

DOWNLOAD PDF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ONTOLOGY (LIBRARY OF ETHICS AND APPLIED PHILOSOPHY)

Chapter 1 : Profile : Washington and Lee University

This item: Moral Responsibility and Ontology (Library of Ethics and Applied Philosophy) Set up a giveaway There's a problem loading this menu right now.

Back to Top Ethics or Moral Philosophy is concerned with questions of how people ought to act, and the search for a definition of right conduct identified as the one causing the greatest good and the good life in the sense of a life worth living or a life that is satisfying or happy. The word "ethics" is derived from the Greek "ethos" meaning "custom" or "habit". Ethics differs from morals and morality in that ethics denotes the theory of right action and the greater good, while morals indicate their practice. It asks questions like "How should people act? See below for more discussion of these categories. He asserted that people will naturally do what is good provided that they know what is right, and that evil or bad actions are purely the result of ignorance: So, in essence, he considered self-knowledge and self-awareness to be the essential good, because the truly wise i. According to Aristotle , "Nature does nothing in vain", so it is only when a person acts in accordance with their nature and thereby realizes their full potential, that they will do good and therefore be content in life. He encouraged moderation in all things, the extremes being degraded and immoral, e. Virtue, for Aristotle , denotes doing the right thing to the right person at the right time to the proper extent in the correct fashion and for the right reason - something of a tall order. Cynicism is an ancient doctrine best exemplified by the Greek philosopher Diogenes of Sinope , who lived in a tub on the streets of Athens. He taught that a life lived according to Nature was better than one that conformed to convention, and that a simple life is essential to virtue and happiness. As a moral teacher, Diogenes emphasized detachment from many of those things conventionally considered "good". Hedonism posits that the principal ethic is maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain. This may range from those advocating self-gratification regardless of the pain and expense to others and with no thought for the future Cyrenaic Hedonism , to those who believe that the most ethical pursuit maximizes pleasure and happiness for the most people. Somewhere in the middle of this continuum, Epicureanism observed that indiscriminate indulgence sometimes results in negative consequences, such as pain and fear, which are to be avoided. According to Epictetus , difficult problems in life should not be avoided, but rather embraced as spiritual exercises needed for the health of the spirit. Pyrrho , the founding figure of Pyrrhonian Skepticism , taught that one cannot rationally decide between what is good and what is bad although, generally speaking, self-interest is the primary motive of human behavior, and he was disinclined to rely upon sincerity, virtue or Altruism as motivations. Humanism , with its emphasis on the dignity and worth of all people and their ability to determine right and wrong purely by appeal to universal human qualities especially rationality , can be traced back to Thales , Xenophanes of Colophon - B. These early Greek thinkers were all instrumental in the move away from a spiritual morality based on the supernatural, and the development of a more humanistic freethought the view that beliefs should be formed on the basis of science and logic, and not be influenced by emotion, authority, tradition or dogma. Normative Ethics Back to Top Normative Ethics or Prescriptive Ethics is the branch of ethics concerned with establishing how things should or ought to be, how to value them, which things are good or bad, and which actions are right or wrong. It attempts to develop a set of rules governing human conduct, or a set of norms for action. Normative ethical theories are usually split into three main categories: Consequentialism, Deontology and Virtue Ethics: Thus, a morally right action is one that produces a good outcome or consequence. Consequentialist theories must consider questions like "What sort of consequences count as good consequences? Utilitarianism , which holds that an action is right if it leads to the most happiness for the greatest number of people "happiness" here is defined as the maximization of pleasure and the minimization of pain. The origins of Utilitarianism can be traced back as far as the Greek philosopher Epicurus , but its full formulation is usually credited to Jeremy Bentham , with John Stuart Mill as its foremost proponent. Hedonism , which is the philosophy that pleasure is the most important pursuit of mankind, and that

DOWNLOAD PDF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ONTOLOGY (LIBRARY OF ETHICS AND APPLIED PHILOSOPHY)

individuals should strive to maximize their own total pleasure net of any pain or suffering. Epicureanism is a more moderate approach which still seeks to maximize happiness, but which defines happiness more as a state of tranquillity than pleasure. Egoism, which holds that an action is right if it maximizes good for the self. Thus, Egoism may license actions which are good for the individual, but detrimental to the general welfare. Individual Egoism holds that all people should do whatever benefits him or her self. Personal Egoism holds that each person should act in his own self-interest, but makes no claims about what anyone else ought to do. Universal Egoism holds that everyone should act in ways that are in their own interest. Asceticism, which is, in some ways, the opposite of Egoism in that it describes a life characterized by abstinence from egoistic pleasures especially to achieve a spiritual goal. Thus, individuals have a moral obligation to help, serve or benefit others, if necessary at the sacrifice of self-interest. Rule Consequentialism, which is a theory sometimes seen as an attempt to reconcile Consequentialism and Deontology, that moral behavior involves following certain rules, but that those rules should be chosen based on the consequences that the selection of those rules have. Negative Consequentialism, which focuses on minimizing bad consequences rather than promoting good consequences. This may actually require active intervention to prevent harm from being done, or may only require passive avoidance of bad outcomes. Deontology is an approach to ethics that focuses on the rightness or wrongness of actions themselves, as opposed to the rightness or wrongness of the consequences of those actions. Some deontological theories include: Natural Rights Theory such as that espoused by Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, which holds that humans have absolute, natural rights in the sense of universal rights that are inherent in the nature of ethics, and not contingent on human actions or beliefs. This eventually developed into what we today call human rights. Pluralistic Deontology is a description of the deontological ethics propounded by W. Ross - He argues that there are seven prima facie duties which need to be taken into consideration when deciding which duty should be acted upon: In some circumstances, there may be clashes or conflicts between these duties and a decision must be made whereby one duty may "trump" another, although there are no hard and fast rules and no fixed order of significance. Contractarian Ethics or the Moral Theory of Contractarianism claims that moral norms derive their normative force from the idea of contract or mutual agreement. It holds that moral acts are those that we would all agree to if we were unbiased, and that moral rules themselves are a sort of a contract, and therefore only people who understand and agree to the terms of the contract are bound by it. Contractualism is a variation on Contractarianism, although based more on the Kantian ideas that ethics is an essentially interpersonal matter, and that right and wrong are a matter of whether we can justify the action to other people. Virtue Ethics, focuses on the inherent character of a person rather than on the nature or consequences of specific actions performed. The system identifies virtues those habits and behaviors that will allow a person to achieve "eudaimonia", or well being or a good life, counsels practical wisdom to resolve any conflicts between virtues, and claims that a lifetime of practicing these virtues leads to, or in effect constitutes, happiness and the good life. It was first advocated by Plato and is particularly associated with Aristotle, and became the prevailing approach to ethical thinking in the Ancient and Medieval periods. It fell out of favor in the Early Modern period, but has recently undergone a modern resurgence. Agent-Based Theories give an account of virtue based on our common-sense intuitions about which character traits are admirable e. Ethics of Care was developed mainly by Feminist writers, and calls for a change in how we view morality and the virtues, shifting towards the more marginalized virtues exemplified by women, such as taking care of others, patience, the ability to nurture, self-sacrifice, etc. Meta-Ethics Back to Top Meta-Ethics is concerned primarily with the meaning of ethical judgments, and seeks to understand the nature of ethical properties, statements, attitudes, and judgments and how they may be supported or defended. A meta-ethical theory, unlike a normative ethical theory see below, does not attempt to evaluate specific choices as being better, worse, good, bad or evil; rather it tries to define the essential meaning and nature of the problem being discussed. It concerns itself with second order questions, specifically the semantics, epistemology and ontology of ethics. The major meta-ethical views are commonly divided into two camps: Moral Realism and Moral Anti-Realism: Moral

