

Second Philosophy

Led by	Oswy Gothly / Keith Parker
Title	Moral Philosophy
Date	23 July 2008

INTRODUCTION

Tonight's debate concerns an issue that has vexed philosophers for thousands of years ie On what basis do we found moral principles and actions.

On one side there are those who believe in moral facts that can be detected and are universal. On the other side are Relativists of some sort. They deny moral facts and therefore we must base our moral authority on some more narrow conviction. In this second case morality is negotiable between cultures and groups.

The first question poses a dilemma. Here you have an individual who can't be detected or policed in any way so why should he be moral? So why should he be moral at all?

DISCUSSION:

Dagny: Because he wants to be?

Oswy: Does your silence mean that morality has no basis at all but fear of being caught in the act of immorality?

Marya: well, I might say that he would hopefully have some sense of responsibility for his actions and care that they may affect other people; however, if he does not, there is no reason for him to adhere to any moral standard

Squish: I really don't think so. This is the same issue I take with people who fear hell. If the only reason you don't murder, steal, torture, etc., is because you are afraid of being punished for it, then you're really messed up

Oswy: Dagny if he is invisible he will do all sort of terrible things like the Invisible Hollow man in the film. His evil nature will be let loose.

Marya: yes, if his nature is inclined towards doing bad things in the first place then yes, he will no doubt do bad things

Squish: but that just means he's a sick man

Dagny: Is he evil then? Why?

Squish: heh, messed up childhood...

Marya: however, if I you were able to make yourself invisible, would you do those things? If you wouldn't, why not?

Squish: definitely not, b/c it would disgust me to do those things

Sojourna: Are we assuming that we only do moral deeds to avoid punishment if caught or to look good in front of others? If so, can we think of a counterexample where we do good when no-one knows, this might be a case against the invisibility theory.

Marya: anyone else?

Squish: many people do good things, even if they won't be rewarded

Marya: true

Dagny: Lots of people give to charity anonymously - this is a counterexample

Squish: and many people refrain from doing bad things, even if they won't be punished

Sojourna: So then those people might do good even if invisible.

Squish: of course

Marya: yes, it would depend on the character of the person involved I should imagine - but what I want to know is 'why'

Squish: why are some people more immoral than others?

Second Philosophy

Kimm: I think it is in our interests to have a degree of co-operation and trust, even if many abuse that to some degree from time to time

Squish: well, I know Marya likes to talk about evolution and morality

Marya: hehe yes I do Squish, but I'm trying to hold back on that one ;)

Sojourna: it could a learnt response to the world and to human relationships, it could because they would have others do unto them, etc, etc

Dagny: I think we enjoy being good for its own sake.

Squish: cooperation was certainly a good survival strategy

Marya: Yes Kim, but what if there are no consequences?

Oswy: All you seem to have a very benign view of human nature. I don't think that is realistic in view of what we see in a world that is policed at the moment. Wouldn't you try and make yourself rich and perhaps acquire a few pleasures along the way?

Squish: by consequences, do you mean punishment/reward, or simply other events?

Marya: I mean punishment/reward

Sojourna: I think that people do good and act nice and civilised when they can - ie when there is plenty about, plenty of work, food, love, etc. I think even good people become un-good when there's a shortage of things...so maybe the environment plays a huge role

Squish: I don't think actions are morally neutral simply because they may not incur reward/punishment

Dagny: I agree Soj. I'd be completely immoral until basic needs met then very good thereafter

Squish: if you tell me I will not be punished, I still don't think murder and not-murder are somehow equivalent

Squish: I wouldn't toss a coin to decide

Sojourna: Yes, Dagny, haha me too, I must admit :)

Marya: mmm, but don't you think there is a power issue involved? You could pretty much do what you liked and get away with it

Kimm: sometimes we re-frame our immorality in order to justify it. You can see that negatively or you can say a moral code may be redundant and needs to be reviewed..

Squish: it's not about being able to get away with something so much as doing something which I want to do

Oswy: I think power is the vital thing here. In the experiment you have huge power. In the Ring of Gyges the shepherd used the power to possess the Queen kill the king and become ruler. Are you saying this is unrealistic?

Kimm: we live in the minds of others; we live in a community of minds. The invisible person as well as the visible

Dagny: I think getting what you wanted all the time would get empty after a while if there was no challenge

Squish: I think some people who are power-hungry and murderous will resort to murder...

