STOICISM NC:

*Truly I tell you, it is hard for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of heaven.*

framework:

Ethics must maintain an orientation towards intrinsic goods; intrinsic good is to locate a good in something non-variable in its value. However, any object of pursuit has variable value because 1) circumstances could mean the object is used badly and 2) we cannot be sure that we will acquire the object. The only thing we can control is that our actions are done from the Stoic virtues. **BALTZLY**[[1]](#footnote-1)**:** The best way into the thicket of Stoic ethics is through the question of what is good, for all parties agree that possession of what is genuinely good secures a person's happiness. The Stoics claim that whatever is good must benefit its possessor under all circumstances. But there are situations in which it is not to my benefit to be healthy or wealthy**. (**We may imagine that if I had money I would spend it on heroin which would not benefit me.) Thus, things like money are simply not good, in spite of how nearly everyone speaks, and the Stoics call them ‘indifferents’ (Diog. Laert., 58A)—i.e., neither good nor bad. The only things that are good are the characteristic excellences or virtues of human beings (or of human minds): prudence or wisdom, justice, courage and moderation, and other related qualities. These are the first two of the ‘Stoic paradoxes’ discussed by Cicero in his short work of that title: that only what is noble or fine or morally good (kalon) is good at all, and that the possession (and exercise) of the virtues is both necessary and sufficient for happiness. But the Stoics are not such lovers of paradox that they are willing to say that my preference for wealth over poverty in most circumstances is utterly groundless. They draw a distinction between what is good and things which have value (axia). Some indifferent things, like health or wealth, have value and therefore are to be preferred, even if they are not good, because they are typically appropriate, fitting or suitable (oikeion) for us.

Thus the standard is **conformity of the will to stoic virtue**. Nothing implies that promoting virtue is good, but simply structuring one’s character in will so as to be properly oriented towards the virtues. In promoting virtues, you’re making virtues the *object* of the will as opposed to the *structure* of the will but any object or pursuit has only variable value. For example, in trying to wise or courageous I might become arrogant or foolhardy.

contention:

**First**, government implementation of a living wage involves an orientation of the will which regards additional material wealth as good. This involves an orientation to both transience and something uncertain. One should satisfy desire not by acquiring objects that might or might not help you satisfy them, but by virtuously orienting one’s desires towards good action as only that can provide an ethical assurance of happiness.