DOWNLOAD PDF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ONTOLOGY (LIBRARY OF ETHICS AND APPLIED PHILOSOPHY)

Realism or Moral Objectivism holds that there are objective moral values, so that evaluative statements are essentially factual claims, which are either true or false, and that their truth or falsity are independent of our beliefs, feelings or other attitudes towards the things being evaluated. It is a cognitivist view in that it holds that ethical sentences express valid propositions and are therefore truth-apt. There are two main variants: Ethical Naturalism This doctrine holds that there are objective moral properties of which we have empirical knowledge, but that these properties are reducible to entirely non-ethical properties. It assumes cognitivism the view that ethical sentences express propositions and can therefore be true or false , and that the meanings of these ethical sentences can be expressed as natural properties without the use of ethical terms. Ethical Non-Naturalism This doctrine whose major apologist is G. Moore holds that ethical statements express propositions in that sense it is also cognitivist that cannot be reduced to non-ethical statements e. Moore claimed that a naturalistic fallacy is committed by any attempt to prove a claim about ethics by appealing to a definition in terms of one or more natural properties e. Ethical Intuitionism is a variant of Ethical Non-Naturalism which claims that we sometimes have intuitive awareness of moral properties or of moral truths. Moral Anti-Realism holds that there are no objective moral values, and comes in one of three forms, depending on whether ethical statements are believed to be subjective claims Ethical Subjectivism , not genuine claims at all Non-Cognitivism or mistaken objective claims Moral Nihilism or Moral Skepticism: There are several different variants: Moral Relativism or Ethical Relativism: Non-Cognitivism , which holds that ethical sentences are neither true nor false because they do not express genuine propositions, thus implying that moral knowledge is impossible. Again there are different versions: Prescriptivism or Universal Prescriptivism: Hare - , that moral statements function as imperatives which are universalizable i. Therefore, because the function of moral language is non-descriptive, moral sentences do not have any truth conditions. Blackburn argues that ethics cannot be entirely realist, for this would not allow for phenomena such as the gradual development of ethical positions over time or in differing cultural traditions. Projectivism in Ethics originally proposed by David Hume and more recently championed by Simon Blackburn is associated by many with Moral Relativism , and is considered controversial, even though it was philosophical orthodoxy throughout much of the 20th Century. This has led to charges of individuals claiming to hold attitudes that they do not really have, and therefore are in some way insincere. Moral Nihilism , which holds that ethical claims are generally false. It holds that there are no objective values that nothing is morally good, bad, wrong, right, etc. Error Theory is a form of Moral Nihilism which combines Cognitivism the belief that moral language consists of truth-apt statements with Moral Nihilism the belief that there are no moral facts. Moral Skepticism , which holds that no one has any moral knowledge or the stronger claim that no one can have any moral knowledge. It is particularly opposed to Moral Realism see above and perhaps its most famous proponent is Friedrich Nietzsche. An alternative division of meta-ethical views is between:

DOWNLOAD PDF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ONTOLOGY (LIBRARY OF ETHICS AND APPLIED PHILOSOPHY)

Chapter 2 : Moral Responsibility (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Moral Responsibility and Ontology (Library of Ethics and Applied Philosophy) by Van den Beld T (Eds). Springer, This is an ex-library book and may have the usual library/used-book markings racedaydvl.com book has hardback covers.

Get Ethics Philosophy essential facts below. View Videos or join the Ethics Philosophy discussion. Add Ethics Philosophy to your Like2do. Ethics Philosophy Ethics or moral philosophy is a branch of philosophy that involves systematizing, defending, and recommending concepts of right and wrong conduct. As a field of intellectual inquiry, moral philosophy also is related to the fields of moral psychology, descriptive ethics, and value theory. Three major areas of study within ethics recognized today are: As the English philosopher Bernard Williams writes, attempting to explain moral philosophy: As bioethicist Larry Churchill has written: A meta-ethical question is abstract and relates to a wide range of more specific practical questions. For example, "Is it ever possible to have secure knowledge of what is right and wrong? Meta-ethics has always accompanied philosophical ethics. For example, Aristotle implies that less precise knowledge is possible in ethics than in other spheres of inquiry, and he regards ethical knowledge as depending upon habit and acculturation in a way that makes it distinctive from other kinds of knowledge. Meta-ethics is also important in G. In it he first wrote about what he called the naturalistic fallacy. Moore was seen to reject naturalism in ethics, in his Open Question Argument. This made thinkers look again at second order questions about ethics. Earlier, the Scottish philosopher David Hume had put forward a similar view on the difference between facts and values. Studies of how we know in ethics divide into cognitivism and non-cognitivism; this is quite akin to the thing called descriptive and non-descriptive. Non-cognitivism is the view that when we judge something as morally right or wrong, this is neither true nor false. We may, for example, be only expressing our emotional feelings about these things. The ontology of ethics is about value-bearing things or properties, i. Non-descriptivists and non-cognitivists believe that ethics does not need a specific ontology since ethical propositions do not refer. This is known as an anti-realist position. Realists, on the other hand, must explain what kind of entities, properties or states are relevant for ethics, how they have value, and why they guide and motivate our actions. It is the branch of ethics that investigates the set of questions that arise when considering how one ought to act, morally speaking. Normative ethics is distinct from meta-ethics because normative ethics examines standards for the rightness and wrongness of actions, while meta-ethics studies the meaning of moral language and the metaphysics of moral facts. To put it another way, descriptive ethics would be concerned with determining what proportion of people believe that killing is always wrong, while normative ethics is concerned with whether it is correct to hold such a belief. Hence, normative ethics is sometimes called prescriptive, rather than descriptive. However, on certain versions of the meta-ethical view called moral realism, moral facts are both descriptive and prescriptive at the same time. These theories offered an overarching moral principle one could appeal to in resolving difficult moral decisions. At the turn of the 20th century, moral theories became more complex and were no longer concerned solely with rightness and wrongness, but were interested in many different kinds of moral status. During the middle of the century, the study of normative ethics declined as meta-ethics grew in prominence. This focus on meta-ethics was in part caused by an intense linguistic focus in analytic philosophy and by the popularity of logical positivism. Virtue ethics Socrates Virtue ethics describes the character of a moral agent as a driving force for ethical behavior, and it is used to describe the ethics of Socrates, Aristotle, and other early Greek philosophers. Socrates BC was one of the first Greek philosophers to encourage both scholars and the common citizen to turn their attention from the outside world to the condition of humankind. In this view, knowledge bearing on human life was placed highest, while all other knowledge was secondary. Self-knowledge was considered necessary for success and inherently an essential good. A self-aware person will act completely within his capabilities to his pinnacle, while an ignorant person will flounder and encounter difficulty. To Socrates, a person must become aware of every fact and its context relevant to his existence, if he wishes to attain self-knowledge. He