Squish: but that doesn't mean that the only thing which enforces moral behaviour is threat of punishment

Dagny: Are the murderous and power hungry the norm or an anomaly?

Squish: that's a good question

Marya: good question Dagny

Oswy: The person with invisibility could engage in ever more extreme temptations there is nothing he could not do. So what's to restrain him?

Squish: power-hungry, I would say normal; murderous - that depends, do you really think that consciences don't exist? I have a woman living downstairs who is disabled and on a fixed income; if I could become invisible and steal from her to buy a new PS3, I wouldn't b/c I know what it's like to be ill, and to be poor and how much pain it would cause her if I robbed her; so that's what restrains me, not threat of punishment

Marya: what restrains you then is your empathy with her

Squish: yes, my recognition that she is a fellow human being who feels, just as I feel

Second Philosophy

Kimm: what about shame and humiliation if your misdeed were known...

Squish: and I wouldn't want to cause someone else misery if I could help it

Marya: yes indeed Squish

Sojourna: You know what, I guess a person who has grown up with the gift of invisible, is not really a person, in so far as has not had the same upbringing and socialisation as us. So our moral code would make no sense whatsoever. It would be an incoherent moral code for the invisible person.

Kimm: I think you have something there, to be is to be embodied

Oswy: So are you saying that the moral realists are right there just are certain things you would not do for moral reason eg deprive he disabled is wrong always?

Squish: or would the invisible person envy our solidness?

Squish: whoa, no one is saying moral objectivism or moral realism is "true" - sorry, moral relativism - those are broad, sweeping claims

Oswy: Soj this person has been given a gift of invisibility and can throw away previous inhibitions.

Squish: too strong to affirm, given what we have so far

Squish: just b/c we can do something doesn't mean we want to

Marya: this is true

Squish: I could beat up the handicapped woman, but I wouldn't!

Marya: so do we base our moral thinking on empathy, in part?

Oswy: But why don't you beat her up? That's the point, what is stopping you?

Squish: mine does, at least :)

Sojourna: ok Os, but maybe they would just go about eating lots of chocolate and kissing people on the cheek instead of doing evil. I think if the person were to do evil, the reasons would be the same for doing evil without invisibility. I mean, visible people do evil all the time.

Squish: what is stopping me is the idea that I would be very upset if I were in her shoes

Dagny: Marya, I think so or else there's no way of judging good from bad

Squish: even if I knew she wouldn't call the police on me

Marya: I think mine does too - but I wonder whether I would be so empathic towards others if I had not experienced life in the way that I have?

Squish: or do anything other than cry bitterly - that would be enough to stop me

Marya: that's the key I think Dagny, how we judge good from bad, and what our basis is for those judgements

Kimm: I think our need to belong is strong... ostracism is a great punishment, exile, like being rendered invisible

Dagny: we can only judge for ourselves and assume it applies to others

Kimm: so people sometimes do evil to fit in

Marya: mmm, I think you're probably right about that but I don't think that is a universal way of being. I think all people have a darker side and perhaps, in some situations, that comes out

Squish: oh yes, everyone has darkness in them; but I don't think it's just fear of punishment that keeps it in check

Sojourna: is it just opportunity or lack of that keeps it in check?

Sojourna: or as I mentioned above, reason for acting on the dark side

Squish: for me, it's the part of me that wants to feel lightness

Oswy: I suspect that we here are all good liberal humanitarian types who have been well socialised but others would be tempted to do evil. We don't because we have been socialised to fear being caught and our image destroyed we would be humiliated?

Marya: not necessarily Soj, I think there is more than one motivation for what we do and what we don't do - empathy, fear of punishment, a need for acceptance, exploring our own natures and so on

Second Philosophy

Squish: Oswy, your comment reminded me of something from the latest batman movie, actually - : Bruce Wayne makes a great sacrifice - of personal reputation and honour - in order to do the heroic thing

Kimm: i think as well that eg robbing from something anonymous and powerful - the insurance company - feels different to robbing from the disabled woman

Marya: yes exactly Kimm

Oswy: Well I think we have now focussed on the issue of what motivates our morality. I think the main part of the discussion is that it's something to do with our inherent nature. Of course it depends on whether you think that nature is benign and empathetic or just primitive and potentially evil.

Oswy: Second Question Jim and the Indians. This is an example of Morality in Action in an extreme situation. I forgot to mention that Jim as well as choosing the victim also has to shoot him. He could of course refuse. So what should he do?

