbes etc. represent the first category of hedonists where as Bentham, Mill, John Stuart etc. representatives of the later category. Thus, according to altruistic or

utilitarianism the ultimate end of the individuals is the greatest pleasure of the greatest number while according to egoistic hedonism the agent's own pleasure is the highest end of his life.

The theory of ethical hedonism has been subjected to criticism. Critics say that even if it is granted that pleasure is the only end of human life, it is very difficult to achieve it. The hedonist wants that one should always seek pleasure. But constant running after pleasure brings about more pain than pleasure.

The hedonist's view that pleasure alone is the object of desire is based upon a psychological misconception. He considers that the feeling of pleasure is the motive behind all actions but such an idea is misconceived.

11.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we may say that the dynamic of moral life lies in sensibility no doubt, but hedonists over-exaggerate the truth embodied in it. Pleasure is a necessary element in the moral ideal but the fallacy of Hedonism lies simply in its over emphasis. Pleasure is really an intrinsic good but it needs the rational insight to become an ideal. There are two chief forms of hedonism— Ethical Hedonism and Psychological Hedonism. Ethical Hedonism is a theory of the moral ideal whereas Psychological Hedonism is merely a theory of fact.

11.5 Key Words

- | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| (i) Hedonism | (ii) Sensibility and reason |
| (iii) Psychological | (iv) Egoistic |
| (v) Altruistic | (vi) Grass |
| (vii) Refined | |

11.6 Question for Exercise

11.6.1 Objective Questions

- (1) Pleasure is
- (a) Extrinsic good
 - (b) Intrinsic good
 - (c) Both a and b
 - (d) None of the above

Answer — (b)

(2) Ethical hedonism is

- (a) Theory of fact
- (b) Theory of value
- (c) Both a and b
- (d) None of the above

Answer — (b)

(3) Psychological hedonism is

- (a) Theory of fact
- (b) Theory of value
- (c) Both a and b
- (d) None of the above

Answer — (a)

11.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) What is Hedonism ? Discuss.
- (ii) Make distinction between ethical hedonism and Psychological hedonism.

11.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions

- (i) What do you mean by Hedonism? Explain its different forms.
- (ii) Explain critically psychological hedonism.

11.7 Suggested Readings

- (i) William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics.**
- (ii) Makenzie : **A Manual of Ethics**
- (iii) Mill : **Utilitarianism**



Egoistic Hedonism as the Standard of Morality

Lesson Structure

- 12.1 Objective
- 12.2 Introduction
- 12.3 Explanation of The Main Theme
 - 12.3.1 Gross Egoistic Hedonism
 - 12.3.2 Refined Egoistic Hedonism
 - 12.3.3 Criticism of Egoistic Hedonism
- 12.4 Summary
- 12.5 Key Words
- 12.6 Questions for Exercise
 - 12.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 12.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 12.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions
- 12.7 Suggested Readings

12.1 Objective

The main objective of this lesson is to explain 'Egoistic Hedonism' as the standard of morality. Egoistic hedonism is a kind of ethical hedonism. Egoistic hedonism is one such theory about the moral standard.

12.2 Introduction

Egoistic hedonism is an ethical according to which each person ought to seek his own greatest pleasure throughout his life. Self interest weighs uppermost in a man. If there is a conflict between ones own interests and interests of others, the safe duty of the man is to himself even at the cost of other's interests. Thus the theory of egoistic hedonism emphasizes the importance of the individual ignoring his necessary dependence upon society. According to this theory the criterion of

rightness of an action lies in its capacity to cause the greatest possible amount of pleasure to the doer.

It is important to note here that the ethical hedonism in its earliest form was individualistic and egoistic. It was based upon the assumption that man's duty is towards himself. He has nothing to do with the pleasure or pain of others. He should, therefore, seek his own pleasure. Self pleasure becomes the highest moral end for him. Egoistic hedonism recognizes the psychological fact that man by his nature naturally seeks to constitute the standard of morality. It is pleasure which determines the rightness or wrongness of human conduct. Therefore, we ought to seek pleasure. If psychological hedonism is true, egoistic ethical hedonism is the only possible theory of ethics.

12.3 Explanation of The Main Theme

'Egoistic Hedonism' is the doctrine that each ought to seek his own greatest pleasure.

12.3.1 Gross Egoistic Hedonism

Aristipus of Cyrene, the founders of the Cyrenaic School, does not recognise qualitative distinctions among individual pleasure. He is a great exponent of the theory of egoistic hedonism. He holds that pleasure is the highest good and one should strive to secure as much pleasure as possible every moment. His hedonism, however, is of the extreme type as he holds that the highest good for man is the most intense sentient pleasure of the moment. According to him, the highest end of human life consists in the enjoyment of the present moment in disregard of all thoughts of the future. He believes that pleasure means sensuous pleasure. All pleasure are of the same nature. There is difference only of degree or intensity in them. It is on the basis of the intensity that pleasure is preferred to another. Bodily pleasure though transitory is more intense than mental pleasure. Sensuous pleasures of the moment, being more intense, are preferable to intellectual pleasures. It alone is desirable. We should try to seek such pleasure in its maximum quantity because value of human conduct is determined by the quantity of pleasure alone. Thus, the theory comes to the level of gross egoism.

Aristipus adhered to the philosophy of materialism and consequently propagated the sensuous pleasure to be the only good. Actions should be evaluated only on the basis of their immediate results. To justify his thesis, Aristipus even declared that sin etc. to be good in certain circumstances. The sensuous bodily pleasure is the highest good. Being a materialist, he was of the view that future is uncertain, life is unpredictable. Hence, It is wise to indulge in maximum pleasure.

In the modern period, hedonism was revived by Thomas Hobbes. He based his doctrine upon psychological hedonism. According to him, every creature has a natural inclination to seek pleasure and to avoid pain. The supreme end for the individual is to seek his own pleasure. Hobbes was also a materialist, so, he confined his psychology to sensuous and bodily pleasures. Hobbes was of the firm view that man was by nature selfish. All his actions were guided by the instinctive impulse of self-love and all altruistic tendencies like sympathy, benevolence, renunciation etc. were also basically the products of selfishness. All altruistic tendencies or actions were the result of the egoistic impulse of self-love and self-preservation.

But such a view of hedonism led him to moral scepticism, as pure sensuous pleasure proved to be an impossibility. As such he had to concede that reason should assist in the attainment of pleasure. Modifying his previous crude hedonistic conception, Aristipus held that a rational being can enjoy more pleasure by self control.

12.3.2 Refined Egoistic Hedonism

Epicurus recognizes qualitative distinction among individual pleasure. Later, another Greek thinker named, Epicurus, too advocated that pleasure is not only the highest but the only good, not only for man but also for gods. He, however, did not subscribe to the theory of Aristipus. He made an improvement upon Aristipus view of hedonism. According to him, the enjoyment of the present moment only does not constitute the object of life. He instead, held that only the most lasting and the highest pleasure can be the end of life. We have to strive for securing the abiding happiness of the whole life. He gave more importance to spiritual pleasures than to the changing physical pleasure. According to him, the aim of life is not transitory pleasure but a happy life. Virtue is essential for a happy life and it is attained by reason rather than passion. So Epicurus laid emphasis upon intellectual pleasures. He preferred the life of intellectual pleasures to that of self-indulgence. Thus, the theory comes to the level of refined egoism.

Epicurus encouraged the practice of self-control, friendship, wisdom in conduct and favoured their development. Presenting a refined version of hedonism, he held that pleasure is not only affective in nature but also rational and social. However, later Epicureans reverted to the sensualistic standpoint of Aristipus and adopted the doctrine of 'eat, drink and be merry' as the ideal of life.

12.3.3 Criticism of Egoistic Hedonism

Egoistic hedonism leads to a state called the paradox of hedonism. A man of pleasure is a man of pains. To seek happiness is to beget misery. So, egoistic hedonism is a suicidal doctrine defeating its own end it is a patent psychological fact

universally admitted that the more one hankers after pleasure, the more does he lose it and the more is one unmindful of it, the more he get it.

Egoistic hedonism supposes that the feelings of pleasure and pain are the moral criteria of our actions, but feelings are pre-eminently subjective. Hence, egoistic hedonism fail to supply us with a uniform or objective standard of moral judgment, for subjective estimate is essentially inaccurate and variable.

Sensualistic egoism is no moral theory at all. It means license, while morality implies rational restraint. Egoistic hedonism removes all restraint from the higher side of our nature and shamelessly parades the gratification of the appetites and passions.

12.4 Summary

In conclusion it can be said that egoistic hedonism can not be satisfactory standard of morality. To reduce all human tendencies to self-love is also erroneous social feeling as a matter of fact are too deep-rooted in human nature. Egoistic hedonism regards each man as an independent unit seeking his own pleasure regardless of the welfare of others. But infact, we live more for others than for ourselves.

12.5 Key Words

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| (i) Egoistic Hedonism | (ii) Gross Egoistic Hedonism |
| (iii) Refined Egoistic Hedonism | (iv) Quantitative Difference |
| (v) Quantitative Difference | (vi) Intensity |
| (vii) Sensualism | (viii) Paradox of Hedonism |

12.6 Question for Exercise

12.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Egoistic hedonism is a form of
- (a) Ethical hedonism
 - (b) Psychological hedonism
 - (d) None of the above

Answer — (a)

- (ii) Who among the following holds the view of gross egoistic hedonissms
- (a) Epicurus
 - (b) Aristipus

- (c) Mill
- (d) None of the above

Answer — (b)

(iii) Who among the following holds the view of refined egoistic hedonism :

- (a) Hobbes
- (b) Aristipus
- (c) Epicurus
- (d) Mill

Answer — (c)

12.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) What do you mean by egoistic hedonism ? Discuss.
- (ii) Explain gross egoistic hedonism.
- (iii) Explain refined egoistic hedonism.

12.6.3 Long Answer Type Question

- (i) Give a critical exposition of Egoistic Hedonism.

12.7 Suggested Readings

- (i) William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics**
- (ii) Mackenzie : **A Manual of Ethics**
- (iii) Mill : **Utilitarianism**



Altruistic Hedonism as the Standard of Morality

Lesson Structure

- 13.1 Objective
- 13.2 Introduction
- 13.3 Explanation of The Main Theme
 - 13.3.1 Bentham's Utilitarianism
 - 13.3.2 Mill's Utilitarianism
- 13.4 Summary
- 13.5 Key Words
- 13.6 Questions for Exercise
 - 13.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 13.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 13.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions
- 13.7 Suggested Readings

13.1 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain 'Altruistic Hedonism' as the standard or morality. Altruistic hedonism is a kind of ethical hedonism. Altruistic hedonism or Utilitarianism holds that greatest happiness of the greatest numbers's is the supreme end of life. Utilitarianism is one such theory about the moral standard.