**Second**, increasing money harms the virtuous disposition of the will. Because money creates an illusion of happiness it leads one to be satisfied without virtue. It’s empirically verified that increases in wealth result in failings. The studies are robust between extremes and within income brackets. More money positively corrupts; it does not just correlate with corruption. There is a reason most traditions warn of the moral dangers of wealth. **PIFF**[[2]](#footnote-2)**:** Studies 1 and 2. Our first two studies were naturalistic field studies, and examined whether upper-class individuals behave more unethically than lower-class individuals while driving. In study 1, we investigated whether upper-class drivers were more likely to cut off other vehicles at a busy four-way intersection with stop signs on all sides. As vehicles are reliable indicators of a person's social rank and wealth (15), we used observers’ codes of vehicle status (make, age, and appearance) to index drivers’ social class. Observers stood near the intersection, coded the status of approaching vehicles, and recorded whether the driver cut off other vehicles by crossing the intersection before waiting their turn, a behavior that defies the California Vehicle Code. In the present study, 12.4% of drivers cut in front of other vehicles. A binary logistic regression indicated that upper-class drivers were the most likely to cut off other vehicles at the intersection, even when controlling for time of day, driver's perceived sex and age, and amount of traffic, b = 0.36, SE b = 0.18, P < 0.05. Percentages of cars that cut off other vehicles as a function of vehicle status are shown in Fig. 1A. In study 2, we tested whether upper-class drivers are more likely to cut off pedestrians at a crosswalk. An observer positioned him- or herself out of plain sight at a marked crosswalk, coded the status of a vehicle, and recorded whether the driver cut off a pedestrian (a confederate of the study) attempting to cross the intersection. Cutting off a pedestrian violates California Vehicle Code. In this study, 34.9% of drivers failed to yield to the pedestrian. A binary logistic regression with time of day, driver's perceived age and sex, and confederate sex entered as covariates indicated that upper-class drivers were significantly more likely to drive through the crosswalk without yielding to the waiting pedestrian, b = 0.39, SE b = 0.19, P < 0.05. Percentages of cars that cut off the pedestrian as a function of vehicle status are shown in Fig. 1B. Study 3. Study 3 extended these findings by using a more direct measure of social class and assessing tendencies toward a variety of unethical decisions. Participants read eight different scenarios that implicated an actor in unrightfully taking or benefiting from something, and reported the likelihood that they would engage in the behavior described (16). Participants also reported their social class using the MacArthur scale of subjective SES (2). This measure parallels objective, resource-based measures of social class in its relationship to health (2), social cognition (4), and interpersonal behavior (7). As hypothesized, social class positively predicted unethical decision-making tendencies, even after controlling for ethnicity, sex, and age, b = 0.13, SE b = 0.06, t(103) = 2.05, P < 0.04. These results suggest that upper-class individuals are more likely to exhibit tendencies to act unethically compared with lower-class individuals. Study 4. Study 4 sought to provide experimental evidence that the experience of higher social class has a causal effect on unethical decision-making and behavior. We adopted a paradigm used in past research to activate higher or lower social-class mindsets and examine their effects on behavior (5, 7). Participants experienced either a low or high relative social-class rank by comparing themselves to people with the most (least) money, most (least) education, and most (least) respected jobs. Participants also rated their position in the socioeconomic hierarchy relative to people at the very top or bottom. This induction primes subjective perceptions of relatively high or low social-class rank. In this prior research, as expected, manipulations of perceived social-class rank influenced generosity (7) and the ability to identify others’ emotions (5). Participants completed a series of filler measures, which included the measure of unethical decision-making tendencies used in study 3 (16). Our main dependent variable was a behavioral measure of unethical tendencies. Specifically, at the end of the study, the experimenter presented participants with a jar of individually wrapped candies, ostensibly for children in a nearby laboratory, but informed them that they could take some if they wanted. This task was adapted from prior research on entitlement (17) and served as our measure of unethical behavior because taking candy would reduce the amount that would otherwise be given to children. Participants completed unrelated tasks and then reported the number of candies they had taken. The manipulation of social-class rank was successful: Participants in the upper-class rank condition (M = 6.96) reported a social-class rank significantly above participants in the lower-class rank condition (M = 6.00), t(127) = 3.51, P < 0.01, d = 0.62. Central to our hypothesis, participants in the upper-class rank condition took more candy that would otherwise go to children (M = 1.17) than did those in the lower-rank condition (M = 0.60), t(124) = 3.18, P < 0.01, d = 0.57. Furthermore, replicating the findings from study 3, those in the upper-rank condition also reported increased unethical decision-making tendencies (M = 4.29) than participants in the lower-class rank condition (M = 3.90), t(125) = 2.31, P < 0.03, d = 0.41. These results extend the findings of studies 1–3 by suggesting that the experience of higher social class has a causal relationship to unethical decision-making and behavior. Study 5. Study 5 focused on positive attitudes toward greed as one mediating mechanism to explain why people from upper-class backgrounds behave in a more unethical fashion. Participants took part in a hypothetical negotiation, assuming the role of an employer tasked with negotiating a salary with a job candidate seeking long-term employment (14). Participants were given several pieces of information, including the fact that the job would soon be eliminated. Participants reported the percentage chance they would tell the job candidate the truth about job stability. Participants also reported their social class using the MacArthur scale (2) and completed a measure of the extent to which they believed it is justified and moral to be greedy (18). We first tested the associations between social class, attitudes toward greed, and probability of telling the job candidate the truth, while accounting for participant age, sex, and ethnicity, as well as religiosity and political orientation, variables that can influence unethical behavior (19). Social class negatively predicted probability of telling the truth, b = −4.55, SE b = 