Squish: he should shoot the chief

Sojourna: What happens if he refuses?

Marya: he should shoot one person to save the tribe, if he refuses, the whole lot will be killed

Dagny: Shoot one then

Oswy: If he refuses the Police Chief Pedro will shoot all the villagers he has captured.

Squish: all the more reason to shoot the stupid chief

Squish: but i guess if he can't get away with that, then shoot one

Oswy: Marya, why is that the correct moral course of action?

Squish: may be the oldest, sickest of the bunch

Marya: it would not be easy since there is no specific target, but, if I were Jim, I would look at each person and at least attempt to determine which one would be willing to sacrifice himself or herself for the rest of the group - not an easy or clear decision

Sojourna: I don't think Jim should shoot anyone. It's not in his moral code, so why should he?

Kimm: he could shoot Pedro

Squish: I wouldn't say it's the "correct" thing to do. Jim is being forced into an unreasonable situation where he must choose the lesser of the two evils

Marya: I didn't say it was correct Oswy, but it is what I would do - and I would do it to save the rest of the group

Oswy: So Mayra you are a Consequentialist. Do what is best for the majority. But is this a firm basis for morality?

Marya: it is not necessarily based on any moral code - it is based on trying to do the best thing in a terrible situation

Oswy: He can't shoot Pedro he has an invisible vest

Squish: Jim is choosing between the minority and majority (being forced to, and it's sickening) - technically he's saving many more minorities by choosing the majority

Marya: but yes, I would take the view of doing a 'greater good'

Sojourna: But I'd argue that it is the greater of two evils if he shoots. If he doesn't shoot, at least he's preserving some form of moral sanity.

Sojourna: I'm assuming he's that type of moral dude.

Squish: if he doesn't shoot, he's letting a bunch of people die, all for his personal sense of dignity

Sojourna: But he isn't letting them.

Oswy: Mayra you can't get away with just saying it's the best, why is it the best. You seem to be saying because it has the best consequences ie most villagers live.

Second Philosophy

Marya: how could he live with himself Soj if he doesn't shoot, he has, in a way, become responsible for the death of the whole group as opposed to just one

Marya: I am saying I would do it for the greater good Oswy

Squish: how can he put his own feelings before the lives of others? Now THAT's immoral

Sojourna: And how can he live with himself if he does shoot - this is a great example of an ethical dilemma.

Marya: yes indeed - he is in trouble either way - so he must decide based on what he believes the right thing to do is

Sojourna: He could bargain with the chief and get himself shot to save all the villagers.

Squish: if Jim puts his own peace of mind before the lives of a bunch of people, then he's a selfish bastard, sorry if that was an inappropriate word

Marya: not at all - spot on :)

Kimm: he deals with the particular situation, then he reviews, he has to change to accommodate his action

Oswy: Kant would say he must not shoot. He has a duty not to murder anyone, he must sacrifice the whole group, he cannot break that principle?

Sojourna: But is he doing it for himself or for some absolute moral standard that is above and beyond him?

Marya: Well, hopefully Kant won't hate me too much for thinking he's wrong about that ;)

Sojourna: OH dear, am I a Kantian then?

Squish: Kant wasn't necessarily right and Jim doesn't care for him

Oswy: Yes Soj you are

Sojourna: How do you know who Jim cares about Squish?

Sojourna: Thanks, Os. I never saw myself as a Kantian.

Dagny: The absolute moral standard is not much use in this situation. Unless he can convince Pedro of it

Marya: we don't know for sure, but we need to put ourselves into his shoes and ask what we would do

Squish: b/c if he were a Kantian, he'd get out of the situation by talking the chief to death

Sojourna: I think Jim should bargain his life for the life of all the villagers - that is the best thing to do.

Oswy: Kant would say that the villager who might be shot cannot be treated as a means to an end however fine it seems. There is a duty not to do what Pedro wants it cannot become a universal law?

Squish: why should he die instead of one of them?

Marya: that would be ideal Soj, but that isn't an option

Sojourna: It isn't an option?