13.2 Introduction

Some hold that what each man seeks or ought to, is his own pleasure, while others hold that what each man seek or ought to seek is the pleasure of all human beings. The former is Egoistic Hedonism and the latter is Altruistic Hedonism or Utilitarianism. Thus according to Utilitarianism the ultimate end of the individual is the greatest pleasure of the greatest number, while according to Egoistic Hedonism, the agent's own pleasure is the highest end of his life. Benthan, Mill, Sidgwick and Spencer are the chief exponents of the Utilitarian doctrine. Utilitarianism exagger-

ates the claim of society, disregarding the rights and privileges of the individual just as egoistic hedonism emphasizes the importance of the individual ignoring his necessary dependence upon society. Utilitarianism maintains that pleasure is undoubtedly the supreme good of man but that every individual should instead of his own pleasure bring the greatest happiness of the greatest number even at the cost of his own interest if necessary.

13.3 Explanation of The Main theme

Among the significant propounders of this theory of Utilitarianism are Bentham and Mill. These thinkers were basically upholders of the materialistic view of life. This is why, according to them the end of moral life is the physical or worldly pleasure. But Bentham does not recognise qualitative distinctions among pleasures, while Mill recognizes qualitative distinctions among pleasures. But as those thinkers were social reformers too, they attached more importance to social duty and social welfare.

13.3.1 Bentham's Utilitarianism

Bentham's Utilitarianism is based on psychological hedonism. He says that 'to obtain the greatest portion of happiness for himself is the object of every rational being. Every man is nearer to himself than he can be of another man and no other can weigh for him his own pleasures and pains. His interest must to himself be the primary interest.' Thus he maintains that greatest pleasure quantitatively determined is the ultimate end of every rational being. He did not regard qualitative differences in pleasure for him, one pleasure is as good as another. All pleasures are equal though some of them can be more desirable than others. Bentham maintains that quality of all pleasures being the same, Pushpin is as good as poetry. The ground of preference or choice of pleasure is quantity and not quality.

To measure the quantity of pleasures Bentham adopts the theory of mathematical Calculation and talks of seven dimensions. According to him, there are seven elements of value in which pleasure or pain vary. We have to take into account these elements indetermining the quantity of pleasures. These elements are Intensity, duration, propinquity certainty, fruitfulness, purity and extensity. Intensity refers to the degree pleasantness that is, whether pleasure is strong or weak. Duration points to the length of time upto which the pleasant experience lasts, certainty indicates the probability of the occurrence of pleasantness resulting from an action. Propinquity shows the nearness in time of the pleasant result. Fruitfulness point to the chance that particular pleasant experience will be followed by more of the same kind of sensations purity marks the likelihood that pleasantness will not be mixed with

pain and extensity points to the number of persons enjoying it. Bentham calls them moral arithmetic or hedonistic calculus. This moral arithmetic can tell us which pleasure is quantitatively richer and consequently more desirable.

Of the seven elements aforesaid, the first six suffice when an individual is considering his own happiness. But when the act has social implications, the seventh becomes important. Bentham through these elements tried to put ethics on scientific basis.

Bentham's enunciation of the hedonist theory, however, has not been found to be satisfactory. It is argued that Bentham based his ethical theory upon psychological hedonism which is not practicable. His exposition of psychological hedonism is fallacious too. To impute selfishness to all human tendencies and to consider pleasure alone to be the object of human desire is to contradict psychology.

Bentham Utilitarianism is open to the charges of Egoism and Sensualism. Extensity is the only altruistic element in Bentham's standard of quantity, while the other six are applicable alike to egoism and altruism. Actually, Bentham's quantitative criterion of pleasure lands him in gross sensualism. His doctrine, therefore, has come to be aptly recognized as sensualistic hedonism.

According to Bentham, quantity is the only measure of value sensual pleasures having the highest intensity must be held moral according to him. But how can one measure the intensity? It may vary from individual to individual. As such, he fails to offer a universal standard of morality.

13.3.2 Mill's Utilitarianism

Mill tried to save Bentham from the attacks of his critics and elaborated the utilitarian principle more successfully. Mill maintains that happiness is the supreme end of morality, but it is not the happiness of the agent himself, it is the great happiness of the greatest number. For this Mill affords the following argument, "No reason can be given why the general happiness is desirable, except that each person desires his own happiness. This however, being a fact, we have not only all the proof, which the case admits of, but all which it is possible to require, that happiness is good, that each person's happiness is a good to that person and the general happiness therefore, a good to the aggregate of all persons." Thus according to Mill, happiness is the only good. Not only this, happiness alone is intrinsically good. Since all other ends of goods, that man may desire are, but there are so many roads to happiness. He bases his doctrine of Ethical or refined altruism on psychological hedonism. "The desire a thing and to find it pleasant are but two ways of expressing the same thing. But finding that the logical consequence of psychological hedonism

is Egoistic Hedonism, he urges that with the growth of age and experience a transition from egoism to altruism takes place in the life-time of every individual through sympathy or fellow feeling. It is because of this factor of experience that his Utilitarianism is given the name of Empirical or non-evaluational Hedonism.

The most significant feature of Mill's utilitarianism is that he adds a qualitative standard to Bentham's quantitative standard. He recognizes the qualitative difference among pleasures. Mill refutes the charge of sensualism against hedonism. According to him the pleasures of the exercise of intellectual faculties are qualitatively superior to those resulting from sense gratification. He says, "It is better to be a Socrates dissatisfied than a pig satisfied." This is why no man who is conscious of his dignity, "would consent to be changed into any of the lower animals, for a promise of the fullest allowance of a beast" Pleasure."

But, Mill has not succeeded in his attempt to reconcile egoism with altruism. His logical proof involves fallacy of composition. It is inferred that because my pleasures are good to me, yours to you, his to him and so on, therefore, my pleasures and your pleasures etc are a good to me, you and him, "It is forgotten," says Mackenzie, "that neither the pleasures nor the persons are capable of being made into an aggregate." A good must be a good for somebody. If we suppose that every man seeks his own pleasure by nature, we fail to explain his transition to altruism both logically and psychologically, "From each for himself to each for all." Observes Martineau "there is no road."

Mill's admission of qualitative difference among pleasures makes his hedonistic theory inconsistent. If one pleasure is more desirable than another, not on account of its nature as pleasure but on account of some other quality it possesses, then the pleasure-theory obviously fails, Mill could not provide a fixed standard of measurement to determine this. Besides, pleasures of different qualities cannot be compared with one another unless they are reduced to quantities. But such a reduction is not possible in Mill's view.

13.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we may say that Altruistic Hedonism cannot be satisfactory standard of morality. Utilitarian principle emphasizes the idea of good as the end of life and identifies the good with the greatest happiness of the greatest number. This principle is necessarily Ideal. There is a qualitative difference in pleasures by recognizing which Mill makes an improvement upon Bentham's and social basis for morality. He also tried to harmonize and purify the life of sensibility through the rational principle.

13.5 Key Words

- (i) Gross altruistic
- (ii) Utilitarianism
- (iii) Refined altruistic
- (iv) Hedonistic Calculus
- (v) Sense of dignity
- (vi) Fallacy of composition
- (vii) Intensity
- (viii) Extensity

13.6 Questions for Exercise

13.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Altruistic Hedonism is a form of
 - (a) Psychological Hedonism
 - (b) Ethical Hedonism
 - (c) Egoistic Hedonism
 - (d) None of the above
- (ii) Who among the following holds the view of gross altruistic hedonism.
 - (a) Mill
 - (b) Bentham
 - (c) Epicurus
 - (d) Aristipus
- (iii) Who among the following holds the view of refined altruistic hedonism.
 - (a) Mill
 - (b) Bentham
 - (c) Epicurus
 - (d) Aristipus

13.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) What do you mean by Utilitarianism ? Discuss.
- (ii) Explain and examine Mill's Utilitarianism.
- (iii) Explain and examine Bentham's Utilitarianism.

13.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions

- (i) Give a critical exposition of Altruistic Hedonism.

13.7 Suggested Reading

- (i) Mackenzie : **A Manual of Ethics**
- (ii) William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics**
- (iii) Mill : **Utilitarianism**



Regorism as the Standard of Morality

Lesson Structure

- 14.1 Objective
- 14.2 Introduction
- 14.3 Explanation of The Main Theme
 - 14.3.1 There is nothing good but the good will
 - 14.3.2 Categorical imperatives
 - 14.3.3 Maxims of Morality
 - 14.3.4 Criticism of Regorism
- 14.4 Summary
- 14.5 Key Words
- 14.6 Questions for Exercise
 - 14.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 14.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 14.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions
- 14.7 Suggested Readings

14.1 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain regorism as the standard or morality. In the history of Ethical studies 'Rigorism' is so called after the name of German Philosopher Immanuel Kant. According to him the moral law is of the nature of 'Categorical Imperatives' Moral law is the law of 'Reason' and is determined by an attitude of the will only.

14.2 Introduction

The Right as the standard emphasises the importance of law. In the history of ethical thought emphasis has been laid on the external law and sometimes on the internal law. As moral life develops internal law takes the place of the external law.

Man in the beginning is guided from outside. In other words, moral law has been identified with the political law, law of nature and the law of God at different stages of morality. But later on it is guided by the internal law as given by moral sense, conscience or reason. In other words, moral law has been identified with dictates of moral sense, law of conscience and the law of reason as development proceeds. 'Law of Reason' as formulated by Kant is the most satisfactory conception of the moral law. Kant's ethical theory is called 'rignonism' because he propounds every string and rigorous rules to be followed in our daily actions. Kant conceives a man essentially, as rational for Kant, as for the stoics, good life is simply the passionless life of reason. He maintains that there is nothing good apart from the good will. It is the jewel that shines by its own light. It is not good because it brings fortune, happiness and pleasure. It is good to itself i.e., good will is the only intrinsically good thing just as the Hedonists maintained that pleasure is the only intrinsically good thing.

14.3 Explanation of The Main Theme

Kant held that the characteristic which makes willing right is that it must be done on a rational principle. It is in this respect that Kant was an upholder of the view that the moral standard is a law of reason. Man is fundamentally rational and is dealing with an universe that is constructed on rational principles.

14.3.1 There is nothing good but the good will

Kant began his famous treatise on Ethics with the expression, "There is nothing in the world and even out of it that can be called good without qualification except a good will." The gifts of fortune and the happiness which they bring with them are good only on the condition that they are rightly and properly used. Talents and worldly wisdom likewise, are good only when they are used as a means to the attainment of some noble end. But a good will is good without conditions or qualifications. It is the only jewel that shines by its own light. This means 'that good will is good not because of what it performs or effects, not by its aptness for the attainment of some proposed end but simply by the virtue of volition. In other words good will is intrinsically and supremely good.