posited that people will naturally do what is good if they know what is right. Evil or bad actions are the results of ignorance. If a criminal was truly aware of the intellectual and spiritual consequences of his or her actions, he or she would neither commit nor even consider committing those actions. Any person who knows what is truly right will automatically do it, according to Socrates. While he correlated knowledge with virtue, he similarly equated virtue with joy. The truly wise man will know what is right, do what is good, and therefore be happy. Unhappiness and frustration are caused by doing wrong, leading to failed goals and a poor life. Therefore, it is imperative for people to act in accordance with virtue, which is only attainable by the practice of the virtues in order to be content and complete. Happiness was held to be the ultimate goal. All other things, such as civic life or wealth, were only made worthwhile and of benefit when employed in the practice of the virtues. The practice of the virtues is the surest path to happiness. Aristotle asserted that the soul of man had three natures: Physical nature can be assuaged through exercise and care; emotional nature through indulgence of instinct and urges; and mental nature through human reason and developed potential. Rational development was considered the most important, as essential to philosophical self-awareness and as uniquely human. Moderation was encouraged, with the extremes seen as degraded and immoral. For example, courage is the moderate virtue between the extremes of cowardice and recklessness. Man should not simply live, but live well with conduct governed by virtue. This is regarded as difficult, as virtue denotes doing the right thing, in the right way, at the right time, for the right reason. Stoicism Epictetus The Stoic philosopher Epictetus posited that the greatest good was contentment and serenity. The "unconquerable will" is central to this philosophy. Allowing a person to disturb the mental equilibrium is, in essence, offering yourself in slavery. If a person is free to anger you at will, you have no control over your internal world, and therefore no freedom. Freedom from material attachments is also necessary. If a thing breaks, the person should not be upset, but realize it was a thing that could break. Similarly, if someone should die, those close to them should hold to their serenity because the loved one was made of flesh and blood destined to death. Stoic philosophy says to accept things that cannot be changed, resigning oneself to the existence and enduring in a rational fashion. Death is not feared. People do not "lose" their life, but instead "return", for they are returning to God who initially gave what the person is as a person. Epictetus said difficult problems in life should not be avoided, but rather embraced. They are spiritual exercises needed for the health of the spirit, just as physical exercise is required for the health of the body. Abstinence is highly desirable. Epictetus said remaining abstinent in the face of temptation was a victory for which a man could be proud. Anscombe argues that consequentialist and deontological ethics are only feasible as universal theories if the two schools ground themselves in divine law. As a deeply devoted Christian herself, Anscombe proposed that either those who do not give ethical credence to notions of divine law take up virtue ethics, which does not necessitate universal laws as agents themselves are investigated for virtue or vice and held up to "universal standards", or that those who wish to be utilitarian or consequentialist ground their theories in religious conviction. In *Whose Justice, Whose Rationality? Complete Conduct Principles for the 21st Century* [20] blended the Eastern virtue ethics and the Western virtue ethics, with some modifications to suit the 21st Century, and formed a part of contemporary virtue ethics. There are several schools of Hedonist thought ranging from those advocating the indulgence of even momentary desires to those teaching a pursuit of spiritual bliss. In their consideration of consequences, they range from those advocating self-gratification regardless of the pain and expense to others, to those stating that the most ethical pursuit maximizes pleasure and happiness for the most people. There was little to no concern with the future, the present dominating in the pursuit of immediate pleasure. Cyrenaic hedonism encouraged the pursuit of enjoyment and indulgence without hesitation, believing pleasure to be the only good. Epicureans observed that indiscriminate indulgence sometimes resulted in negative consequences. Some experiences were therefore rejected out of hand, and some unpleasant experiences endured in the present to ensure a better life in the future. To Epicurus, the summum bonum, or greatest good, was prudence, exercised through moderation and caution. Excessive indulgence can be destructive to pleasure and can even lead to pain. For example, eating one food too often makes a person lose a taste for it. Eating too much food at once leads to discomfort

DOWNLOAD PDF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ONTOLOGY (LIBRARY OF ETHICS AND APPLIED PHILOSOPHY)

and ill-health. Pain and fear were to be avoided. Living was essentially good, barring pain and illness. Death was not to be feared. Fear was considered the source of most unhappiness. Conquering the fear of death would naturally lead to a happier life. Epicurus reasoned if there were an afterlife and immortality, the fear of death was irrational. If there was no life after death, then the person would not be alive to suffer, fear or worry; he would be non-existent in death. The importance of outcomes that are good for the community outweigh the importance of individual pleasure and pain. Thus, from a consequentialist standpoint, a morally right action is one that produces a good outcome, or consequence. This view is often expressed as the aphorism "The ends justify the means". The term "consequentialism" was coined by G. Anscombe in her essay "Modern Moral Philosophy" in , to describe what she saw as the central error of certain moral theories, such as those propounded by Mill and Sidgwick. The defining feature of consequentialist moral theories is the weight given to the consequences in evaluating the rightness and wrongness of actions. Apart from this basic outline, there is little else that can be unequivocally said about consequentialism as such.

DOWNLOAD PDF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ONTOLOGY (LIBRARY OF ETHICS AND APPLIED PHILOSOPHY)

Chapter 3 : Ethics - Wikipedia

Moral responsibility in this sense is what the conference was and this book is about. It is about the conditions which must be met for a person to be justly held responsible for his or her moral faults and failures.