Marya: no, in the story of Jim and the Indians, it is one of them or all of them - it's one of those restrictive thought experiments ;)

Squish: just asking why it's preferable that Jim dies instead of one of the villagers

Kimm: what about the Indians, do they have any agency... one of them might volunteer to die

Sojourna: Well, I think it would be best for Jim to die, because then he doesn't do a bad thing and shoot anyone (to answer Squish)

Marya: they might do Kimm, but that doesn't come up in the story - the story is about what the correct 'moral' thing for Jim to do is, given the specific set of circumstances

Squish: he isn't guilty for being forced into this unreasonable choice by a stupid chief

Oswy: Kimm the Indians would say all sorts of things. Some of them would be Kantians and tell Jim to walk away others would beg for life. The advice would be totally confusing Jim has to decide. Pedro wont be talked out of it there is only one choice to make.

Sojourna: There is no correct moral thing here - it is an unsolvable ethical dilemma (I think)

Marya: I agree with that, Soj

Dagny: I think the moral dilemma is shoot or don't, and let lots die. Anything else is avoiding the question

Marya: and it will come down to the individual's (Jim) choice on what he or she thinks the best thing to do is

Second Philosophy

Sojourna: OK Dagny

Kimm: sometimes there is no right decision, but you have to decide and live with it... then it can be a sort of courage to act....

Squish: yes, but Jim isn't doing a "bad" thing in choosing one of them

Marya: depending on one's own point of view

Oswy: If it's an unsolvable dilemma what does that say about morality. Surely the Hollow man thought experiment is right we just make up our minds about morality depending on our preferences at the time?

Dagny: he's forced to do something bad either way.

Squish: but those preferences aren't arbitrary or spontaneous

Dagny: perhaps we can't always choose to do anything right

Marya: well, not to go back to my views on evolution, but I don't believe there is an objective moral standard

Squish: Yes, Dag, I was saying something along the same lines when I pointed out he's being forced to choose between two evils

Oswy: Some would say Jim is doing a bad thing if he shoots. He is murdering someone

Marya: I believe we need moral laws in the same way that we need other laws - to regulate behaviour

Squish: if he doesn't shoot, he's murdering many more people

Oswy: Jim is a member of the human race, he can't opt out in choice just because they are difficult he has to do something we all have to make choices.

Dagny: in this situation Jim might get comfort from a law telling him the right thing when he actually knows both are bad but this is a dangerous route

Squish: no kidding

Sojourna: I think we could solve this dilemma if we had two extra choices: 1) Shoot the chief, 2) Bargain his life for the villagers.

Oswy: If he doesn't shoot then Pedro is guilty of murder but Jim cannot condone one murder as a means to prevent others.

Squish: just fire the damn gun until it's out of bullets

Marya: look at it this way: our 'moral' views have changed a great deal over the last 200 odd years, and one might wonder where they will go in time. What will become morally acceptable in the future ... and what does this say about any objective moral truths

Squish: Jim would be condoning many murders by not choosing

Oswy: You could use that reasoning to say we should be able to torture one person in order to get information to save others?

Squish: a very loaded other story

Squish: ah that's another story

Dagny: only if it were guaranteed to save others

Marya: yes Oswy - but to say it that way is to set up a straw man really - there is always more to a situation than a simple black and white decision

Oswy: He can't be condoning since he is not being asked to approve he is required to make a choice

Squish: yes, Jim is sure if he chooses he will put one man to death

Squish: and if he doesn't choose, he will put many men to death

Sojourna: Oswy, I was going to say that and then I thought of the concentration camps

Sojourna: When people do nothing....

Sojourna: Or shouldn't I be going there with this?

Squish: the concentration camps - have you read the studies on ordinary men and extraordinary evil?

Sojourna: Nope Squish

Squish: very famous social psychology studies

Dagny: he's in the wrong through no fault of his own. People find themselves in such situations all the time

Marya: yes indeed Dagny

Second Philosophy

Squish: it's much easier to do evil if you are just "following orders"; somehow people think it clears their consciences

Oswy: Another issue here is that Jim would show no virtue if he shot one man. So virtue ethics is of no use either.

Sojourna: oh Squish yeah I think I know what you are talking about - from first year psych many years ago

Squish: he shows no virtue? Would he be showing virtue in letting everyone else get shot?

Marya: I agree with Squish on this

Oswy: I am going to sum up and move to question three. the question which was used in the Intro phil course was designed to show that when we come to it no moral course of action is unproblematic. You could argue that in the end Jim just has to choose as best he can and he cannot be condemned for that. Morality is very fragile.

Marya: yes indeed Oswy

Squish: I think we should also note that morality is especially complex in extreme situations

Oswy: Question three opposed two views. The nationalist says my nation first ie I have commitments to my community. The communitarian says Human Rights are for all they are absolute and universal. eg Genocide is a crime whoever does it. Who is right?