"A good will", says Mackenzie, "is merely the consciousness that the attainment of a certain end would give satisfaction, a good will is the identification of one-self with that end." Will and act, when there is an act at all, are but the inner and outer side of the same phenomenon. A good will, thus, can not actually fail to issue in a good action even though it may fail to achieve a good result. A good will issues in a good action and conversely there can be no good action without a good will. The

morality of an action therefore, depends upon the motive or good will from which we act, irrespective of result—good or bad, it leads to.

This view of good will leads Kant to propound his doctrine of the moral law as a categorical imperative, which is open to the objection of formalism and rigorism. This good will is barely formal and contentless, it is will that 'wills nothing'.

14.3.2 Categorical Imperatives

All laws, except those of nature are in a sense of the nature of commands. Now commands may be absolute in character or subject to qualifications. Hypothetical imperatives are based on commands that are subject to qualifications. The laws of architecture, some laws of political economy and even the rules of formal logic in a way exemplify hypothetical imperatives. The laws of architecture apply only to those who wish to construct stables or commodious and beautiful buildings, similarly some laws of political economy are neither constant nor universal in as much as, they vary with the conditions of society and are applicable to those who wish to produce wealth.

Categorical imperative on the other hand, is a command which is absolute in its nature. Laws of Ethics, according to Kant are categorical imperatives and not hypothetical ones. The supreme moral principle, whatever it may be, lays it commands upon us absolutely and admits of no question. what we ought to do. There can be no higher law by which the moral imperative might be set aside (Mackenzie). Categorical imperative differs even from assertorial laws like every one seeks naturally his happiness or desires his intellectual perfection. These assertorial laws are not absolutely universal : But the moral laws are, on the other hand, absolutely universal, they apply to all men irrespective of their choice. Thus, according to Kant, moral law is the only categorical imperative.

The absolute characters of duty, which Kant's categorical imperative implies, makes many of the acts that we ordinarily call moral, non-moral, if not immoral. Mothers's care of the child out of love and affection is not truly moral for it does not proceed from the sense of duty. But such act not being done from duty are not according to Kant truly moral. This view of duty disparages affections and desires altogether. Kant's statement is, "Duty for the sake of duty."

14.3.3 Maxims of Morality

Kant urges that the moral law is unconditionally binding on rational beings, it admits of no exception. According to Kant moral laws are universal in nature. The moral law is, thus categorical imperative and is stated as "Act only on that maxim which thou can set at the same time will to become a universal law."

From this general statement of the categorical imperative, Kant deduces three special forms depending upon this :

- (i) Act, as if , the maxim of the actions were to become by thy will a universal law of nature.
- (ii) The second special form emphasis that humanity is an end in itself. The form is, 'so act as to treat humanity whether in thy own person or in that of another as an end and never as a means only.' Thus, suicide is wrong and disinterested benevolence good from this point of view.
- (iii) The third special form of the categorical imperative emphasises autonomy or freedom of will and regards human beings as forming a kingdom of ends. This form implies that the will of every rational being, the rational is to be a universally legislative will. In other words, man is a law unto himself : The fact that every individual is an end in himself implies that his will as rational, is autonomous and free and, therefore, serves as universally legislative. The third special form of the categorical imperative is, therefore, known as the principle of autonomy or self-legislation and expresses that the reason of each person is itself the author of the laws which he ought to obey.

14.3.4 Criticism of Regorism

Kant's theory has been criticised in the following ways. The moral law can not be regarded as imperative. There is a sense in which, even the moral law can not be regarded as a categorical imperative. To describe the moral law as imperative is misleading because to call it an imperative or command is to say, that it is of the nature of must rather than of an ought. Again, a moral law as categorical can only assert that we must do what is right. But categorical imperaive can not go beyond this, i.e., it can not tell us what is right that we ought to do. It is formal, without content or matter.

Kant theory may also be criticized on the ground that a good action is not merely consistant with other good actions either in Kant's sense of its principle being capable of universalization or in any other sense. We have not yet discovered in what this goodness consists, whether in a unique moral feeling to cricumstances or in conformity to a law of nature or in productivity of good results, the more formal consistency which Kant advocated will never by itself make an action good.

Kant stated two other forms of the categorical imperative, or additional conditions that a valid moral law must fulfill (a) 'Treat every rational being including yourself always as an end, and never as a mere means : Some people have

criticized. this form by pointing out that we are constantly using other people as means. We use a porter as a means of carrying our luggage, a teacher as a means of educating our selves, Kant, however, never stated that we should not use the services of others or that they should not use our services. What rightly emphasized **was** that we should never use people as more means, but always should remember **that** they are ends, things of value in themselves apart from the services that they render to us. Kant made this point more expedient when he refereed to the aim of the moral life as a kingdom of ends.

14.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we may say that Kant's rigorism cannot be satisfactory standard of morality. It recognizes law of Reason as the standard of moral rectitude and therefore, emphasizes the role of reason in the moral life. It is a type of the jural Ethics emphasizing the concept of Right. But Kant ethics has become individualistic due to the negation on his part of the importance of human feeling because the element which links man with man is emotion and not reasons. Kant wants to remove feeling completely from life. In this way his opinion becomes rigorist.

14.5 Key Words

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (i) Rationalism | (ii) Rigorism |
| (iii) Duty for duty's Sake | (iv) Categorical imperative |
| (v) Jural | (vi) Good Will |
| (vii) Maxims of morality | (viii) Universal Law |

14.6 Questions for Exercise

14.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) "Duty for duty's sake" This Statement has been given by
- (a) Mill
 - (b) Bentham
 - (c) Kant
 - (d) Butler
- Answer — (c)**
- (ii) According to Kant Moral Law is

- (a) A-Priori
- (b) Syntheitic
- (c) A-posteriori
- (d) All of the above

Answer — (a)

(ii) According to Kant moral laws are

- (a) Hypothetical Imperative
- (b) Categorical imperative
- (c) Both a and b
- (d) None of the above

Answer — (b)

14.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain Kant's maxims of morality.
- (ii) Explain Kant's duty for duty's sake.
- (iii) "Three is nothing good but the good will." Discuss.

14.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain and examine Kant's rationalism or rigorism as a moral standard.
- (ii) Explain categorical Imperative according to Kant.

14.7 Suggested Readings

1. Kant : **Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals**
2. Mackenzie : **A Manual of Ethics**
3. William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics**



Intuitionism as the Standard of Morality

Lesson Structure

- 15.1 Objective
- 15.2 Introduction
- 15.3 Explanation of The Main Theme
 - 15.3.1 Meaning of Intuitionism
 - 15.3.2 Forms of Intuitionism
- 15.4 Summary
- 15.5 Key Words
- 15.6 Questions for Exercise
 - 15.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 15.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 15.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions
- 15.7 Suggested Readings

15.1 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain 'Intuitionism' as the standard of morality. Intuitionism stands for the theory that actions are right or wrong according to their own intrinsic nature and not in virtue of any ends outside of themselves. Thus intuitionism is known as internal law not External Law.

15.2 Introduction

The right as the standard emphasises the importance of law, The word right is derived from ractus, straight according to law. In the history of ethical thought emphasis has been laid on the external law sometimes on the internal law. As moral life develops internal law takes the place of the external law. Man in the beginning is guided from outside, but later on it is guided by the internal law or intuitionism as given by moral sense, conscience or reason. In other words, moral law has been identified with dictates of moral sense, law of conscience and the law of reason as

development proceeds, so, there are three forms of Intuitionism : Moral sense or Aesthetic intuitionism, law of conscience or unphilosophical intuitionism and law of reason or philosophical Intuitionism.

15.3 Explanation of The Main Theme

15.3.1 Meaning of Intuitionism

By intuitionism is generally meant the theory that the knowledge of the Moral law is instinctive or a priori. The Intuitionists suppose that the rightness or wrongness of an action is its inherent quality, which does not depend upon its consequence. It is said that we discern the morality of an action immediately through our moral faculty which is instinctive, underived, unerring and universal, In its wider sense, Intuitionism stands for the theory that action are right or wrong according to their own intrinsic nature and not in virtue of any ends outside of themselves. Thus, speaking truth would be regarded as a duty, not because it is essential for social well-being or for any other intrinsic reason, but because it is right in its own nature. But, in the narrower sense, it is understood to mean the doctrine which refers to the judgments upon action to the tribunal of conscience, a faculty which admits of no question or appeal.

William Lillie defines "intuition as the immediate apprehension of an object by the mind without the intervention of any reasoning process. "Based on this definition of Lillie a moral intuition is accordingly, one that apprehends some moral object immediately, without giving any reasoning about it. (An Introduction to Ethics, P. 118)

Similarly, according to Mackenzie, "Intuition may be described generally as the theory that actions are right or wrong according to their own intrinsic nature and not in virtue of any ends outside themselves which they tend to realize." (A Manual of Ethics. p. 92)

J.N. Sinha writes further in his celebrated book 'A Manual of Ethics' that Intuitionism is a theory, that conscience immediately and intuitively perceives that rightness and wrongness of particular action without reference to their ends and consequences.

What is this conscience ? According to Rashdau (Theory of God and Evil)" conscience' is an ever present dictator issuing detailed injunctions to meet particular case as they arise". The matter does not click herein. He further says that intuition is the theory that actions are proved right or wrong a priori without reference to their consequences. But, according to Lillie, such definition of intuitionism is nothing short of confusing it with deontology. (An Introduction to Ethics. p.120)

15.3.2 Forms of Intuitionism

- (i) **Perceptual or Aesthetic Intuitionism or Moral sense view of Shaftsbury and Hutcheson** : The moral sense is a faculty of Internal perception which immediately recognizes the moral qualities of acts "No sooner are actions viewed, no sooner the human affections and passions are discerned than straight an inward eye distinguishes and sees the fair and shapely, the amiable of the admirable, apart from the deformed, the foul, the adjous or the despicable. "Similarly, Hutcheson speaks of the moral sense as analogous to the sense of beauty and describes it as that which makes, "Rational actions appear beautiful or deformed."

But this view is not sound. Intuitive knowledge being always valid, moral sense contradicts itself and leads to moral scepticism and perplexity. Moreover, consistently with moral sense an error can never be detected for the possibility or detection implies an abandonment of the theory, Again, moral sense is inconsistent, with penitence and conversion. A deprived nature would scarcely feel any shame at wrong doing.

- (ii) **Unphilosophical or Practical Intuitionism** : The law of conscience. Butler identifies it conscience. His view is styled as unphilosophical intuitionism. "There is a principle of reflection in men, by which they distinguish between approve and disapprove their own actions This principle in man by which he approves or disapproves his heart's temper and action, is conscience. The approval and disapproval of this conscience, which makes man a 'Law unto himself' is immediate or instinctive and unerring. It pronounces determinantly some actions to be in themselves just right or good, others to be in themselves evil, wrong, unjust. In short according to unphilosophical Intuitionism, conscience pronounces on the morality of particular courses of conduct at the moment of action. It is, so to say, the light which discloses the moral qualities of acts and guides our conduct in the moral sphere.