His other interests include philosophy of religion, philosophy of medicine, and metaphysics. His dissertation is titled: Modality, Representation, and Powers. David also worked as an associate ethics consultant at the Veterans Affairs Hospital in Buffalo during the and calendar years. He completed his PhD in philosophy at Syracuse University, and did his undergraduate work in philosophy at Southern Methodist University. His research interests are in the philosophy of agency, ethics, and philosophy of religion. Much of his work focuses on free will and moral responsibility, and their apparent incompatibility with a deterministic universe. He is also interested in foundational questions concerning population ethics. His interests include publication ethics, Informed Consent and the ethics of surgical simulation. His research has included work in experimental philosophy, cognitive science of religion, and ethics. His main research interests are in ethics, in particular, issues surrounding free will and moral responsibility, especially as they relate to addiction. Before he was at Syracuse, he did his undergraduate work in philosophy and political science at Arizona State University. His research interests are in ethics, death, and epistemology. His interests include a wide range of clinical ethics issues, particularly those related to surrogate decisionmaking. She is presently an affiliate associate professor at the University of Dallas. She is interested in questions at the intersection of metaphysics and bioethics. Her dissertation focused on the definition of death and the impossibility of diagnosing it with certainty in time to explant vital organs, concluding that it is more practical to attempt to avoid causing death than to diagnose death. She aims to apply clinical ethics in an experiential learning project that concerns environmental literacy, medical humanities, and health communication. At UB she manages various websites while designing and teaching the lab-based course, Communication Graphics, and the online course, Virtual Media Ethics, among others. D, is Professor and Chair of Philosophy at St. He works on topics in bioethics and political philosophy. His dissertation is on consent in medicine and politics. He has published on moral status in the Journal of Medicine and Philosophy and Environmental Values, on the ethics of law enforcement in the Journal of Political Philosophy, and on epistemic closure with James Beebe in Oxford Studies in Experimental Epistemology. During the academic year he will be a Humane Studies Fellow.

DOWNLOAD PDF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ONTOLOGY (LIBRARY OF ETHICS AND APPLIED PHILOSOPHY)

Chapter 4 : Ethics (philosophy) Resource | Learn About, Share and Discuss Ethics (philosophy) At raceday

Moral Responsibility and Ontology (Library of Ethics and Applied Philosophy) - Kindle edition by A. van den Beld. Download it once and read it on your Kindle device, PC, phones or tablets.

Under deontology, an act may be considered right even if the act produces a bad consequence, [35] if it follows the rule or moral law. According to the deontological view, people have a duty to act in a way that does those things that are inherently good as acts "truth-telling" for example , or follow an objectively obligatory rule as in rule utilitarianism. Kant then argues that those things that are usually thought to be good, such as intelligence , perseverance and pleasure , fail to be either intrinsically good or good without qualification. Pleasure, for example, appears to not be good without qualification, because when people take pleasure in watching someone suffer, they make the situation ethically worse. He concludes that there is only one thing that is truly good: Nothing in the worldâ€™ indeed nothing even beyond the worldâ€™ can possibly be conceived which could be called good without qualification except a good will. Pragmatic ethics Associated with the pragmatists , Charles Sanders Peirce , William James , and especially John Dewey , pragmatic ethics holds that moral correctness evolves similarly to scientific knowledge: Thus, we should prioritize social reform over attempts to account for consequences, individual virtue or duty although these may be worthwhile attempts, if social reform is provided for. Ethics of care Care ethics contrasts with more well-known ethical models, such as consequentialist theories e. These values include the importance of empathetic relationships and compassion. Care-focused feminism is a branch of feminist thought, informed primarily by ethics of care as developed by Carol Gilligan and Nel Noddings. Noddings proposes that ethical caring has the potential to be a more concrete evaluative model of moral dilemma than an ethic of justice. Role ethics Role ethics is an ethical theory based on family roles. Confucian roles are not rational , and originate through the xin, or human emotions. Anarchism Anarchist ethics is an ethical theory based on the studies of anarchist thinkers. The biggest contributor to the anarchist ethics is the Russian zoologist, geographer, economist, and political activist Peter Kropotkin. Kropotkin argues that ethics itself is evolutionary, and is inherited as a sort of a social instinct through cultural history, and by so, he rejects any religious and transcendental explanation of morality. The origin of ethical feeling in both animals and humans can be found, he claims, in the natural fact of "sociality" mutualistic symbiosis , which humans can then combine with the instinct for justice i. This principle of treating others as one wishes to be treated oneself, what is it but the very same principle as equality, the fundamental principle of anarchism? And how can any one manage to believe himself an anarchist unless he practices it? We do not wish to be ruled. And by this very fact, do we not declare that we ourselves wish to rule nobody? We do not wish to be deceived, we wish always to be told nothing but the truth. And by this very fact, do we not declare that we ourselves do not wish to deceive anybody, that we promise to always tell the truth, nothing but the truth, the whole truth? We do not wish to have the fruits of our labor stolen from us. By what right indeed can we demand that we should be treated in one fashion, reserving it to ourselves to treat others in a fashion entirely different? Our sense of equality revolts at such an idea. Postmodernism This article or section possibly contains synthesis of material which does not verifiably mention or relate to the main topic. Relevant discussion may be found on the talk page. July Learn how and when to remove this template message The 20th century saw a remarkable expansion and evolution of critical theory, following on earlier Marxist Theory efforts to locate individuals within larger structural frameworks of ideology and action. This was on the basis that personal identity was, at least in part, a social construction. Post-structuralism and postmodernism argue that ethics must study the complex and relational conditions of actions. A simple alignment of ideas of right and particular acts is not possible. There will always be an ethical remainder that cannot be taken into account or often even recognized. Such theorists find narrative or, following Nietzsche and Foucault, genealogy to be a helpful tool for understanding ethics because narrative is always about particular lived experiences in all their complexity rather than the assignment of an idea or norm

to separate and individual actions. Zygmunt Bauman says postmodernity is best described as modernity without illusion, the illusion being the belief that humanity can be repaired by some ethic principle. Postmodernity can be seen in this light as accepting the messy nature of humanity as unchangeable. Hoy describes post-critique ethics as the "obligations that present themselves as necessarily to be fulfilled but are neither forced on one or are enforceable" , p. Hoy concludes that The ethical resistance of the powerless others to our capacity to exert power over them is therefore what imposes unenforceable obligations on us. That actions are at once obligatory and at the same time unenforceable is what put them in the category of the ethical. Obligations that were enforced would, by the virtue of the force behind them, not be freely undertaken and would not be in the realm of the ethical. Applied ethics Applied ethics is a discipline of philosophy that attempts to apply ethical theory to real-life situations. The discipline has many specialized fields, such as engineering ethics , bioethics , geoethics , public service ethics and business ethics. Specific questions[edit] Applied ethics is used in some aspects of determining public policy, as well as by individuals facing difficult decisions. The sort of questions addressed by applied ethics include: But not all questions studied in applied ethics concern public policy. For example, making ethical judgments regarding questions such as, "Is lying always wrong? People, in general, are more comfortable with dichotomies two opposites. However, in ethics, the issues are most often multifaceted and the best-proposed actions address many different areas concurrently. In ethical decisions, the answer is almost never a "yes or no", "right or wrong" statement. Many buttons are pushed so that the overall condition is improved and not to the benefit of any particular faction. Particular fields of application[edit].