1.90, t(103) = −2.39, P < 0.02, and positively predicted favorable attitudes toward greed, b = 0.16, SE b = 0.04, t(103) = 3.54, P < 0.01. In addition, favorable attitudes toward greed negatively predicted probability of telling the truth, b = −12.29, SE b = 3.93, t(100) = −3.12, P < 0.01. Testing our mediational model, when social class and attitudes toward greed were entered into a linear regression model predicting probability of telling the job candidate the truth, social class was no longer significant, b = −2.43, SE b = 1.87; t(101) = −1.30, P = 0.20, whereas attitudes toward greed were a significant predictor, b = −11.41, SE b = 3.81; t(101) = −3.00, P < 0.01. Using the bootstrapping method (with 10,000 iterations) recommended by Preacher and Hayes (20), we tested the significance of the indirect effect of social class on probability of telling the truth through attitudes toward greed. The 95% confidence interval for the indirect effect did not include zero (range: −3.7356 to −0.6405), suggesting that upper-class individuals are prone to deception in part because they view greed in a more positive light. Study 6. Study 6 extended these findings to actual cheating behavior. Participants played a “game of chance,” in which the computer presented them with one side of a six-sided die, ostensibly randomly, on five separate rolls. Participants were told that higher rolls would increase their chances of winning a cash prize and were asked to report their total score at the end of the game. In fact, die rolls were predetermined to sum up to 12. The extent to which participants reported a total exceeding 12 served as a direct behavioral measure of cheating. Participants also completed the measures of social class (2) and attitudes toward greed (18) that we used in study 5. Controlling for participant age, sex, ethnicity, religiosity, and political orientation, social class positively predicted cheating, b = 0.22, SE b = 0.11, t(181) = 1.98, P < 0.05, and more favorable attitudes toward greed, b = 0.06, SE b = 0.03, t(186) = 2.22, P < 0.03. In addition, attitudes toward greed predicted cheating behavior, b = 0.61, SE b = 0.29, t(180) = 2.36, P < 0.02. When social class and attitudes toward greed were entered into a linear-regression model predicting cheating behavior, social class was no longer a significant predictor, b = 0.16, SE b = 0.11, t(185) = 1.50, P = 0.14, whereas attitudes toward greed significantly predicted cheating, b = 0.68, SE b = 0.27, t(185) = 2.50, P < 0.02. The Preacher and Hayes (20) bootstrapping technique (with 10,000 iterations) produced a 95% confidence interval for the indirect effect that did not include zero (range: 0.0005–0.3821). These results further suggest that more favorable attitudes toward greed among members of the upper class explain, in part, their unethical tendencies. Study 7. To further understand why upper-class individuals act more unethically, study 7 examined whether encouraging positive attitudes toward greed increases the unethical tendencies of lower-class individuals to match those of their upper-class counterparts. When the benefits of greed were not mentioned, we expected that upper-class individuals would display increased unethical tendencies compared with lower-class individuals, as in the previous studies. However, when the benefits of greed were emphasized, we expected lower-class individuals to be as prone to unethical behavior as upper-class individuals. These findings would reveal that one reason why lower-class individuals tend to act more ethically is that they hold relatively unfavorable attitudes toward greed (and, conversely, that one reason why upper-class individuals tend to act more unethically is that they hold relatively favorable attitudes toward greed). Participants listed either three things about their day (neutral prime) or three benefits of greed (greed-is-good prime). Participants then responded to a manipulation check assessing their attitudes toward greed before completing a measure of their propensity to engage in unethical behaviors at work, such as stealing cash, receiving bribes, and overcharging customers (21). Participants also reported their social class using the previously described MacArthur measure (2). As expected, participants primed with positive features of greed expressed more favorable attitudes toward greed (M = 3.12) compared with participants in the neutral-prime condition (M = 2.42), t(87) = 2.72, P < 0.01, d = 0.58. Our central prediction was that the manipulation of attitudes toward greed would moderate the relationship between social class and unethical behavior. To test this theory, we regressed the measure of unethical behavior on social class, the greed manipulation, and their interaction, while controlling for age, ethnicity, sex, religiosity, and political orientation. Results yielded a significant effect for social class, such that upper-class participants reported more unethical behavior than lower-class participants, b = 0.13, SE b = 0.07, t(84) = 2.00, P < 0.05, and a significant effect for the greed manipulation, such that participants primed with positive features of greed reported more unethical behavior than neutral-primed participants, b = 0.38, SE b = 0.18, t(84) = 2.18, P < 0.04. These effects were qualified by the predicted significant interaction between social class and the greed manipulation, b = −0.24, SE b = 0.18, t(84) = −2.34, P < 0.03. As shown in Fig. 2, in the neutral-prime condition, upper-class participants reported significantly more unethical behavior relative to lower-class participants, t(45) = 2.04, P < 0.05. However, when participants were primed with positive aspects of greed, lower-class participants exhibited high levels of unethical behavior comparable to their upper-class counterparts, t(38) = −1.42, P = 0.17. Together, the findings we observed in study 7 indicate that priming the positive features of greed moderates class-based differences in unethical behavior. Importantly, lower-class individuals were as unethical as upper-class individuals when instructed to think of greed's benefits, suggesting that upper- and lower-class individuals do not necessarily differ in terms of their capacity for unethical behavior but rather in terms of their default tendencies toward it. Discussion The results of these seven studies provide an answer to the question that initiated this investigation: Is society's nobility in fact its most noble actors? Relative to lower-class individuals, individuals from upper-class backgrounds behaved more unethically in both naturalistic and laboratory settings. Our confidence in these findings is bolstered by their consistency across operationalizations of social class, including a material symbol of social class identity (one's vehicle), assessments of subjective SES, and a manipulation of relative social-class rank, results that point to a psychological dimension to higher social class that gives rise to unethical action. Moreover, findings generalized across self-report and objective assessments of unethical behavior and in both university and nationwide samples.