But conscience is not an infallible guide and can not be raised to the dignity of a moral standard. Butler's conscience is a merely formal principle, for when he gives, its content, that content is the content of self-Love. Again, deversity and error, often found in connection with our moral judgment, imply that conscience is not exclusively an unerring faculty of intuition.

Moreover, it is doubtful whether the revelations of conscience are the same for all persons and nationalities. The Spartans encouraged theft, it cleverly committed. Again, conscience as interpreted by the intuitionists appears to be an external and arbitrary guide. It is but a part of ourself and

not the whole Self-that assumes authority over us and issues mandates for our regulation without assigning any reason or justification.

(iii) **Philosophical Intuition** : Law of Reason according to the philosophical intuitionism is intuitively judged to be right or wrong is always have some general rule of conduct, from which the morality of this or that particular act may be deduced. Conscience at this stage is reason intuitively discovering moral principles and not a faculty of particular moral judgement or perceptions, which tells the plain man unerringly and immediately, the course of present duty in almost any circumstances. Conscience is so to say, an unerring and authoritative faculty of general or first principles merely, i.e. it only discovers the fundamental principles of morality, by the application of which to particular cases we decide questions of right and wrong.

'Philosophical Intuitionism' says James Seth "sacrifices all the concreteness and particularity which belonged to Butler's Theory of Conscience : This form of intuitionism, thus provides us with no more than the merest generalities or abstractions, which must be made concrete before they have any real significance. 'Moral life' says Seth "Consists of particulars of situations of definite circumstances and individual occasions and an indeterminate or vague morality, such as, provided by philosophical intuitionism, therefore, with its fixed and absolute principles can find no place in Ethical Scheme. In short, Philosophical intuitionism is form without matter, whereas the unphilosophical intuitionism is matter without form.

15.4 Summary

Conclusively, it may be said that intuitionism fails to satisfy the requirements of an Ethical explanation in as much as it is a mere Psychology of the moral consciousness. It may explain the source of our moral distinctions but it cannot formulate a moral ideal. We may admit that moral intuitions are facts and yet may not be fit to stand as the criteria of moral value , for what is axiomatic to common sense may not be axiomatic to Ethical sense is sufficiently definite to give practical guidance to common people in common circumstances but the attempt to elevate it into a system of intuitional Ethics is necessarily failure.

15.5 Key Words

- | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| (i) Intuitionism | (ii) Moral quality |
| (iii) A-priori | (iv) Conscience |
| (v) Moral sense theory | (vi) Aeshetic sense theory |

15.6 Questions for Exercise

15.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) According to Intuitionism, 'The Standard of Morality is
- (a) External law
 - (b) Internal Law
 - (c) Consequence
 - (d) All of the above

Answer — (a)

- (ii) According to Intuitionism, " The moral law is
- (a) A priori
 - (b) A posteriori
 - (c) synthetic
 - (d) None of the above

Answer — (a)

- (iii) Moral law has been identified with dictates of
- (a) Moral sense
 - (b) Law of conscience
 - (c) Law of reason
 - (d) All of the above

Answer — (d)

15.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain the nature of moral science.
- (ii) Explain the law of conscience.
- (iii) Explain the law of reason.

15.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain briefly the different forms of Intuitionism
- (ii) Explain critically ' Intuitionism' as a moral theory.

15.7 Suggested Reading

- (i) Mackenzie : **A Manual of Ethics**
- (ii) J.N. Sinha : **A Manual of Ethics**
- (iii) William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics**
- (iv) James Seth : **Ethical Principles**
- (v) Rashdall : **Theory of Good and Evil**



Perfectionism as the Standard of Morality

Lesson Structure

- 16.1 Objective
- 16.2 Introduction
- 16.3 Explanation of the Main Theme
 - 16.3.1 Self Realization Through Self-Sacrifice
 - 16.3.2 Reconciliation of Hedonism and Rationalism
 - 16.3.3 Reconciliation of Egoism and Altruism
 - 16.3.4 Objection against perfectionism
- 16.4 Summary
- 16.5 Key Words
- 16.6 Questions For Exercise
 - 16.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 16.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 16.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions
- 16.7 Suggested Readings

16.1 Objective

The main objective of this lesson is to explain 'Perfectionism' as the standard of morality. Perfectionism is the theory of self-realization. The rationalists identify the true self with the rational self only, the Hedonists with the sentient self but the self-realization or perfectionism harmoniously combines both the aspects of the self. Hence Self realization is the ideal of moral life.

16.2 Introduction

The essential element in the nature of man is the rational or spiritual principle within him. Man has appetites as animals have. Like them he has sensations and mental images, but these and every thing else in man's nature are modified by the

fact that he has reason. His appetites are not mere appetite, his sensations are not mere sensation. His appetites are determined by the consciousness of an end and his sensations have the element of knowledge i.e., his appetites are desires and his sensations are perceptions. This is due to the fact that man is essentially rational, self-conscious, spiritual being. In the words of Aristotle, 'Man is an animal' but he is a rational animal and his good lies in the perfection of his rational or 'Ideal Nature'. Similarly, Hegel says that the key to his Ethical Theory is "Be a person and respect others as persons." According to P.B. Chatterji, "the theory is called perfectionism because it holds up an ideal of mental perfection to be realised by the self's own effort." Thus, perfectionism is the theory of self-realization. It means the realization of the true or ideal self. This ideal self is neither the sentient of Hedonists nor the rational self of Rationalists but the total self of the Eudaimonists. Thus this theory implies the perfection of the self as a whole. According to Urban, "Good or value for man lies in the perfection of his functions, but these functions are more than organic. They are rational spiritual and ideal."

16.3 Explanation of the Main Theme

Perfectionism is also called the theory of self-realization. Self-realization implied the development of personality. This development of Personality consists in turning back upon the impulsion instinctive, sentient, individual or selfish self and gathering up all the scattered threads of its life in the skin of a rational whole that constitute the true selfhood of man. Self-realization, thus, implies that feeling or sensibility must become organic to reason, the life of the former must become, an element in the life of the latter not conversely. Self-realization means that the lower functions should be sympathized, systematized and sub-ordinated to the higher functions.

Aristotle gave to the end or final cause of the moral life the name of 'eudaemonia' and while the Greeks used this word for something very near to what we call 'happiness' or even, 'prosperity' in English it is safer not to attempt to translate a word to which Aristotle certainly gave a special technical significance. Aristotle defined 'eudaemonia' as the exercise of a men's soul (or realization of a man's capacities) in accordance with excellence' (or virtul) and if there be more than one excellence, in accordance with the best and most complete excellence. The word that has been translated 'exercise' or 'realization' in the world from which over English word 'energy' comes and has something of its connotation of active working. The question raised by this definition as by all perfection theories of ethics in which capacities of our nature are most worth developing.

16.3.1 Self-realization through Self-sacrifice

Sometimes Self-realization is equated with self-sacrifice. Both of these terms are not at all antagonistic rather they are complementary to and imply each other. Infact, self-realization is possible only through self-sacrifice. 'Die to live' is not an unmeaning expression. Similarly, the Biblical expression "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit," clearly brings out the value of self-sacrifice for self-realization. This relation of self-ralization to self-sacrifice suggests the problem-what is the self that is to be realized and what is the self that is to be sacrificed ?

The answer is that it is the comprehensive self that is to be realized and the narrow self that is to be sacrificed.

But the word 'comprehensive' seems too quantitative an expression to be quite satisfactory for this purpose, James Seth suggests a very good answer to this question. He writes, " I must die as an individual subject of sensibility, if I would live as moral person, the master of sensibility, I must crucify the flesh (a term for the natural impulsive, sentient or unmoralized man), if I would live the life of the spirit, I must lose my lower self. I would find the higher as the life of the lower is the grave of the higher self, so from the death of the lower comes from in resurrection, glory, the higher and true-self. Each selfish self must be denied or brought under the law of the life of the total rational self. The false, worthless, particular, private, separate self must die, if the true self, the rational personality is to live. Thus, the everlasting 'may' or such self-sacrifice precedes and makes possible the everlasting 'yea of a true self-fulfilment?

16.3.2 Reconciliation of Hedonism and Rationalism

Hedonism answers the sentient self, Rationalism the rational self, Eudaemonism the total self, rational and sentient. Eudaemonism realises the limitations of Rationalism and Hedonism and seeks to wield them into a harmonious unity whereby human personality may attain its perfection. The Rationalists identify the true self of man with the rational self only, the Hedonists with the sentient self but the self realization theory of harmoniously combines both the aspects of the self. The ideal of moral life is neither the gratification of desires as the Hedonists maintain, nor the annihilation of desires, as the Rationalists maintain, but the systematization of desires. Similarly, the moral ideal is not to be self-consistent, but to be consistent with the true self. Hence self-realization is the ideal of moral life. Self-realization means the attainment of a comprehensive point of view from which the good of all ceases to be distinguishable in essence from the good of each. Self-realization so understood does not mean individual selfishness.

16.3.3 Reconciliation of Egoism and Altruism

This theory of 'Development of Personality' or 'Self-Realization' reconciles the conflicting claims of Egoism and Altruism for it recognizes that the true self is the social self. Self-realization consists in the attainment of a comprehensive point of view for which the good of all ceases to be distinguishable in essence from the good for each. Rightly understood self-realization is not seeking the individual or private good of each independently but it implies the realization of a perfect humanity of which we are but members.

16.3.4 Objection against perfectionism or self-realization

The term perfection or self-realization is too vague and ambiguous in many respects. It is apt to suggest a too individualistic view of the moral end unless it is duly understood and rightly interpreted. No doubt, rightly interpreted, self-realization is possible only by realizing social ends. Self-realization aims at the realization of perfect humanity and implies that each individual can realize his true-self by finding out his appropriate station in his social or moral system and by doing the duties that belong thereby to that system. But in spite of this there is some truth in the objection, 'Self-realization even at its best is selfish in the sense that each (even the benevolent and the saint) seeks his own salvation or perfection, disregarding all others'. There are some who positively believe that self-perfection or spiritual salvation is possible only by leading a solitary life of a mystic devoted to calm contemplation.

Perfectionism or self-realization is not very clear in its meaning and implication. Self-realization does not definitely tell us what short of self is to be realized. The theory does not give any content. It is almost as formal as Rationalism is. Caird, however, tried to give it some definiteness by speaking of "self-realization through self-sacrifice." But to discover what self is to be realized and what is to be sacrificed, is not very easy and even when theoretically discovered the path of self-sacrifice and thereby self-realization is beset with difficulties. In fact, it is a 'Herculean task' as James Seth remarks.

It is sometimes suggested that the self to be realized is the self that contains the supreme values. But to say so is to take value as the criterion of moral judgments. So interpreted self-realization means the realization of the "Superman' (Nietzsche) which implies a transvaluation of all values. At any rate, the ideal of self-realization appears to carry us round in a circle.