DOWNLOAD PDF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ONTOLOGY (LIBRARY OF ETHICS AND APPLIED PHILOSOPHY)

Chapter 5 : Moral Responsibility - Philosophy - Oxford Bibliographies

van Woudenberg R. () *Moral Responsibility and Agent Causation*. In: van den Beld T. (eds) *Moral Responsibility and Ontology*. *Library of Ethics and Applied Philosophy*, vol 7.

This entry focuses on compatibilist approaches to moral responsibility—that is, approaches that see moral responsibility as compatible with the causal order of the world. This is partly because they have more to say about the nature of moral responsibility and the practices associated with it, and also because there is a separate entry on free will. The entry also focuses mainly on the debates considered most significant by contemporary analytic philosophers. However, it also points to some earlier contributions and to some significant contributions from outside those debates. In particular, it is interesting that contemporary debates often focus on the agency of the responsible person, without attending to the forms of interaction that person may participate in. However, as Peter Strawson points out in a seminal essay see *Responsibility and the Reactive Sentiments*, moral responsibility is intimately related to our reactions to one another. Should those reactions be understood by reference to features of the person held responsible, or by reference to the relationship between persons where some action or outcome is at issue, or even by reference to wider social and political structures? Moral responsibility also borders on a number of topics of great practical importance. These include responsibility under the law, the responsibilities of groups and organizations, accountability within organizations, and how distributive justice and individual responsibility are related. Again, this entry focuses largely on individual moral responsibility and only mentions a few social and legal discussions of responsibility with especial implications for how we think about individual responsibility.

General Overviews
A number of recent overviews give useful introductions, but offer different approaches to the topic. Duff and Eshleman are relatively accessible introductions; McKenna is more demanding and technical. Kutz is the most intellectually penetrating but is orientated by concerns in law and jurisprudence rather than morality. Edited by Edward Craig, Edited by Edward N. Stanford University Press, Edited by Jules Coleman and Scott Shapiro. Oxford University Press, Nonetheless, a significant contribution arguing that the relational aspects of responsibility attribution are of critical importance. That is, we hold persons responsible within the context of particular relationships—personal, organizational or legal—and consider ourselves responsible to particular persons or bodies.

DOWNLOAD PDF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ONTOLOGY (LIBRARY OF ETHICS AND APPLIED PHILOSOPHY)

Chapter 6 : Hobbes's Moral and Political Philosophy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Grau C.M. () Moral Responsibility and Wolf's Ability. In: van den Beld T. (eds) Moral Responsibility and Ontology. Library of Ethics and Applied Philosophy, vol 7.

Kant then argues that those things that are usually thought to be good, such as intelligence, perseverance and pleasure, fail to be either intrinsically good or good without qualification. Pleasure, for example, appears not to be good without qualification, because when people take pleasure in watching someone suffer, this seems to make the situation ethically worse. He concludes that there is only one thing that is truly good: Nothing in the world—indeed nothing even beyond the world—can possibly be conceived which could be called good without qualification except a good will. He defines respect as "the concept of a worth which thwarts my self-love". Act only according to that maxim by which you can also will that it would become a universal law. Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end. Every rational being must so act as if he were through his maxim always a legislating member in a universal kingdom of ends. Kant argued that the only absolutely good thing is a good will, and so the single determining factor of whether an action is morally right is the will, or motive of the person doing it. If they are acting on a bad maxim, e. For a lie always harms another; if not some human being, then it nevertheless does harm to humanity in general, inasmuch as it vitiates the very source of right [Rechtsquelle] All practical principles of right must contain rigorous truth This is because such exceptions would destroy the universality on account of which alone they bear the name of principles. If God commands people not to work on Sabbath, then people act rightly if they do not work on Sabbath because God has commanded that they do not do so. If they do not work on Sabbath because they are lazy, then their action is not truly speaking "right", even though the actual physical action performed is the same. One thing that clearly distinguishes Kantian deontology from divine command deontology is that Kantianism maintains that man, as a rational being, makes the moral law universal, whereas divine command maintains that God makes the moral law universal. For instance, Kamm argues that we believe it would be impermissible to kill one person to harvest his organs in order to save the lives of five others. Yet, we think it is morally permissible to divert a runaway trolley that would otherwise kill five innocent and immobile people onto a side track where one innocent and immobile person will be killed. Kamm believes the Principle of Permissible Harm explains the moral difference between these and other cases, and more importantly expresses a constraint telling us exactly when we may not act to bring about good ends—such as in the organ harvesting case. In , Kamm published a book that presents new theory that incorporates aspects of her "Principle of Permissible Harm", the "Doctrine of Productive Purity". Attempts have been made to reconcile deontology with virtue-based ethics and consequentialism. King develops a hierarchy of principles to link his meta-ethics, which are more inclined towards consequentialism, with the deontological conclusions he presents in his book.

DOWNLOAD PDF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ONTOLOGY (LIBRARY OF ETHICS AND APPLIED PHILOSOPHY)

Chapter 7 : Bruce N. Waller, Against Moral Responsibility - PhilPapers

Also in John Fischer and Mark Ravizza (eds.): *Perspectives on Moral Responsibility* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press,).
5 *Ibid.*, p. (of Fischer and Ravizza reprint). 6 "Freedom and Resentment" pp. 7 *Responsibility and the Moral Sentiments*, p. 8 "Freedom and Resentment", p.