additional reasons to prefer:

1) Objects of mere pleasure are only contingently objects of will, pending rational approval. I can decide that it is bad I take pleasure in torturing puppies and so refuse to act on such desires. One first must properly structure their will before desires can properly act as objects of action.

2) Only grounding the good in virtuous character can one account for moral responsibility. If one is responsible for actions, their moral content must have been under their control. This means morality must go beyond simply taking the right action, but also out of the right set of virtuous dispositions. An individual may incidentally make the right choice, and even incidentally make it for the right reason simply by luck. Only dispositions of virtuous character indicate that goodness is more than an incidental product of luck because it is persistent through varying circumstances.

more at util:

1) it takes a stance not on individuals being happy but them living rightly. Mother Teresa flourished virtuously far more than individuals who live full of self-indulgence.

2) it is not concerned with humans living, but the way they live. Keeping people alive means they have more time to be virtuous it also means they have more time to be vicious and thus misses the point – life can be good or bad as an object of pursuit since Hitler or Mao’s life was probably not valuable.

3) actions presuppose a narrow deontic goal. One agent given X data might conclude action A is good, another with different data might conclude B is good. Both could be using equally virtuous reasoning even if both actions do not have the same ends.

on-case virtue expansions:

1) Theory can begin as deontic or Aretaic. The first answers how I am required to act, and the answers are prescriptions. The second contains terms used to evaluate action or actor. It includes terms like “blameworthy,” “praiseworthy” or “virtuous.” The Aretaic cannot be derived from the deontic – which means the former must come conceptually first. **GRYZ:**[[3]](#footnote-3) The way we use words ‘good/bad’ and ‘right/wrong’ seems to support the above claims. Goodness and badness come in degrees, hence we have words like ‘better’ and ‘worse’**;** we lack similar terms for deontically evaluated **actions.** The availability of degree terms in the former case seems to indicate the presence of many criteria used in evaluation; an all-or- nothing choice, implied by the use of ‘right’ or ‘wrong’, suggests focusing on only one quantum **quality.12 But** fine-grainedness is not only a property of particular aretaic terms, the entire aretaic vocabulary is infinitely richer and allows us to draw much finer distinctions in act-evaluations than the deontic vocabulary. For example, by saying that something is praiseworthy we imply that it deserves approval or favor: we assess it higher when we say that it is admirable, since then it should be also respected and honored. The meaning of the word ‘praiseworthy’ can be quite well conveyed by saying, that it is something that ought to be done, or that it is the right (in Ross’s understanding of ‘right’) thing to do: yet expressing the word ‘admirable’ in deontic vocabulary seems just impossible. From what has been said so far one can derive an encouraging conclusion for the advocates of attractive ethics. Sheer richness and fine-grainedness of aretaic vocabulary seems to be a good reason for believing that all that can be said in deontic terms can be equally well expressed in aretaic terms. This is not to say, however, that we can produce a translation manual which would provide us with a general method of expressing deontic notions in terms of aretaic ones for all possible cases. In particular, it does not seem possible, as we hope to have shown, to substitute ‘good’ for ‘right’ or ‘deplorable’ for ‘wrong’. The relation between the aretaic and the deontic seems to be somewhat similar to the relation between the physical and the mental in the mind-body problem. We can claim that deontic is supervenient on the aretaic without committing ourselves to the idea of complete definitional reduction. In other words, we may allow for token identity (each particular action can have an aretaic description that perfectly matches the deontic one) and deny the possibility of type identity (that there is aretaic sentence true of all and only the actions having some deontic property). If this analogy is correct then the idea of definitional reduction of the deontic to the aretaic**, and in particular, Stocker’s identification of rightness and goodness,** is doomed. But we can still pursue a more modest goal. If our task is just to substitute every particular deontic evaluation with an aretaic one, there are no logical reasons that would make it impossible **(it would not work, of course, in the opposite direction).** From that perspective, attractive ethical theories seem to be much better off than the imperative ones.