16.4 Summary

Conclusively it may be said that perfectionism is the theory of self-realization, it

means the realization of the true or ideal self. Self realization implied the development of personality. The theory of 'Self-realization' or 'Development of Personality' is the most satisfactory. It is approximately the best formulation of the moral ideal. It reconciles and removes the inadequancies of Egoism and Altruism, Rationalism and Hedonism, gives a better interpretation of self-consistency as well as of happiness. The theories of Hedonism and Rationalism are alike defective, one-sided and erroneous. Being based on misunderstanding of the human nature they stand self condemned.

16.5 Key Words

- | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| (i) Perfectionism | (ii) Eudaemonism |
| (iii) Self-realization | (iv) Self-sacrifice |
| (v) Conscience | (vi) Moral obligation. |
| (vii) Development of personality | (viii) Moral ideal |

16.6 Questions For Exercise

16.6.1 Objective Questions

(i) According to perfectionism, the ideal of life is

- (a) Pleasure
- (b) Self-realization
- (c) Passionless life of reason
- (d) None of the above

Answer — (b)

(ii) According to perfectionism, the ideal self is

- (a) The sentient Self
- (b) The rational self
- (c) The total self, rational and sentient.
- (d) None of the above

Answer — (c)

(iii) Perfectionism is the ethics of

- (a) Sensibility
- (b) Reason
- (c) Personality
- (d) None of the above

Answer — (c)

- (iv) Who among the following holds the view that 'Die to live' and Be a person and respect as persons'.
- (a) Bradley
 - (b) Mill
 - (c) Hegel
 - (d) Aristotle

Answer — (c)

16.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) What is meant by self-Realization ?
- (ii) How does perfectionism reconcile Hedonism with Rationalism ?
- (iii) How does perfectionism reconcile Egoism with Altruism ?

16.6.3 Long Answer Type Question

- (i) Explain and examine perfectionism or Eudomonism as a moral theory.

16.7 Suggested Readings

- (a) William Lillie : **An Introduction to Ethics**
- (b) Mackenzie : **A Manual of Ethics**
- (c) James Seth : **Ethical Principles**
- (d) F. C. Sud and K. Sud : **Ethics Made Easy**



Theories of Punishment

Lesson Structure

- 17.1 Objective
- 17.2 Introduction
- 17.3 Explanation of the Main Theme
 - 17.3.1 The Retributive Theory
 - 17.3.2 The Preventive Theory
 - 17.3.3 The Reformative Theory
 - 17.3.4 Justification of Capital Punishment
- 17.4 Summary
- 17.5 Key Words
- 17.6 Questions For Exercise
 - 17.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 17.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 17.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions
- 17.7 Suggested Readings

17.1 Objective

The main objective of this lesson is to explain 'Theories of Punishment'. The aim of Punishment is to reform, deter and vindicate the authority of the moral law.

17.2 Introduction

It is the demand of morality that virtuous should get reward and vices should be punished. Virtuous persons do socially good work and, therefore, deserve rewards whereas vices should reap punishment because these create problems and tension in the smooth functioning of the social set up. Thus, the provision of reward and punishment in the society has been prevalence since the dawn of knowledge on the homo-sapiens. Bentham and Mill have termed rewards and punishment as ethical

motivations and punishment has specifically been termed as the external negative sanction of morality.

17.3 Explanation of the Main Theme

Three main theories are put forward on the question of reward and punishment. They are the Retributive theory, the Deterant theory and the Refomative theory. Now it is desirable to deal with each of these theories separately.

17.3.1 The Retributive Theory

It has for its aim the upholding of the dignity of the moral law. The man who breaks a moral law must suffer pain so that he may realize that the suffering came to him as a result of his wrong doing. It is regarded as one of the most satisfactory theory. It involves within its scope the aim of the other two theories as well. If the aim of punishment is to vindicate the authority of the law, this will be partly done in so far as the offender is reformed and in so far as similar acts are prevented.

Indeed neither reformation nor prevention is likely to be effected by punishment unless it is recognized that punishment is the vindication of law, i.e., a realization of the fact that the law holds good, although it has been broken but in reality it is inviolable. Reformation and Prevention is possible only when the offender as well as the people realize and see that the punishment is the natural and logical outcome of the crime of the criminal.

The aim of the Retributive Theory of Punishment is to allow men's deeds to return on his own head, i.e., to make it apparent that the evil consequences of his act are not merely evils to others, but evils, in which he himself is involved.

This view has, however, been objected to by the Christian countries, because it seems to rest on unchristian passion of revenge. This objection, however, is unsound, because retribution inflicted by court of justice need not involve any feeling of personal malevolence, which revenge as a passion implies. It is but reasonable that evil should return upon the criminal, for he has done evil. According to this Punishment is the 'negative reward', which the criminal has earned for himself, it is in a way 'the wages of his sin'. Besides, it seeks to appease or satisfy the wounded majesty of the law, which no other theory does. Hegel advocated this theory.

17.3.2 The Preventive or Deterrent Theory

The aim of punishment, according to this theory, is to prevent or deter others from committing similar crimes or offences as is expressed in the famous dictum of the Judge. "You are not punished for stealing sheep but in order that the sheep may not be stolen."

The view is unjust for it treats man as a thing, as a mere means, not as an end in himself, which the dignity of man requires. It is against Kant's dictum, "Treat humanity whether in thine own person or that of another, always as an end, never as a means only." the aim of Punishment should be not only to prevent men from doing wrong but also to teach them how to do right, i.e. an attempt should be made to build up character by incentive to good conduct and thus nourish a sense of self-respect.

The amount of punishment according to the deterrent theory should be very severe so that it may be able to prevent others from doing the same offence. But this is not very sound. At any rate the amount of punishment should be equal to the offence done because punishment is a negative reward for what the criminal has himself earned by doing the offence. But capital Punishment should be avoided because it leaves no room for the reformation of the criminal. At any rate punishment should be very judicious and wisely selected. Sometimes forgiveness is more effective than punishment especially when the offender is self-conscious and feels the remorse and is penitent of the crime. But this remorse should be very genuine, otherwise leniency shown through forgiveness may be misused.

17.3.3 The Educative or Reformatory Theory

The aim of Punishment, according to this theory, is to cure or reform the offender rather than to punish or to cure him. This view is gaining ground at the present time for it fits in best with the humanitarian sentiments of the present age. Prisons are being replaced by mental hospitals and Reformatory Schools. The tendency to commit crimes is to some extent inherited, and, therefore, it looks absurd that a man should be punished for the sins of his fathers. Indeed, it is probable that in many cases kind treatment would have better result than punishment.

But the original function of punishment is not fulfilled by this theory. the aim of punishment is not simply to educate and reform the criminal, but also to bring home to him that the law which he dared to violate cannot in reality be violated. This is only possible by inflicting proper punishment. There would be a self-contradiction in society which abstains from punishing the guilty. Suppose a society had a law against stealing, yet allowed a thief to escape scot-free, the law of such a society would be no more than mere injunctions or recommendations to its citizens. They would not have the force of imperatives and the dignity or authority of law would not be properly vindicated, which is the primary aim of Punishment.

The Reformatory Theory is based on the assumption that crime is a pathological phenomenon, a form of insanity, and, therefore, the proper treatment of the criminal, is that which seeks his cure rather than his punishment. But this assumption is wrong.

There are cases of criminal insanity but there are others which are not in any way connected with insanity. In a case of criminal insanity the accused should no doubt be treated as a patient, for in such cases a man ceases to be himself and may, therefore, be treated as a thing rather than as a person. But in other cases—the cases of normal crime, the man can be held responsible and accountable for his actions and should, therefore, be properly punished. To reduce all crimes to a pathological phenomenon is to sap the very foundation of our moral judgments, merit as well as demerit reward as well as punishment are there be undermined. Such a view is not ethical for it refuses to recognize the commonest moral distinctions. Even the majority of men, the criminals themselves will not be willing to have their crimes put down to the account of insanity.

Moreover, by accepting the Reformatory Theory we miss the element of suffering, which is the essential element of punishment. True reformation comes only with the acceptance of punishment by mind and heart as the inevitable fruit of the act. The aim of Punishment is discipline, i.e., to bring home to a man such a sense of guilt as shall work in him a deep repentance for the past evil and new obedience for the time to come.

17.3.4 Justification of Capital Punishment

In the Context of discussion of theories of punishment the justification of Capital Punishment is also discussed. Penalty of death or capital punishment can hardly be justified on moral grounds. Infact capital punishment has no moral justification. If a person is hanged all possibilities of reforming him, as the Refomative theory requires, or bringing home to him the dignity of the moral law which he dared to violate, as the Retributive Theory demands, are gone once for all.

Consequently, in some of the civilized countries capital punishment has been abolished altogether. Moreover, by inflicting capital punishment the society or government make itself guilty of the same crime for which it kills the criminal Besides, Capital Punishment means that we treat the criminal not as a person like ourselves, but only as thing, which can be used as a means. Butl morality demands that we should treat humanity whether, in our own person or in that of another, always as any end, never merely as a means.

Conclusively it may be said that capital punishment is unjust and untenable both from the Reformatory and the Retributive points of view. It has some significance only from the preventive or deterrent point of view. However, the Retributive theory is not a sound theory. It demands a tooth for a tooth and a nail for a nail, without any moral justification in the name of prevention of similar crimes. But being cruel and retaliatory in its nature it is repulsive to the humanitarian sentiments of the civilized

world. In short, ethically considered, capital punishment has no justification and should, therefore, be abolished and should be resorted to, if at all, under very rare and exceptional circumstances only.

17.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we may say that the preventive theory is unjust and untenable and the Reformatory and Retributive theories are in reality inseparable, for punishment is, in its essence, a ratification of the moral order, of which crime is the notorious breach, yet it is not mere a barren vindication of that order, it has an effect on character and moulds it to order.

The relation between the three theories may be summed up in the words of James Seth, "In proceeding from the deterrent to the reformatory view of punishment we are only proceeding from an external to an internal view of the same thing. To be permanently deterrent punishment, must be educative and reformatory as well. There must be inner as well as outer reformation. To the ethical prevention must be added self-Prevention and this comes only with inner reformation. Such a reformation implies the acceptance by the criminal of the punishment as just, his recognition in it of the ethical completion of his own act and this is the element of justice of desert, which is thus seen to be the basis of the other elements in punishment."

17.5 Key words

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| (i) Punishment and Reward | (ii) Retributive Theory |
| (iii) Preventive Theory | (iv) Reformatory Theory |
| (v) Capital Punishment | |

17.6 Questions For Exercise

17.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) The famous dictum of the judge : 'you are not punished for stealing she but in order that the sheep may not be stolen.' related to
- Reformatory Theory
 - Preventive Theory
 - Retributive Theory
 - None of the above

Answer — (b)

- (ii) In which theory demands 'a tooth for a tooth' and 'nail for a nail' tit
- (a) Reformatory Theory
 - (b) Preventive Theory
 - (c) Retributive theory
 - (d) None of the above

Answer — (c)

- (iii) In which theory treats man as a thing, as a mere man, not as an end
- (a) Reformatory Theory
 - (b) Preventive Theory
 - (c) Retributive Theory
 - (d) All of the above

Answer — (b)

17.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) Can you justify Capital Punishment ? Discuss.
- (ii) What is the Ethical basis of Punishment ?