In contrast to traditional ethical theoryâ€™ concerned with purely theoretical problems such as, for example, the development of a general criterion of rightnessâ€™ applied ethics takes its point of departure in practical normative challenges. Along with general overviews and journals, nine central branches of applied ethics are added, with four or five references in connection to each branch. It should be noted that these branches constitute only a selection among the plethora of disciplines within AE. Moreover, there is some overlap among the different areas. For instance, as ethical discussions on these fields are evolving and growing, animal ethics , environmental ethics , and the ethics of human enhancement have developed into separate branches of applied ethics originally, they were all part of bioethics with their own anthologies and monographs. Textbooks A number of textbooks exist within applied ethics. But as the field is always expanding and at the same time becoming more and more specialized, it is very difficult to give a fair overview of the most important textbooks within applied ethics. However, there is no doubt that some of the most influential works are the pioneering works Singer on issues like animal ethics, abortion, and environmental ethics and Glover on the ethics of causing death and saving lives. A number of textbooks cover a wide variety of subjects within applied ethics, for example, Harris , Oderberg , and Singer Besides these, splendid textbooks exist that have a more narrow scope, such as Rachels on euthanasia, Bowie on business ethics, Sumner on free speech and pornography, and Husak on the legalization of drugs. Concise and clearly written introduction to several key subjects within business ethics. *Causing Death and Saving Lives*. This is a modern classic within applied ethics. The book gives a lucid introduction to the ethics of abortion, infanticide, suicide, euthanasia, capital punishment, and war. It also contains a concise and introductory chapter on the method of applied ethics. *An Introduction to Medical Ethics*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, However, this is compensated for by an excellent utilitarian treatment of issues such as abortion, euthanasia, artificial reproduction, death, and the morality of sex. All chapters are lucid and readable. This book has been reprinted several times. *The Case for Decriminalizing Drugs*. A very readable book for all interested in not only the moral and empirical complexity surrounding the criminalization of drug use but also the pros and cons of criminalizing acts in general. An approach that is less represented in the literature in comparison with the usual utilitarian- or deontological-based literature in applied ethics. In a clear and systematic manner, it treats the following subjects: *The End of Life*: Oxford University Press, Very clearly written book in which the author argues in favor of euthanasia in certain situations. Cambridge University Press, It covers a wide range of areas such as abortion, animal ethics, civil disobedience, environmental ethics, and our obligations to refugees and world hunger. The book has been reprinted several times, including a third edition. In this latter edition all chapters have been revised and updated and a new chapter has been added on climate ethics. *The Hateful and the Obscene: Studies in the Limits of Free Expression*. University of Toronto Press, Users without a subscription are not able to see the full content on this page. Please subscribe or login. How to Subscribe Oxford Bibliographies Online is available by subscription and perpetual access to institutions. For more information or to contact an Oxford Sales Representative click here.

Chapter 8 : Deontological ethics - Wikipedia

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

So far 3 volumes are available: Readers new to Hobbes should begin with Leviathan, being sure to read Parts Three and Four, as well as the more familiar and often excerpted Parts One and Two. The Philosophical Project Hobbes sought to discover rational principles for the construction of a civil polity that would not be subject to destruction from within. Continued stability will require that they also refrain from the sorts of actions that might undermine such a regime. For example, subjects should not dispute the sovereign power and under no circumstances should they rebel. In general, Hobbes aimed to demonstrate the reciprocal relationship between political obedience and peace. The State of Nature To establish these conclusions, Hobbes invites us to consider what life would be like in a state of nature, that is, a condition without government. Perhaps we would imagine that people might fare best in such a state, where each decides for herself how to act, and is judge, jury and executioner in her own case whenever disputes arise—and that at any rate, this state is the appropriate baseline against which to judge the justifiability of political arrangements. He assumes that people are sufficiently similar in their mental and physical attributes that no one is invulnerable nor can expect to be able to dominate the others. While people have local affections, their benevolence is limited, and they have a tendency to partiality. Concerned that others should agree with their own high opinions of themselves, people are sensitive to slights. They are curious about the causes of events, and anxious about their futures; according to Hobbes, these characteristics incline people to adopt religious beliefs, although the content of those beliefs will differ depending upon the sort of religious education one has happened to receive. Hobbes further assumes as a principle of practical rationality, that people should adopt what they see to be the necessary means to their most important ends. The State of Nature Is a State of War Taken together, these plausible descriptive and normative assumptions yield a state of nature potentially fraught with divisive struggle. The right of each to all things invites serious conflict, especially if there is competition for resources, as there will surely be over at least scarce goods such as the most desirable lands, spouses, etc. People will quite naturally fear that others may citing the right of nature invade them, and may rationally plan to strike first as an anticipatory defense. Conflict will be further fueled by disagreement in religious views, in moral judgments, and over matters as mundane as what goods one actually needs, and what respect one properly merits. Further Questions About the State of Nature In response to the natural question whether humanity ever was generally in any such state of nature, Hobbes gives three examples of putative states of nature. First, he notes that all sovereigns are in this state with respect to one another. Third and most significantly, Hobbes asserts that the state of nature will be easily recognized by those whose formerly peaceful states have collapsed into civil war. The bonds of affection, sexual affinity, and friendship—as well as of clan membership and shared religious belief—may further decrease the accuracy of any purely individualistic model of the state of nature. Another important open question is that of what, exactly, it is about human beings that makes it the case supposing Hobbes is right that our communal life is prone to disaster when we are left to interact according only to our own individual judgments. Perhaps, while people do wish to act for their own best long-term interest, they are shortsighted, and so indulge their current interests without properly considering the effects of their current behavior on their long-term interest. This would be a type of failure of rationality. Such an account would understand irrational human passions to be the source of conflict. Game theorists have been particularly active in these debates, experimenting with different models for the state of nature and the conflict it engenders. The Laws of Nature Hobbes argues that the state of nature is a miserable state of war in which none of our important human ends are reliably realizable. Happily, human nature also provides resources to escape this miserable condition. Humans will recognize as imperatives the injunction to seek peace, and to do those things

necessary to secure it, when they can do so safely. They forbid many familiar vices such as iniquity, cruelty, and ingratitude. Although commentators do not agree on whether these laws should be regarded as mere precepts of prudence, or rather as divine commands, or moral imperatives of some other sort, all agree that Hobbes understands them to direct people to submit to political authority. The social covenant involves both the renunciation or transfer of right and the authorization of the sovereign power. Political legitimacy depends not on how a government came to power, but only on whether it can effectively protect those who have consented to obey it; political obligation ends when protection ceases. Absolutism Although Hobbes offered some mild pragmatic grounds for preferring monarchy to other forms of government, his main concern was to argue that effective governmentâ€”whatever its formâ€”must have absolute authority. Its powers must be neither divided nor limited. The powers of legislation, adjudication, enforcement, taxation, war-making and the less familiar right of control of normative doctrine are connected in such a way that a loss of one may thwart effective exercise of the rest; for example, legislation without interpretation and enforcement will not serve to regulate conduct. Similarly, to impose limitation on the authority of the government is to invite irresolvable disputes over whether it has overstepped those limits. If each person is to decide for herself whether the government should be obeyed, factional disagreementâ€”and war to settle the issue, or at least paralysis of effective governmentâ€”are quite possible. To avoid the horrible prospect of governmental collapse and return to the state of nature, people should treat their sovereign as having absolute authority. He argues that subjects retain a right of self-defense against the sovereign power, giving them the right to disobey or resist when their lives are in danger. He also gives them seemingly broad resistance rights in cases in which their families or even their honor are at stake. These exceptions have understandably intrigued those who study Hobbes. It is not clear whether or not this charge can stand up to scrutiny, but it will surely be the subject of much continued discussion. Hobbes progressively expands his discussion of Christian religion in each revision of his political philosophy, until it comes in *Leviathan* to comprise roughly half the book. There is no settled consensus on how Hobbes understands the significance of religion within his political theory. Hobbes on Women and the Family Scholars are increasingly interested in how Hobbes thought of the status of women, and of the family. Hobbes was one of the earliest western philosophers to count women as persons when devising a social contract among persons. He insists on the equality of all people, very explicitly including women. People are equal because they are all subject to domination, and all potentially capable of dominating others. No person is so strong as to be invulnerable to attack while sleeping by the concerted efforts of others, nor is any so strong as to be assured of dominating all others. In this relevant sense, women are naturally equal to men. They are equally naturally free, meaning that their consent is required before they will be under the authority of anyone else. He also argues for natural maternal right: He witnesses the Amazons. In seeming contrast to this egalitarian foundation, Hobbes spoke of the commonwealth in patriarchal language. Hobbes justifies this way of talking by saying that it is fathers not mothers who have founded societies. Such debates raise the question: To what extent are the patriarchal claims Hobbes makes integral to his overall theory, if indeed they are integral at all? Very helpful for further reference is the critical bibliography of Hobbes scholarship to contained in Zagorin, P.