Squish: do the two necessarily conflict?

Marya: First of all, is that a clear definition of communitarianism Oswy?

Squish: human rights may be universal, but why absolute?

Marya: I recall in the politics course deciding I was absolutely not a communitarian but I do believe that all people should be equal...

Oswy: It's a bit simplified but how would you expand it.

Marya: well, what I gauged from it (and I could be wrong here) was the communitarian believes 'his' way should be enforced upon all people; irrelevant of what that 'way' is - meaning, the communitarian believes he has a right to educate his children into say, a particular faith for example

Sojourna: I think it goes something like human rights for all, but my country first.

Squish: hmm, well I think this boils down to loyalty then

Sojourna: Loyalty?

Squish: it's like an expanded version of family ethics; would you save your family at the expense of others?

Dagny: Yes but not my nation

Sojourna: Yes, I was thinking about family too. And even individuals.

Oswy: Another way of putting this is . There are some who say all the worlds citizens have to have equal human rights and an equal share of wealth. The nationalist says yes but only after my community is taken care of.

Squish: the national vs international is like a huge extrapolation from family to not-family

Dagny: Big difference between family and nation

Squish: er, I would draw a line of demarcation between rights and wealth; those are separate issues

Squish: yes, big difference, but similar sentiment

Dagny: not at all to me

Squish: what makes you loyal to your family first?

Sojourna: Dagny, what do you mean? Why is it a big difference?

Sojourna: I want to hear your view, Dagny

Dagny: because I know and love my family but don't really understand why we have nations

Marya: I'm with Dagny on this

Sojourna: Aha, ok, got you. Yep.

Oswy: The point I am trying to get at is that the nationalist says that you can bend universal ideas of rights and equality. So again it depends on my preference for my community first.

Second Philosophy

Squish: I think some people would say they love their nations and their fellow citizens, who share similar lifestyles and similar views

Squish: more similar than foreigners

Oswy: So why is that sentiment moral?

Sojourna: I think technology will dissolve the issue of nations in years to come. Hoping anyway.

Squish: but the nationalist believes in equality within his own nation?

Marya: well, it's a tough one Oswy - I think people first and I agree with Dagny, nation is just a concept we hold at the moment, and, the way things are going, we may well live to see a more borderless world overall

Dagny: agree with you soj

Squish: yes, hopefully political maps will have little meaning in the future

Oswy: I don't see nationalism vanishing, it seems to be strong and growing?

Squish: jingoism is popular here in the US

Squish: in this time of world crises

Squish: political and financial crises

Marya: no, I think nationalism will go along the same path as religion ... hopefully becoming obsolete in time

Oswy: Look at the recent problems with the EU treaty vote.

Marya: yes, but this is all very new still - think of how it could potentially be in say 500 year's time - we've only been at integration since WW2

Squish: yeah, social reactions to novel proposals tend to be negative at the beginning

Oswy: So you are hoping for the Star Trek option. But again I ask why is that preferable?

Squish: people were undoubtedly sprouting ulcers when Galileo first suggested his heretical science

Dagny: We'll split along ideological rather than geographical lines I think

Marya: I think it is preferable because it is about people

Squish: yes Marya!

Squish: and I do hope humanism becomes dominant in the future, and for the record, I think humanism is preferable because we're all human

Oswy: So are you saying there is a universal moral law that upholds the idea of equal human rights which would include equality of resources?

Squish: ...what's with the "universal moral law" thing?

Marya: I am saying there is no universal moral law Oswy. There are only laws - laws that we adhere to in order to coexist

Oswy: Then why have you this concern with a world government where everyone has equal moral rights?

Squish: not necessarily a world gov't

Marya: I don't understand what you mean Oswy?

Squish: I thought we were advocating more cooperation

Dagny: Cooperation at individual rather than state level

Marya: I just want to be clear on what Oswy is saying because I'm not sure I understand the question

Oswy: You are hoping that nationalism gives way to some form of world or regional government? You say this is because you are concerned with humans. What advantage will the world or regional government bring to humanity?

Marya: we need particular laws to ensure that we can coexist, since we are all different

Squish: I'm not sure how we jumped from the idea that political boundaries are unfounded to the assertion of a universal gov't

Marya: it is about coexistence Oswy

Second Philosophy

Squish: not a regional vs global gov't. I thought this was about universal ideology. How we govern ourselves is not quite the same issue as how we regard other people

Oswy: For the sake of the argument let's just say it's beyond national government. Marya what are these particular laws you see will be such an advantage?