17.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain briefly the main theories of Punishment.
- (ii) Explain and examine 'Retributive Theory' of Punishment.
- (iii) Explain critically Reformatory theory of Punishment.
- (iv) Explain critically preventive theory of punishment.

17.7 Suggested Readings

- (i) A. C. Ewing : **Morality of Punishment**
- (ii) J. N. Sinha : **A Manual of Ethics**
- (iii) James Seth : **Ethical Principles**



Varnashrama Dharma And Purushartha

Lesson Structure

- 18.1 Objective
- 18.2 Introduction
- 18.3 Explanation of The Main Theme
 - 18.3.1 Planning Society
 - 18.3.2 Planning Life
 - 18.3.3 Purushartha
- 18.4 Summary
- 18.5 Key Words
- 18.6 Questions For Exercise
 - 18.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 18.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 18.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions
- 18.7 Suggested Readings

18.1 Objective

The Objective of this lesson is to explain 'Varnashrama Dharma and Purushartha'. Varnashrama Dharma relates to duties allotted to individuals belonging to different 'varnas' and 'ashramas'. Socially the life is planned according to 'Varnas' (Brahmins, Kashatryas, Vaishayas and Sudras) and individually it is planned through the four stages (Brahmacharya, Grahastaya, Banaprasthya, and Sanyas). Karma, Artha, Dharma and Moksha are the four Purusharthas or objectives of life. The Promotion of these four values of life constitute, in other words, the cultural and the Ethical Ideal of the Indian Society.

18.2 Introduction

Varnashrama and Purushartha are important concepts in Indian Ethics. All this is about the four different varnas — Brahmins, Kashatryas, Vaishayas and Shudras.

By organising them properly the ancient Indians planned their society. gave their society a well knit organized and well coordinated planning. After this planning of the society into four different varnas, the well meaning leaders of our ancient culture launched the planning of individual's life into the four stages—Brahmacharya, Grahstaya, Vanaprasthya, and Sanyas, named as ashramas which are four in number and are nothing short of four institutions to help individuals achieve their desired and cherished goals. 'Purusharth' means aims and objects of life. These objects are four in number. They are-Karma, Artha, Dharma and Moksha. These are the four values sustaining the Indian Culture. The promotion of these four values of life constitute, in other words the spiritual, cultural and ethical ideals of the Indian Society.

18.3 Explanation of the Main Theme

18.3.1 Planning Society

The Society in ancient India was so organised as to be able to preserve and protect the ancient heritage, adapt it to new conditions and transmit the same to the posterity. The various castes or 'Varnas' were bound to each other by the consideration of service and self-sacrifice. The society was a system of inter-related and inter-dependent parts knit together to subserve the purpose of the whole. The various constituents were as if 'members one or another' closely allied in functions and in origin too.

The society was divided in four castes or Varnas. Brahmins, Kashatryas, Vaishayas and the Sudras.

The fighting classes or Kashatrayas ensured the defence of the cultural citadel of Dharma, developed their resources in its behalf and shed their blood in its defence.

The Vaishayas tilled the soil, conducted trade and business and shaped nature's materials and produced wealth for themselves as well as for the society as a whole. But they were by no means selfish, avaricious or greedy. They regarded themselves as the custodians of what they produced and used the same for the common good. In fact they gave away a part of their wealth for common well of good. They supported the Brahmins who were concerned to the development of culture.

The Brahmins constituted the cultural class. The Brahmins were above economic needs. They were maintained and supported by the Vaishayas. Their main concern was to lift themselves spiritually so as to attain perfection and thereby to lead humanity to a spiritual goal of perfection by their example and precept. It was for the Brahmins to create the Ideal forms of art and the master pieces of Literature Science, Philosophy and Religion.

The Sudras constituted the menials or the working classes. They were unskilled artisans and labourers and served the three upper classes with devotion and zeal and received their remuneration in cash or kind fixed by custom, use or want. Their duty was devotion to service.

The Various classes were thus closely knit together. There was no cleavage of classes in ancient India. The various classes were organically inter-related and inter-dependent upon one another. Perfect harmony prevailed in the society as a whole. Social tyranny by one class over the other did not exist in ancient India.

18.3.2 Planning Life

Likewise Individual's life in ancient India was very wisely and judiciously planned for the Individual. The life span of the Individual was divided into four stages or Ashramas of life as—

- (i) Brahmacharya or the period of training or self discipline.
 - (ii) Grahastaya, the period of household or family life.
 - (iii) Vanaprasthya, or the period of retreat or the period of the loosening of the social bonds and relations.
 - (iv) The Sanyas Asrama or the period of renunciation.
 - (v) Period of Bahamacharya is the period of student-ship. It is the period of training and discipline. It is the formative period of life and the young student is moulded to life of duty, austerity, self control, Self-denial, self discipline, self education, development of character, formation of good moral habits are the outstanding virtues of this stage of life. The young student is expected to lead a simple life with sublime high ideals. Chastity or sex purity with no idea of self indulgence in any shape or form is enjoined upon him or her. The student is expected to conserve his or her energy for the development of the body, mind and soul. In short the young Brahmachari is to devote him self or herself to the learning of Science, Art, Philosophy, Religion and Literature etc. But above all he was to learn and practise the art of living.
- (ii) **The Period of Grahastaya :** At about the age of 25 the Individual gets married and becomes a householder. With marriage the life of celebracy ends and the life as a householder begins. In a married life the individual finds his or her consummation. Man is not self sufficing. Marriage is a necessary social institution. It is a sacred institution essential not only for men and women but for Gods as well Siva and Parvati, Vishnu and Laxmi,

glorify and sanctify of married life. Like Purusha and Prakirti to where the union of all creation is due, the Gods and Goddesses symbolise the masculine and feminine functions.

Socially the Grahastaya Asrama implies work for the whole world. The householder lives and toils not only for himself but for the family, community, nation, nay the whole world. He is to develop a cosmopolitan or universal humanitarian outlook. The Grahastaya is the foundation and support for the other three stages of life. Economically the three stages depend upon the householder. He is to earn, spend and distribute his personal wealth according to the Law of Dharma. The Grahsthi is simply a custodian of what he has and is to use it for the comon good.

- (iii) Vanaprasthya or the period of retreat. At this stage the householder gives up home and retreats to the forest to lead a life of solitude. He practises self-control and self denial with a view to loosen the social bounds and ties he had made as a householder. It is a period of training and preparation for the life of the spirit that he is to lead as a Sanyasin in the next stage. The individual retires from the active life of stress and strain with a view to conserve his energy for a pilgrimage to the eternal life of the sprit. The life of the spirit is the Ideal and the Vanaprasthya prepares himself for it, with a view to attain Moksha he is to lead a life of Dharma transcending the life of Artha and Karma Wealth and power, happiness and worldly enjoyments are no longer his aspirations of life.
- (iv) **The Sanyas Asrama or the period of Ranunciation :** According to Indian Culture life is a pilgrimage from the temporal to the eternal from the life of the world to the life of the spirit or from the life of wealth, power and happiness to the spiritual life which means communion with God the Absolute. For this the moral ideal of the Hindus consists in, "For the family sacrifice the individual, for the community the family and for the country or the nation the community and for the soul, the whole world." Vanaprasthya prepares the individual for it and the Sanyasin achieves it. This last part of the life's journey is to live in a single file. The Sanyasin giving up every thing frees himself from the cares and anxieties of the world and thus in a way achieves spiritual fredom.

He has no private and personal ambition. He identifies himself with the whole world and thinks himself one with God. He takes on the wideness of the whole world. He becomes the apostle of truth, sweetness, love and righteousness. In short a Sanyasin is a Karm Yogin. Gyan Yogin but above all she is a devotee or Bhagat.

Non-violence and universal love guide him. He is perfectly resigned to the will of God and is one with him.

The four stages of life are not, however, distinct. They are inter-related and inter-dependent. One naturally and essentially leads to the other. The various stages are organically knit together. For a successful pilgrimage to the eternal life of the spirit leading to Moksha the individual should gradually pass from one stage to the other. Like the root, stalk, leaf and blossom in a plant, the various Ashramas are knit together in the life of man.

18.3.3 Purushartha

Indian culture centres round the four values. Karma, Artha, Dharma and Moksha. The promotion of these four values of life constitute in other words the cultural and the Ethical ideal of the Indian Society.

This Ideal of fourfold values rests on the fourfold needs of the human personality. Their needs are (i) Food and sex, (ii) Power and property, (iii) Social relations with others, and (iv) the Communion with God or the Spirit of the universe. In other words Karma, Artha, Dharma and Moksha are the four purusharthas or objects of life. Karma is the enjoyment of pleasures sensual as well as sensuous. Artha is the ordering of one's worldly concerns so as to lead to happiness. Dharma is the discharge of one's duties rationally conceived. Moksha is the disentangling of one self from transitory pleasures and enjoyments to obtain the higher and more permanent forms of pleasure. In Moksha man aspires after bliss or Anand rather than sensual or intellectual pleasures. With the development of personality the worldly ends of Artha and Karma become means for the higher ends of Dharma and Moksha until eternity and unto infinity.

These four values of life give pleasure or please us in one way or the other or at one stage of life or the other, Karma is sense gratification and implies the pleasure obtained through sensual and sensuous gratification of the desires of the body and the mind. Artha is the pleasure that one feels in obtaining wealth and power. Dharma also affords us pleasure. It satisfies the moral or the social self, and we feel the pleasure of doing good to others and we feel pleasure in doing our duties towards ourselves or towards others or towards God. We feel elated when we do a good job to others in society. Similarly Moksha satisfies our soul's desire. In Moksha one feels bliss or Anand which cannot be described adequately but can only be realised and experienced by one who is fortunately able to attain it. In other words Karma Satisfies the bodily self, Artha, the material self, the Dharma, the social self as Moksha the spiritual self or the soul. According to Shankara, Karma, Artha, and Dharma are Gouna Purusharthas and Moksha is the Mukhya Purushartha, i.e. the First three

have extrinsic value while the least i.e., Moksha has an intrinsic value. Artha, Karma and Dharma are the means for the attainment of the Moksha. Moksha is thus the highest end of life.

In short, Moksha or spiritual realisation is the end or ideal of human life. Moksha is spiritual freedom. Moksha is the communion of the finite with the infinite.