Chapter 9 : Michael J. Zimmerman, An Essay on Moral Responsibility - PhilPapers

some of the main topics are moral responsibility, moral development, moral character, altruism, psychological egoism, moral luck, and moral disagreement. Evolutionary ethics ethics based on the role of evolution in shaping human psychology and behavior.

Some Historical Background What follows in this section is a brief outline of the origins and trajectory of reflection on moral responsibility in the Western philosophical tradition. Against this background, a distinction will be drawn between two conceptions of moral responsibility that have exerted considerable influence on subsequent thinkers. An understanding of the concept of moral responsibility and its application is present implicitly in some of the earliest surviving Greek texts, i. If some particular outcome is fated, then it seems that the agent concerned could not be morally responsible for that outcome. Likewise, if fatalism were true with respect to all human futures, then it would seem that no human agent could be morally responsible for anything. Though this brand of fatalism has sometimes exerted significant historical influence, most philosophers have rejected it on the grounds that there is no good reason to think that our futures are fated in the sense that they will unfold no matter what particular deliberations we engage in, choices we make, or actions we perform. Aristotle 384–322 BCE seems to have been the first to construct a theory of moral responsibility. A bit later, he clarifies that only a certain kind of agent qualifies as a moral agent and is thus properly subject to ascriptions of responsibility, namely, one who possess a capacity for decision. According to Aristotle, a voluntary action or trait has two distinctive features. First, there is a control condition: That is, it must be up to the agent whether to perform that action or possess the trait—it cannot be compelled externally. Second, Aristotle proposes an epistemic condition: Aristotle aims to identify the conditions under which it is appropriate to praise or blame an agent, but it is not entirely clear how to understand the pivotal notion of appropriateness in his conception of responsibility. There are at least two possibilities: These two possibilities may be characterized in terms of two competing interpretations of the concept of moral responsibility: While Aristotle argued against a version of fatalism On Interpretation, ch. Causal determinism is the view that everything that happens or exists is caused by sufficient antecedent conditions, making it impossible for anything to happen or be other than it does or is. One variety of causal determinism, scientific determinism, identifies the relevant antecedent conditions as a combination of prior states of the universe and the laws of nature. Another, theological determinism, identifies those conditions as being the nature and will of God. It seems likely that theological determinism evolved out of the shift, both in Greek religion and in Ancient Mesopotamian religions, from polytheism to belief in one sovereign God, or at least one god who reigned over all others. The doctrine of scientific determinism can be traced back as far as the Presocratic Atomists 5th cent. BCE, but the difference between it and the earlier fatalistic view seems not to be clearly recognized until the development of Stoic philosophy 3rd. If fatalism is true, then human deliberation, choice, and action are completely otiose, for what is fated will transpire no matter what one chooses to do. In other words, even though our deliberations, choices, and actions are themselves determined like everything else, it is still the case, according to causal determinism, that the occurrence or existence of yet other things depends upon our deliberating, choosing and acting in a certain way Irwin Since the Stoics, the thesis of causal determinism, if true, and its ramifications, have taken center stage in theorizing about moral responsibility. During the Medieval period, especially in the work of Augustine 354–430 and Aquinas 1225–1274, reflection on freedom and responsibility was often generated by questions concerning versions of theological determinism, including most prominently: During the Modern period, there was renewed interest in scientific determinism—a change attributable to the development of increasingly sophisticated mechanistic models of the universe culminating in the success of Newtonian physics. The possibility of giving a comprehensive explanation of every aspect of the universe—including human action—in terms of physical causes became much more plausible. Many thought that persons could not be free and morally responsible if such an explanation of human action turned

out to be true. Others argued that freedom and responsibility would not be undermined by the truth of scientific determinism. In keeping with this focus on the ramifications of causal determinism for moral responsibility, thinkers may be classified as being one of two types: For example, those who accept the merit-based conception of moral responsibility have tended to be incompatibilists. That is, most have thought that if an agent were to genuinely merit praise or blame for something, then he would need to exercise a special form of control over that thing *e*. In addition to Epicurus, we can cite early Augustine, Thomas Reid *â€*, and Immanuel Kant *â€* as historical examples here. Thomas Hobbes *â€*, David Hume *â€*, and John Stuart Mill *â€* are, along with the Stoics, representatives of this view. This general trend of linking the consequentialist conception of moral responsibility with compatibilism about causal determinism and moral responsibility and the merit-based conception with incompatibilism continued to persist through the first half of the twentieth century. As discussed above, philosophical reflection on moral responsibility has historically relied upon one of two broad interpretations of the concept: Though versions of the consequentialist view have continued to garner support Smart; Frankena Increased attention to the stance of regarding and holding persons morally responsible has generated much of the recent work on the concept of moral responsibility. All theorists have recognized features of this practice *â€* inner attitudes and emotions, their outward expression in censure or praise, and the imposition of corresponding sanctions or rewards. In other words, it was typically assumed that blame and praise depended upon a judgment, or belief pre-reflective in most cases, that the agent in question had satisfied the objective conditions on being responsible. For the holder of the consequentialist view, this is a judgment that the agent exercised a form of control that could be influenced through outward expressions of praise and blame in order to curb or promote certain behaviors. For those holding the merit view, it is a judgment that the agent has exercised the requisite form of metaphysical control, *e*. If holding responsible is best understood as resting on an independent judgment about being responsible, then it is legitimate to inquire whether such underlying judgments and their associated outward expressions can be justified, as a whole, in the face of our best current understanding of the world, *e*. According to incompatibilists, a judgment that someone is morally responsible could never be true if the world were deterministic; thus praising and blaming in the merit-based sense would be beside the point. Compatibilists, on the other hand, contend that the truth of determinism would not undermine the relevant underlying judgments concerning the efficacy of praising and blaming practices, thereby leaving the rationale of such practices intact. Strawson sets out to adjudicate the dispute between those compatibilists who hold a consequentialist view of responsibility and those incompatibilists who hold the merit-based view. According to Strawson, the attitudes expressed in holding persons morally responsible are varieties of a wide range of attitudes deriving from our participation in personal relationships, *e*. In the first, one might conclude that, contrary to first appearances, the candidate did not violate the demand for a reasonable degree of good will. In the second kind of circumstance, one may abandon the participant perspective in relation to the candidate. In these cases, one adopts the objective standpoint, one from which one ceases to regard the individual as capable of participating in genuine personal relations either for some limited time or permanently. Such individuals lie, in some sense or to some varying extent, outside the boundaries of the moral community. For example, we may regard a very young child as initially exempt from the reactive attitudes but increasingly less so in cases of normal development or adopt the objective standpoint in relation to an individual we determine to be suffering from severe mental illness *P*. The central criticism Strawson directs at both consequentialist and traditional merit views is that both have over-intellectualized the issue of moral responsibility *â€* a criticism with which many subsequent thinkers have wrestled. Strawson, by contrast, maintains that the reactive attitudes are a natural expression of an essential feature of our form of life, in particular, the interpersonal nature of our way of life. Though judgments about the appropriateness of particular responses may arise *i*. That is, their justification refers back to an account of the reactive attitudes and their role in personal relationships, not to some independent theoretical account of the conditions on being responsible. Given the above, Strawson contends that it is pointless to ask whether the practice of holding responsible can be rationally justified if determinism