2) only a virtue paradigm is capable of expressing the content of moral rules. Rules are indeterminate unless grounded in social and communal use and only such a ethical system can account for the decision making of moral life. **KRIPKE:**[[4]](#footnote-4) Following Wittgenstein, I will develop the problem initially with **respect to a mathematical example, though** the **relevant sceptical** problemappliesto all **meaningful uses of languag**e. I, like almost all English speakers, use the word ‘plus’ and the symbol ‘+’ to denote a well-**knownn** mathematical function, addition. The **function is** defined for all **pairs of positive** integers. **By means of my** external symbolic representation and my internal mental representation, I ‘grasp’ the rule for addition. One point is crucial to my ‘grasp’ of this rule. Although I myself have computed only finitely many sums in the past, the rule determines my answer for indefinitely many new sums **that I have** never **previously** considered. **This is the** whole point of the notion that in learning to add I grasp a rule: my past, intentions regarding addition determine a unique answer for indefinitely many new cases in the future. Let me suppose, for example, that ‘68 + 57’ is a computation that I have never performed before. Since I have performed — even silently to myself, let alone in m y publicly observable behavior — only finitely many computations in the past, such an example surely exists. In fact, the same finitude guarantees that there is an example exceeding, in both its arguments, all previous computations. I shall assume in what follow s that ‘68 + 57’ serves for this purpose as well. I perform the computation, obtaining, of course**,** the answer ‘125’. I am confident, **perhaps after checking my work, that ‘125’ is the correct answer.** It is correct both in the arithmetical sense **that 125 is the sum of 68 and 57,** and in the metalinguistic sense **that ‘plus’ as I intended to** use that word in the past, denoted a function which, when applied to the numbers I called ‘68’ and ‘ 57’ yields **the value 125.** Now suppose I encounter a bizarre sceptic. This sceptic questions my certainty about m y answer, in what I just called the ‘metalinguistic’ sense.Perhaps, he suggests, as I used the term ‘plus’ in the past, the answer I intended for ‘68 + 57’ should have been ‘5’! Of course the sceptic’s suggestion is obviously insane. My initial response to such a suggestion might be that the challenger should go back to school and learn to add. Let the challenger, however, continue. After all, he says, if I am now so confident that, as I used the symbol ‘+’ my intention was that ‘68 + 57’ should turn out to denote 125, this cannot be because I explicitly gave myself instructions that 125 is the result of performing the addition in this particular instance. By hypothesis, I did no such thing. But of course the idea is that, in this new instance, I should apply the very same function or rule that I applied so m any times in the past. But who is to say what function this was? In the past I gave myself only a finite number of examples instantiating this function. All, we have supposed, involved numbers smaller than 57. So perhaps in the past I used ‘plus’ and ‘+’ to denote a function which I will call ‘quus’ [Defined as plus in all instances unless the second integer equals 57] and symbolize by ‘⊕ ’ . It is defined by: x ⊕ y = x + y, if x, y < 57 = 5 v otherwise. Who is to say that this is not the function I previously meant by ‘+’? The sceptic claims (or feigns to **claim) that I** am now misinterpreting my own previous usage. By ‘plus’, he says, I always meant quus; now, under the influence ofsome insane frenzy, or a bout of LSD , I have come to misinterpret my own previous usage.Ridiculous **and fantastic** though it is, the sceptic’s hypothesis is not logically impossible. To see this, assume the common sense hypothesis that by ‘+’ I did mean addition. Then it would be possible, though surprising, that under the influence o f a momentary, ‘high’, I. should misinterpret all my past uses of the plus sign as symbolizing the quus function, and proceed, in conflict with my previous linguistic intentions, to compute 68 plus 57 as .5. (I would have made a mistake, not in mathematics, but in the supposition that I had accorded with m y previous linguistic intentions.) The sceptic is proposing that I have made a mistake precisely of this kind, but with a plus and **quus reversed. Now if** the sceptic **proposes his hypothesis sincerely, he is crazy; such a bizarre** hypothesis **as the proposal that I always meant quus is absolutely wild. Wild it indubitably is,** no doubt **it** is false; but if it is false, there must be some fact about my past usage that can be cited to refute it. For although the hypothesis is wild, it does not seem to be a priori impossible. Of course this bizarre hypothesis, and the references to LSD, or to an insane frenzy, are in a sense merely a dramatic device. The basic point is this. Ordinarily, I suppose that, in computing ‘68 + 57’ as I do, I do not simply make an unjustified leap in the dark. I follow directions I previously gave myself that uniquely determine that in this new instance I should say ‘125’ . What are these directions? By hypothesis**,** I never explicitly told myself that I should say ‘125’ in this very instance. Nor can I say that I should simply ‘do the same thing I always did’ if this means ‘compute according to the rule exhibited by my previous examples.’ That rule could just as well have been **the rule for** quaddition (the quus function) as for addition. The idea that in fact quaddition is what I meant, that in a sudden frenzy I have changed my previous usage, dramatizes the problem. In the discussion below the challenge posed by the sceptic takes two forms. First, [s]he questions whether there is any fact that I meant plus**,** not quus, that will answer his sceptical challenge. Second, [s]he questions whether I have any reason to be so confident that now I should answer ‘125’ rather than ‘ 5’. The two forms of the challenge are related, I am confident that I should answer ‘125’ because I am confident that this answer also accords with what I meant. Neither the accuracy of my computation nor of my memory is under dispute. So it ought to be agreed that if I meant plus, then unless I wish to change my usage, I am justified in answering (indeed compelled to answer) ‘125’, not '5 ’ . An answer to the sceptic must satisfy two conditions. First, it must give an account of what fact it is **(about** my mental state) that **constitutes my meaning plus**, not quus. But further, there is a condition that any putative candidate for such a fact must satisfy. It must, in some sense, show how I am justified in giving the answer ‘125’ to ’68 + 57’. **The** ‘directions’ mentioned in the previous paragraph, that determine what I should do in each instance, must somehow be ‘contained’ in any candidate for the fact as to what I meant. Otherwise, the sceptic has not been answered when he holds that my present response is arbitrary. Exactly how this condition operates will become much clearer below, after we discuss Wittgenstein’s paradox on an intuitive level, when we consider various philosophical theories as to what the fact that I meant plus might consist in. There will be m any specific objections to these theories. But all fail to give a candidate for a fact as to what I meant that would show that only ‘125’ , not ‘5’, is the answer I ‘ought’ to give. The ground rules of our formulation of the problem should be made clear. For the sceptic to converse with me at all, we must have a common language. So I am supposing that the sceptic, provisionally, is not questioning my present use of the word ‘plus’; he agrees that, according to m y present usage, ‘68 plus 57’ denotes 125. Not only does he agree with me on this, he conducts the entire debate with me in my language as I presently use it. He merely questions whether my present usage agrees with m y past usage, whether I am presently conforming to my previous linguistic intentions. The problem is not “How do I know that 68 plus 57 is 125?”,which should be answered by giving an arithmetical computation, but rather “ How do I know that ‘68 plus 57’, as I meant ‘plus’ in the past, should denote 125?” If the word ‘plus’ as I used it in the past, denoted the quus function, not the plus function (‘quaddition’ rather than addition), then my past intention was such that, asked for the value of ‘68 plus 57’ , I should have replied ‘ 5’. I put the problem in this way so as to avoid confusing questions about whether the discussion is taking place ‘both inside and outside language’ in some illegitimate sense. If we are querying the meaning of the word ‘plus’, how can we use it (and variants, like ‘quus’) at the same time? So I suppose that the sceptic assumes that he and I agree in our present uses of the word ‘plus’ : we both use it to denote addition. He does not ~~ at least initially - deny or doubt that addition is a genuine function, defined on all pairs of integers, nor does he deny that we can speak of it. Rather he asks why I now believe that by ‘plus’ in the past, I meant addition rather than quaddition. If I meant the former, then to accord with my previous usage I should say ‘125’ when asked to give the result of calculating ‘68 plus 57’. If I meant the latter, I should say ‘5’ The present exposition tends to differ from Wittgenstein’s original formulations in taking somewhat greater care to make explicit a distinction between use and mention, and between questions about present and past usage. About the present example Wittgenstein might simply ask, “How do I know that I should respond ‘125’ to the query ‘68 + 57’?” or “How do I know that ‘68 + 57’ comes out 125?” I have found that when the problem, is formulated this way, some listeners hear it as a sceptical problem about arithmetic: “How do I know that 68 + 57 is 125? ” (Why not answer this question with a mathematical proof?) At least at this stage, scepticism about arithmetic should not be taken to be in question: we may assume, if we wish, that 68 + 5 7 = 125 ; Even if the question is reformulated ‘metalinguistically’ as “ How do I know that ‘plus’, as I use it, denotes a function that, when applied to 68 and 57, yields 125?”, one may answer, “ Surely I know that ‘plus’ denotes the plus function and accordingly that ‘68 plus 57’ denotes 68 plus 57. But if I know arithmetic, I know that 68 plus 57 is 125. So I know that ‘68 plus 57’ denotes 125!” And surely, if I use language at all, I cannot doubt coherently that ‘plus’, as I now use it, denotes plus! Perhaps I cannot (at least at this stage) doubt this about my present usage. But I can doubt that my past usage of ‘plus’ denoted plus. The previous remarks - about a frenzy and LSD - should make this quite clear. Let me repeat the **problem.