18.4 Summary

Now, to sum up the whole discussion we may say that Vanashrama. Dharma and Purusharthas are related to social and spiritual aspects of human life. Indian society was a harmonious whole and Indian culture was the outcome of such a well established social organisation. In fact the society was so organised that every individual irrespective of caste, varna, sex or ashrama of life would be his ordained duty unconditionally and disinterestedly. Disinterested action or Niskam Karma has been the guiding principle of the Indian Society. Every member was thought to do his or her duty before or without thinking of his or her rights. Of course the rights were automatically safeguarded. Thus, Socially the life is planned according to varnas and individually it is planned through the four stages. Indian culture centres round the four values-Karma, Artha, Dharma, and Moksha. These are the four Purusharthas or Ideal of life. Artha, Karma and Dharma are the means for the attainment of the Moksha. Moksha is thus the highest end of life. It consists in enjoying bliss or Anand by being in communion with God.

18.5 Key Words

- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| (i) Vanashrama Dharma | (ii) Purushartha |
| (iii) Renunciation | (iv) Social Aspects |
| (v) Spiritual Aspects | (vi) Virtue |
| (vii) Ultimate end | (viii) Liberation |
| (xi) Values | |

18.6 Questions For exercise

18.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Social Stratification based on
- Purushartha
 - Varna System
 - Ashramas System

- (d) None of the above

Answer — (b)

- (ii) Moksha satisfies

- (a) The Bodily self
(b) The Social Self
(d) The Spiritual Self

Answer — (d)

- (iii) The Sanyas Asrama is

- (a) The period of self discipline
(b) The period of family life
(c) The period of renunciation
(d) The period of retreat

Answer — (c)

18.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (a) Explain Purusharh
(b) Explain Varna-System
(c) Explain Asrama-System

18.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions

- (a) Explain Varnashram Dharma
(b) What is Purushartha ? Explain its different kinds.

18.7 Suggested Readings

- (i) J. N. Sinha : **A Manual of Ethics**
(ii) : **Manusamriti**
(iii) Dr. D. Pathaka : **Indian Ethics**



Nishkama Karma', Pravrtti-Nivrtti

Lesson Structure

- 19.1 Objective
- 19.2 Introduction
- 19.3 Explanation of the Main Theme
 - 19.3.1 Meaning of Yoga
 - 19.3.2 Nishkama Karma of Gita
 - 19.3.3 Pravrtti and nivrtti
 - 19.3.4 Nishkama Karma and Kant's Duty
for Duty's Sake.
 - 19.3.5 Criticism of Nishkama Karma
- 19.4 Summary
- 19.5 Key Words
- 19.6 Questions For Exercise
 - 19.6.1 Objective Questions
 - 19.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions
 - 19.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions
- 19.7 Suggested Readings

19.1 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain 'Nishkama Karma' Pravrtti-Nivrtti'. The central teaching of the Gita is Nishkam Karma Yoga. The Gita, therefore, talks of doing actions without any attachment, that is, without keeping in mind the favourable consequences of the action. The Gita synthesises both Pravrtti and Nivrtti.

19.2 Introduction

Gita has been regarded as the most important scripture in Indian literature. Gita presents the path of Niskama Karmayoga, in which the knowledge, devotion and

action are synthesized and the intellect, emotion and will attain their highest culmination. This Niskama Karmayoga is the central teaching of Gita, its meaning however, requires a clarification. After hearing the whole teaching of Gita, Arjuna became prepared to fight. Thus by the analysis of the end of Bhagwad Gita Talk proves that its aim is action. The concept of Nishkama Karma" is the gist and crux of Indian Ethical Thought. Its literal meaning is to perform any activity without having the desire for its favourable outcome or fruit. To desire for its favourable outcome or fruit. To desire anything while performing any action is to associate oneself with the fruit of the said action. As a result of the consequences of the action turn out to be favourable and good, we are pleased and if the consequences donot happen as per our aspirations and expectations, we become sad and displeased and accordingly bcome involved in the total process of the karma activity. This is not at all good in the eyes of the Gita. Thus, the Gita talks of doing actions without any attachment. Hence, Gita prefers Karma yoga to the renunciation of Karma.

19.3 Explanation of the Main Theme

19.3.1 Meaning of Yoga

To understand the Central teaching of Gita, let us clarify the meaning of the term 'Yoga'. Here also one finds various interpretations by various commentators. To grasp at the truth in all this variety of opinions, one should keep his eyes steadily on the Gita itself. The word Yoga has been derived from the root 'Yuj' which means union or identity. It is due to this that Ramanuja has so much emphasized the union of the Jiva and the God. This view of Ramanuja is not untrue, but it is necessary to point out here that in the absolute union, self and the God become one while Ramanuja does not admit such a complete identity betwen individual and God even at the highest stage of Action, as it will be seen in sequence, is an important aspect of yoga in Gita. Hence the devotional inerpratation will be incomplete. According to Sri Krishna "Yoga is perfection in action." It is by this alone that one can attain the ultimate end i.e. realisation of God or the consolidation of the society. It is here that the God can be realised and the social good can be attained. As a matter of fact, consolidation of Society is an essential aspect of God realisation in Gita, because the man who has realised God should work as the divine instrument in the world to achieve divine purpose.

19.3.2 Niskama Karma of Gita

The Central teaching of Gita is Niskama Karma Yoga. The meaning of the Niskama Karma Yoga must have been clear by now. Niskama does not mean without personal desire, since an action without motive is psychologically possible. It means an

action in identity with the divine will or to be a successful instrument in the hands of divine power. Karma in Gita means acting according to one's own varna and Ashram. Gita believes in the Varna-Ashram system. It has been established by God himself that he is the invitor of the Varna system in society. The Gita has given a divine sanction to the scientific Principle of division of labour in society. This division of labour was not hereditary. It was based upon one's own temperament and capacity. Thus, Gita has synthesized the modern Psychological findings with the spiritual truths.

Karmayaoga is not opposed to Jnana Yoga. In fact, the former is possible only when the latter is attained. No embodied being can completely renounce action. The constituent gunas of prakrti, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, necessarily give rise to actions.

The ideal of the Gita is not negativism, asceticism or escapism. It is not negation of actions, but performance of actions in a detached spirit. It is not Naiskarmya, but Niskama Karma. The giving up is not of action itself, but of interest, desire, fruit attachment regarding action. Desire binds a man, he should, therefore, act in such a way when action does not bind. According to Gita without knowledge renunciation of desire and attachment is not possible. So only a true Jnani can perform Niskama Karma. Therefore, the Gita says : only fools and not wise people speak of Jnana and Karma as different and opposed, really they are one.

19.3.3 Pravrtti and Nirvrtti

The Gita synthesises both Pravrtti and Nirvrtti. As Prof. M. Hiriyanna says "The Gita teaching stands not for renunciation of action but for renunciation in action." (Outlines of Indian Philosophy) It is emphatically stated that Samnyasa does not mean the renunciation of action but of interest, desire and attachment, it means the giving up of the fruit of all work.

Hence, Gita prefers Karma Yoga to the renunciation of Karma. According to Gita, "Both renunciation and Karma Yoga may lead to liberation and yet Karma Yoga is better than renunciation of Karma." But this does not mean that action is the central teaching. Gita's teaching is very clear in this respect. "Yogi is better than ascetic, Yogi is better than the knower, is better than doer as well, hence O Arjuna, be a Yogi." (VI, 46) These words make it amply clear that Yoga is not action, but perfection in action.

19.3.4 Nishkama Karma and Kant's Duty for Duty's Sake

In Gita the supreme duty is action without desire. Action without desire does not mean unmotivated action but acting with a sagacious intention of submission to God. Thus, according to Gita activities which are conjoined to a desire for result are

improper. Gita is not utilitarian. It holds that those who entertain any desire for the result of their activities are extremely poor. In the same way Kant, too does not look upon the result as the object of moral judgment. According to him there is nothing which supersedes good will. Moral laws are categorical. But there is difference upon some issue. To Kant the ultimate end is duty while in Gita it is God. Kantian ethics is jurial while the ethics of Gita is teleological. Kant' ethics is not very much related to religion while the ethics of Gita is religious and spiritual.

19.3.5 Criticism of Niskama Karma

An objection is raised here that absolutely disinterested action is a Psychological impossibility. But it is not valid. Firstly, the liberated sage has risen much above the psychological plane. He is on the transcendental mystic plane and empirical injunctions, and prohibitions ordinary rules of practice and Psychological rules donot apply to him. Intellect cannot grasp this state, it can only point towards it.

Secondly, for the aspirant, we may say that the Gita recommends, not the annihilation of all desires, but the merging of all desires in one supreme desire, the desire for the development of spiritual life. All actions, therefore, should be inspired by this supreme desire. The betterment of our spiritual life is the single motive and the only end prescribed for all our actions.

19.4 Summary

Conclusively, it may be said that the concept of "Nishkama Karma", Pravrtti and Nivrvti' is the gist of Indian ethial thought. The central teaching of the Gita can be beautifully summarised, in this sentence of Annie Besant "It is meant to lift the aspirant from the lower levels of renunciation where objects are renounced, to the higher and loftier heights where desires are dead and where yogi dwells in calm and ceaseless contemplation, while his body and mind are actively employed in discharging the duties that fall to his lot in life. The Gita thus tries to build up a Philosophy of Karma based on Janan and supported by Bhakti in a beautiful manner." Nishkama Karma synthesises both Pravrtti and Nivrvti.

19.5 Key Words

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| (i) Disinterested Action | (ii) Valition |
| (iii) Duty for duty Sake | (iv) Pravrtti and Nivrvti |
| (v) Renunciation of Action | (vi) Renunciation in Action. |

19.6 Question For Exercise

19.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) The meaning of Nishkama Karma is
- (a) For renunciation of action
 - (b) For renunciation in action
 - (c) Negation of actions
 - (d) All of th above

Answer — (b)

- (ii) The Gita synthesises of
- (a) Pravrtti and Nivrtti.
 - (b) Determinism and freedom of will.
 - (c) The good of society and individual.
 - (d) All of the above

Answer — (a)

19.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain Pravrti and Nivrtti
- (ii) Is Nishkama Karma possible ? Discuss.
- (iii) Explain Gita's Nishkama Karma and Kant'' Duty for duty sake.

19.6.3 Long Answer Type Question

- (i) Explain 'Nishkama Karma'

19.7 Suggested Radings

- (i) J. N. Sinha : **A Manual of Ethics**
- (ii) Prof. M. Hiriyanna : **Out lines of Indian Philosophy**
- (ii) C. D. Sharma : **A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy**



Daiva And Purushkara

Lesson Structure

- | | |
|------|---|
| 20.1 | Objective |
| 20.2 | Introduction |
| 20.3 | Explanation of The Main Theme |
| | 20.3.1 Daiva or Fatalism |
| | 20.3.2 Purushkara or the Concept of Free Will Theory. |
| | 20.3.3 The Gita Reconciles of Daiva and Purushkara. |
| 20.4 | Summary |
| 20.5 | Key Words |
| 20.6 | Questions for Exercise |
| | 20.6.1 Objective Questions |
| | 20.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions |
| | 20.6.3 Long Answer Type Questions |
| 20.7 | Suggested Readings |

20.1 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain 'Daiva and Purushkara'. There are two separate viewpoints in the Indian ethical Philosophy—Daiva and Purushkara. The Gita successfully reconciles two opposed concepts of Daiva and Purushkara.