Marya: recognising that we are all different, we all have a slightly different or vastly different take on things - so we need standard laws to ensure that we can get along well enough to share this planet. Very basic laws
Oswy - essentially what we now call 'basic human rights'

Squish: and underlying that, the recognition that all human beings are equal

Marya: I do not perceive that there is such a thing as a human right, as much as I do not believe there is such a thing as a universal moral law - but this is what it is called so this is why I am referencing it in this way

Oswy: So you want universal basic laws that ensure human cooperation. The purpose being this will allow human flourishing?

Marya: yes, all humans, irrelevant of geographical location; does any of that make sense?

Squish: yes - all humans - that is the goal of humanism - makes perfect sense :)

Dagny: yes makes sense to me

Oswy: So it seems to me you do believe in laws that can ensure human flourishing and these must be universally applied if they are to work. They will have to be exercised in some sort of universal forum like the UN?

Marya: yes, initially Oswy

Sojourna: But how can universal laws work when there is no universal quality to begin with?

Squish: or just exercised by all regional gov'ts

Sojourna: Some people right now need more than others, etc, etc

Marya: yes Soj, it is a process that is still very much in its early stages and will not doubt take a very long time to implement

Sojourna: Hmm, yes.

Oswy: Well Soj you could lay down a law that the worlds resources must be shared eg via Aid. This would be a means to an end of human flourishing.

Squish: yes Soj - and it is important to assert that those in need are as deserving of basic quality of life as those who live in sickening decadence

Marya: states do need to regulate each other, just as we regulate each other on an individual basis - which is why groups like the UN are useful

Dagny: Achieving fairness is pretty impossible but still worth stating as an aim

Marya: yes indeed Dagny, it is a starting point and something we can work with and towards - no system will ever be perfect as long as there are humans involved ;)

Sojourna: I agree Dag, but why is it impossible do you think?

Squish: I think it's worthwhile to distinguish regulatory needs from ideological aims

Oswy: It doesn't mater the point I am trying to get at is that there are people like you Marya who believe in universal laws that ensure humanities flourishing. There are others who say no the only basis for morality and human flourishing is that we look after our own communities first. Why should I for instance be concerned about the arrest of Serbian ex war leaders let the Serbs sort that out themselves.

Marya: because the Serbs are our neighbours Oswy and we should care what happens to them - or at least I do

Squish: Oswy, the people who argue for community first aren't thinking about humanity first; that's the main difference

Marya: yes

Squish: but in the end, humanity is the bottom line

Marya: yes

Oswy: The fact that you care for them does not give you a moral right to interfere. That's what a lot of Serbs would say.

Second Philosophy

Dagny: Humanity is the bottom line - as long as my kids are ok. That's the problem

Sojourna: Yep, Dag, and I think that will always be the basis for inequality so long as humans are having kids in the way we do now

Squish: in the end, people must realize that in order for one's children to be "ok", humanity must be "ok"

Oswy: That's it in a nutshell Dagny and that means that we bend our universal aspirations of humanistic morality to fit. It comes back to preference?

Dagny: intergenerational sacrifice not easy to sell

Sojourna: Squish - that's only for ALL kids to be ok, not MY kids.

Marya: See this is it Oswy, what right do I have to interfere - this is the very big question - if Serbia were to join the international 'community' then we have a responsibility to look out for each other and ensure that those basic human 'rights' are adhered to - we need to regulate each other to maintain the balance. By joining the international community, we make an agreement which all of us have to adhere to ... that's the crux of it

Squish: Soj, the "my kids only" view will hopefully mature into "all kids"

Oswy: Right its quarter past 8 and I am shattered. I will sum up in a second.

Sojourna: fair enough, Squish.

Summary

Oswy: The purpose of this debate was to try and show that the issue of morality is just as problematic now as it was 2000 years ago. We aspire to be good we support all sorts of ideals we want to think humanity is one on these issues. Yet when we are faced with invisibility or non-policing, or a hard case who do we shoot? Or do I put my self interests as part of a nation before the world community then it doesn't seem so easy. Morality bends and becomes relativistic. Simon Blackburn has developed a strategy called Quasi Moral realism to solve this problem but that is another debate.