** The sceptic doubts whether any instructions I gave myself in the past compel (or justify) the answer ‘125’ rather than ‘5’ . He puts the challenge in terms o f a sceptical hypothesis about a change in m y usage. Perhaps when I used the term ‘plus’ in the past, I always meant quus: by hypothesis I never gave myself any explicit directions that were incompatible with such a supposition. Of course, ultimately, if the sceptic is right, the concepts of meaning and of intending one function rather than another .will make no sense. For the sceptic holds that no fact about my past history - nothing that was ever in m y mind, or in my external behavior - establishes that I meant plus rather than quus. (Nor, of course, does any fact establish that I meant quus!) But if this is correct, there can of course be no fact about which function I meant, and if there can be no fact about which particular function I meant in the past, there can be none in the present either. But before we pull the rug out from under our own feet, we begin by speaking as if the notion that at present we mean a certain function by ‘plus’ is unquestioned and unquestionable. Only past usages are to be questioned. Otherwise, we will be unable to formulate our problem. Another important rule of the game is that there are no limitations, in particular, no behaviorist limitations, on the facts that may be cited to answer the sceptic. The evidence is not to be confined to that available to an external observer, who can observe my overt behavior but not my internal mental state. It would be interesting if nothing in my external behavior could show whether I meant plus or quus, but something about my inner state could. But the problem here is more radical. Wittgenstein’s philosophy of mind has often been viewed as behavioristic, but to the extent that Wittgenstein may (or may not) be hostile to the ‘inner’, no such hostility is to be assumed as a premise; it is to be argued as a conclusion. So whatever ‘looking into my mind’ may be, the sceptic asserts that even if God were to do it, he still could not determine that I meant addition by ‘plus’. This feature of Wittgenstein contrasts, for example, with Quine’s discussion of the ‘indeterminacy of translation’ .10 There are m any points of contact between Quine’s discussion and Wittgenstein’s. Quine, however, is more than content to assume that only behavioral evidence is to be admitted into his discussion. Wittgenstein, by contrast, undertakes an extensive introspective11 investigation, and the results of the investigation, as we shall see, form a key feature of his argument. Further, the w ay the sceptical doubt is presented is not behavioristic. It is presented from the ‘inside’. Whereas Quine presents the problem about meaning in terms o f a linguist, trying to guess what someone else means by his words on the basis of his behavior, Wittgenstein’s, challenge can be presented to me as a question about myself; was there some past fact about me — what I ‘meant’ by plus - that mandates what I should do now? To return to the sceptic. The sceptic argues that when I answered ‘125’ to the problem ‘68 + 57’ , my answer was an unjustified leap in the dark; my past mental history is equally compatible with the hypothesis that I meant quus, and therefore should have said ‘ 5’ . We can put the problem this w ay: When asked for the answer to ‘68 + 57’ , I unhesitatingly and automatically produced ‘125’ , but it would seem that if previously I never performed this computation explicitly I might just as well have answered ‘ 5. Nothing justifies a brute inclination to answer one way rather than another. Many readers, I should suppose, have long been impatient to protest that our problem arises only because o f a ridiculous model of the instruction I gave m yself regarding ‘addition’ . Surely I did not merely give myself some finite number of examples**, from which** I am supposed to extrapolate the whole table (“ Let ‘+’ be the function instantiated by the following examples: . . . ” ). No doubt infinitely many functions are compatible with that. Rather I learned - and internalized instructions for - a rule which determines how addition is to be continued. What was the rule? Well, say, to take it in its most primitive form : suppose we wish to add x and y. Take a huge bunch of marbles. First count out x marbles in one heap. Then count out y marbles in another. Put the two heaps together and count out the number of marbles in the union thus formed. The result is x + y. This set of directions, I may suppose, I explicitly gave myself at some earlier time. It is engraved on my mind as on a slate. It is incompatible with the hypothesis that I meant quus. It is this set of directions, not the finite list of particular additions I performed in the past, that justifies and determines m y present response. This consideration is, after all, reinforced when we think what I really do when I add 68 and 57. I do not reply automatically with the answer ‘125’ nor do I consult some non-existent past instructions that I should answer ‘**125’ in this case. Rather** I proceed