is true. This is either because it is not psychologically possible to divest ourselves of these reactions and so continually inhabit the objective standpoint, or even if that were possible, because it is not clear that rationality could ever demand that we give up the reactive attitudes, given the loss in quality of life should we do so. In sum, Strawson attempts to turn the traditional debate on its head, for now judgments about being responsible are understood in relation to the role reactive attitudes play in the practice of holding responsible, rather than the other way around. Whereas judgments are true or false and thereby can generate the need for justification, the desire for good will and those attitudes generated by it possess no truth value themselves, thereby eliminating any need for an external justification Magill That is, unlike most former consequentialist forms of compatibilism, it helps to explain why we feel that some agents deserve our censure or merit our praise. They do so because they have violated, met, or exceeded our demand for a reasonable degree of good will. Responding to the first of these, some have argued that it does seem possible to critique existing practices of holding responsible from standpoints outside them. If such evaluations are legitimate, then, contrary to what Strawson suggested, it seems that an existing practice can be questioned from a standpoint external to it. In other words, being responsible cannot be explicated strictly in terms of an existing practice of holding responsible. This then, would suggest a possible role to be played by independent theoretical conditions on being responsible, conditions which could prove to be compatibilist or incompatibilist in nature. There is a strong pull to think that our reactive attitudes are altered in such cases because we perceive such a background to be deterministic. If this is the proper interpretation of the phenomenon, then it is evidence that theoretical considerations, like the truth of determinism, could in fact dislodge the reactive attitudes Nagel Incompatibilists, in particular, seem largely unpersuaded and so have continued to assume a more or less traditional merit-based conception of moral responsibility as the basis for their theorizing. A number of compatibilists also remain unconvinced that Strawson has successfully shown independent theoretical considerations to be irrelevant to ascriptions of responsibility. It is noteworthy that some of these have accorded the reactive attitudes a central role in their discussions of the concept of responsibility, resulting in new merit-based versions of compatibilism see e. Until recently philosophers have assumed that they were concerned about a shared concept of moral responsibility. Even when controversy increasingly arose over how best to characterize it, the assumption seems to have been that it was a controversy over the one correct way of characterizing the concept of responsibility. Strawson was certainly amongst those who made this assumption in trying to adjudicate the dispute between those compatibilists who held the consequentialist view of responsibility and incompatibilists who held the merit-based view. However, a number of authors have suggested of late that at least some disagreements about the most plausible overall theory might be based on a failure to distinguish between different but related concepts of responsibility. Broadly speaking, a distinction has been made between responsibility as accountability and responsibility as attributability. In other words, an agent is responsible, if and only if it is appropriate for us to hold her responsible, or accountable, via the reactive attitudes. This highlights a main theme in Strawson--namely, that our responsibility practices are inherently social. Through the reactive attitudes e. Relatedly, this line of thought may help explain the historical preoccupation with whether responsibility for an action requires the ability to have done otherwise. That is, the normative concern for a fair opportunity to avoid blame and sanction may lie behind the felt need to have access to alternatives. Notably, some accounts of responsibility make no essential reference to the reactive attitudes or their accompanying practices. According to such views, the practice of ascribing responsibility involves assigning a credit or debit to a metaphorical ledger associated with each agent Feinberg: In other words, an agent is responsible if a fault or credit is properly attributable to her. Ledger views belong to a broader class of views which regard responsibility to be a matter of proper attributability. Satisfying some baseline conditions of responsibility as attributability would appear to be necessary in order to be responsible in the sense of accountable. For example, it would seem unfair to hold someone accountable for an action via reactive attitudes such as resentment or indignation, if the action was not properly attributable to the agent--say, because she succumbed to a genuinely coercive psychological compulsion. Yet being

responsible in the attributability sense is not sufficient for being responsible in the accountability sense. As Watson points out, it may make no sense to hold the agent responsible for the action in question, since it may not be the sort of thing for which they are accountable to us. For example, one may think that in making a career decision, an acquaintance failed to give due consideration to what would most fully develop and exercise his talents. Though this is not a moral judgment in the narrow sense favored by accountability theorists that is, it is unconnected to any interpersonal demand, or mutual expectation, of the sort presupposed by the reactive attitudes it is a case of finding fault in the way an agent has exercised his judgment. If responsibility as accountability and attributability can come apart in this way, then there appear to be at least two distinct concepts of responsibility. Such a view—call it the "answerability" model—appears to combine aspects of the attributability and accountability models see discussion by Watson and Shoemaker. The self-disclosure aspect of the attributability model is reflected in emphasizing that the target of appraisal must be judgment-sensitive. The interpersonal emphasis characteristic of Strawson-inspired accountability models is reflected in the demand for justification though answerability theorists tend to reject a necessary connection between these demands and the reactive attitudes. In this way, the answerability model offers the possibility of re-unifying discussions of responsibility Smith, but some see further grounds for distinguishing an additional sense of responsibility Shoemaker. The recognition of diversity within the concept or amongst concepts of moral responsibility has generated new reflection on whether the conditions on being morally responsible are in tension with one another Nagel; G. Strawson, "Responsibility and the Demands of Reason"; Honderich