20.2 Introduction

◆◆◆

Daiva and Purushkara are two separate point of views in the Indian ethical Philosophy. The combined concept of 'Daiva' and 'Purushkara' relates to the well known problem of the freedom of will, which divides the ethical thinkers into two opposing schools—one Libertarians or the free willists and another the Determinists According to Daivavada or fatalism, human life is completely governed by well-knit and pre-determined divine planning. Determinists are supported by the daivavadian's because

they hold that each and every course of our action is always determined by outer forces and circumstances beyond our control. While according to 'Purushkara' man is totally free in the performance of his activities.

20.3 Explanation of the Main Theme

20.3.1 Daiva or Fatalism

According to 'Daiva' the whole human life pattern is under the governance of one supreme imperceptible entity. No human activity is possible without the prior permission completely governed by predetermined divine planning. Thus, man is not fully independent in his actions. Everything is predetermined and preplanned. Such sort of view tends to support 'Fatalism' in life what is the meaning of 'fatalism'? Fatalism is the view that we cannot change our fate. Our fate is not under our control. We are not the master of our fate, rather we are dependent on it. Fate reigns every where, so says a famous Sanskrit proverb —

'Bhagym Phalati Sarvada

Na Coi Vidya Na Paurusam.'

This well-known Sanskrit Proverb makes it crystal clear that the place and role of effort, endeavours and labour in the life of a human being is not only secondary but even negligible. This view is dangerously fatalistic because it kills the element of sincerity in us and makes us completely senile. Despite this, there has been an incessant war between the supporters of both the separate views and till date it has not been possible to adjust as to whose place is justifiably more abvalues, sustainable and important.

It would not be uncontextual to mention in this connection that in almost all the contos of the Mahabharat which is one of the strongest pillars of the Indian ethical Philosophy, there has been enough evidence of the emphasise is on the role of 'Fate' in the life of human beings. 'Daiva' has been adjudged as the strongest entity in the creation, rather the whole process of creation is under the strict control of 'Daiva'. Human beings perform their activities strictly in accordance with God's fiats, and the Concept of 'Daiva' or 'Fatalism' also emphasises the point that not even a single leaf moves not without the prior permission of the supreme authority, that is, God. All the wordly phenomena happen with God's wish or wishes, of course, with the same purpose of welfare of the general lot. The celebrate thinkers and Philosophers Sankaracharya and Ramanuja's opinion that the true meaning of 'Daiva' is the prevalence of the obligatory on him is the fact that this actions should be done in the right dirctions. He can develop and reorient his life only with the help of continuous

efforts. The successes and failures of any person depend chiefly on his own deliberation. He is solely responsible either for success or failure, either for his achievements of honour or spots of defamation. The supporters of this view underline saying that —

'Karm pradhan vishva kari' rakha

Jo jas karihai so tas phal chakha.'

The former is supported by the 'purushkarvadians' because they hold that human will is absolutely free act in any way it pleases, while the latter, i.e., determinists are supported by the 'daivavadian's because they hold that each and every course of our action is always determined by outer forces and circumstances beyond our control. The determinists maintain that the Law of Causality is as strictly applicable to the action of human beings as to the other phenomena, and therefore given the character of an individual and also the inducements acting upon him. We can predict his conduct with accuracy.

The theory of 'Indeterminism' or 'Purushkara' takes of the necessity of freedom for morality. If there is to be any meaning in the moral imperatives, the will must not be absolutely determined, but must, in some sense, be free. In fact there is involvement in the moral consciousness, the conviction that we ought to act in one way rather than in another, that one manner of action is good or right and another bad or evil. This implies freedom to choose one course of action in preference to the another. But if a man is determined, he cannot be anything different from what he is determined to be. Sidgwick expresses the same thing when he says, "Against the formidable array of cumulative evidence offered in favour of determinism, there is but one opposing argument of real force, the immediate affirmation of consciousness in the moments of deliberate choice certainly when I have a distinct consciousness of choosing between alternatives of conduct, one of which, I conceive as right or reasonable, I find it impossible not to think that I can now choose to do what I so conceive."

But indeterminism or Purushkara too is not free from defects. Freedom is a necessity for morals no doubt but the defect of indeterminism lies in our exaggerating the fact of freedom or in other words, it lies in misunderstanding the meaning of the word freedom.

Freedom, in the first place, does not mean, as it is sometimes taken to mean that will is not influenced by motives and impulses. Such a supposition is logically irrelevant and psychologically untenable. To maintain that will is not at all affected by impulses or motives, is to avoid the problems altogether and to leave undecided

the case when will is influenced by them. Moreover, such a supposition is absurd. "To act without motive (i.e., without reference to anything) that reasonably serve as an inducement to action," says Makenizie," would be to act from blind impulses as some of the lower animals may be supported to do." This is evidently the very reverse of what we understand by freedom. In fact impulses and motives supply material for the exercise of will. A will without any motive or impulses is "a will that wills nothing."

Freedom, in the Second place, is taken to mean as being independent of the influences of God. These influences can be seen in each and every particle of the universe.

Let us now try to find out the place of necessity and determinism that Daivavada posits in morality. Necessity which is essential to moral, means simply the uniform activity of a given character. The moral life consists in the formation of character or as Aristotle put it in the establishment of good habits." The more decidedly a character is formed, the more uniform and predictable will be its choice and its actions but, on the other hand, it is difficult to predict what will be done by a man who is constantly shifting or oscillating from one universe to another. Fixity of purpose and not fickle-mindedness is the very back bone of character and thereby of immoral life. It is, in this sense, that moral life or human will is determined or that necessity is essential to morals, Determinism is correct in as far as nobody can go beyond his character. Every man has certain well-marked inherent aptitudes and impulses, which go a long way in the determination of conduct, choice and motives etc.

But if determinism is interpreted to mean determined from external circumstances, impulses and desires etc, it is untenable and is open to the following objections.

Character is not the bent of mind, wholly created by circumstances. We cannot conceive the human mind as a mere tennis ball driven to and fro by the impulses from without. Man is to a large extent, the master of, and not a slave to his circumstances. Whenever there is a conflict of motives of desires, which is to himself to be got over, the point to bear in mind is that it is a conflict of himself, with something external to him, not of one impulse with another impulse. What gives the conflict of desires. its whole meaning is that it represents the man at strife with himself. It is not, thus the strongest motive that always wins and determines our conduct. It is we ourselves, i.e., our will that judges. We are not led by the impulses and desires from without personal reflection can and often does modify our desires and impulses.

Moreover, determinism renders a satisfactory explanation of the facts of moral life impossible. What moral meaning can there be in duty or virtue when it is but a

necessity of nature that impels us to do actions. Similarly, if we are but puppets in the hands of all powerful outer circumstances, wherein lies responsibility on our part and with it all justification to punish an offender vanishes. The moral 'ought' will likewise cease to have any significance. 'Ought' implies 'can' and the word 'can' have no meaning where every thing is predetermined. In a deterministic world moral imperatives would cease to have any meaning.

20.3.2 Purushkar or the concept of Free Will Theory

Completely opposed to the above mentioned view is yet another view called 'Purushkar' according to which man is totally free in the performance of his activities. There is nothing like a binding in him. He is not only completely independent in his actions, but also he is solely responsible for his actions. He does not need the help of any sort of outer power in his activities. Man's actions according to this view, are not at all controlled by any imperceptible being. Man is the sole master of his destiny. He does not need anybody's assistance in this regard, He should chiefly rely on his own self. The only thing that is circumstances. Thus, there is no real freedom it is said, if will is determined by circumstances. This is obviously wrong and is based on the misunderstanding of the meaning of the word circumstances. Circumstances in this sense, are very closely connected with character and in a way it largely depends on character whether anything external is to be reckoned with the circumstance or not. Thus, when a man is determined by his circumstances, he is in a way determined by his character, i.e., not by conditions that are in any way external to him so, determined he is only self-determined and therefore free.

20.3.3 The Gita Reconciles of Daiva and Purushkara

The law of Karma propounded by the Gita too supports the theory of self-determination in special way. According to the law of Karma, A man has to reap the fruits of his actions. The Gita specifies three types of actions :

- (i) Sanchit
- (ii) Praradha
- (iii) Sanchiyaman

Sanchit Karma originates from the action done in the past life. A man fails to reap the fruits of such past actions in the previous life. Prarabdh Karma is related to the previous birth but its result starts in the present life stage and the Sanchiyaman karma are done in the present life.

Elaborating all this, the Gita says that the work we have done in the past life determines our 'fate'. To ignore it is sheer ignoracne, because the works being done in the present life will determine our future life and its deliberations. All this is to

suggest that as we sow so we reap. Our fate is in our own hands. It is our own actions that determine our future course of actions and fate. Thus the Gita successfully reconciles two opposed concept of Daiva and purushkara.

20.4 Summary

To sum up the whole discussion we may say that necessity and freedom i.e., 'Daiva' or 'Determinism' and 'Purushkara' or 'Indeterminism' both are needed for moral, self determination, therefore, is a sound Ethical theory and reconsiders the two extremes of determinism that 'Daiva' and indeterminism i.e., Purushkara. The law of Karma propounded by the Gita too supports the theory of self - determination in a special way. Thus, the Gita reconciles two opposed concepts of Daiva and Purushkara.

20.5 Key Words

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| (i) Determinism | (ii) Indeterminism |
| (iii) Self-determinism | (iv) Freedom of will |
| (v) Daiva and Purushkar | (vi) Fatalism |
| (vii) Sanchit Karma | (viii) Prarabdh Karma |
| (ix) Sanchiyaman Karma | |

20.6 Questions for Exercise

20.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) The concept of Daiva tends to support
- only Fatalism
 - Only Determinism
 - Both fatalism and determinism
 - None of the above
- (ii) The concept of purushkara tends to support
- Indeterminism
 - The concept of free will theory
 - Both a and b
 - None of the above

Answer — (c)

- (iii) 'Man is the sole master of his destiny' This statement related to
- (a) Daivavada
 - (b) Purushkara
 - (c) Determinism
 - (d) None of the above

Answer --- (b)

20.6.2 Short Answer Type Questions

- (i) Explain Daivavada
- (ii) Explain Purushkaravada
- (iii) What do you mean by self-determinism

20.6.3 Long Answer Type Question

- (i) Explain and examine the concept of Daiva and Purushkara.

20.7 Suggested Readings

- (i) D'. Arcy : A Short Study of Ethics
- (ii) Urban : Fundamental of Ethics
- (iii) Mackenzie : A Manual of Ethics