according to an algorithm **for addition that I previously learned. The algorithm is more sophisticated and practically applicable than the primitive one just described, but there is no difference in principle. Despite the initial plausibility of this objection,** thesceptic’s responseis **all too** obvious.True, if ‘count’, as I used the word in the past, referred to the act of counting **(and m y other past words are correctly interpreted in the standard w ay),** then ‘plus’ must have stood for addition. But I' applied. ‘count’ , like ‘plus’, to only finitely many past cases. Thus the sceptic can question my present interpretation o f m y past usage of ‘count’ as he did with ‘plus’ . In particular, he can claim that by ‘count’ I formerly meant quount, where to ‘quount’ a heap is to count it in the ordinary sense, unless the heap was formed as the union of two heaps, one of which has 57 or more items, in which case one must automatically give the answer ‘ 5’. It is clear that if in the past ‘counting’ meant quounting, and if I follow the rule for ‘plus’ that was quoted so triumphantly to the sceptic, I must admit that ‘68 + 57’ must yield the answer ‘ 5’ . Here I have supposed that previously ‘count’ was never applied to heaps formed as the union of sub-heaps either of which has 57 or more elements, but if this particular upper bound does not work, another will do. For the point is perfectly general: if ‘plus’ is explained in terms of ‘counting’, a non-standard interpretation of the latter will yield a non-standard interpretation of the former. It is pointless of course to protest that I intended the result of counting a heap to be independent of its composition in terms of sub-heaps: Let me have said this to myself as explicitly as possible: the sceptic will smilingly reply that once again I am misinterpreting my past usage, that actually ‘independent’ formerly meant quindependent, where ‘quindependent’ means . . . Here of course I am expounding Wittgenstein’s well know n remarks about ‘' a **rule for interpreting a rule” .** It is tempting to answer the sceptic by appealing from one rule to another more ‘basic’ rule. But the sceptical move can be repeated at the more ‘basic’ level also.Eventually the process must stop **- “ justifications** come to an end somewhere” - and I am left with a rule which is completely unreduced to any other. How can I justify my present application of such a rule, when a sceptic could easily interpret it so as to yield any of an indefinite number of other results? It seems that my application of it is an unjustified stab in the dark. I apply the rule blindly. Normally, when we consider a mathematical rule such as addition, we think of ourselves as guided in our application of it to each new instance. Just this is the difference between someone who computes new values of a function and someone who calls out numbers at random. Given my past intentions regarding the symbol ‘+’ one and only one answer is dictated as the one appropriate to ‘68 + 57 ’. On the other hand, although an intelligence tester may suppose that there is only one possible continuation to the sequence 2, 4, 6, 8, . . mathematical and philosophical sophisticates know that an indefinite number of rules (even rules stated in terms of mathematical functions as conventional as ordinary polynomials) are compatible with any such**,** finite initial segment. So if the tester urges me to respond, after 2, 4, 6, 8, . . with the unique appropriate next number, the proper response is that no such unique number exists, nor is there any unique (rule determined) infinite sequence that continues the given one. The problem can then be put this way: Did I myself, in the directions for the future that I gave myself regarding ‘+’, really differ from the intelligence tester? True, I may not merely stipulate that ‘+’ is to be a function instantiated by a finite number of computations. In addition, I may give myself directions for the further computation of ‘+’, stated in terms of other functions and rules. In turn, I may give myself directions for the further computation of these functions and rules, and so on. Eventually, however, the process must stop, with ‘ultimate’ functions and rules that I have stipulated for myself only by a finite number of examples, just as in the intelligence test. If so, is not my procedure as arbitrary as that of the man who guesses the continuation of the intelligence test? In what sense is my actual computation procedure, following an algorithm that yields ‘125’, more justified by my past instructions than an alternative procedure that would have resulted in ‘5’? Am I not simply following an unjustifiable impulse?’ Of course, these problems apply throughout language and are not confined to mathematical examples**, though it is with mathematical examples that they can be most smoothly brought out.** I think **that** I have learned the term ‘table’ in such a way that it will apply to indefinitely many future items. **So I can apply the term to a new situation, say when I enter the Eiffel Tower for the first time and see a table at the base.** Can I answer a sceptic who supposes that by ‘table’ in the past I meant tabair, where a ‘tabair’ is anything that is a table not found at the base of the Eiffel Tower**, or a chair found there? Did I think explicitly of the Eiffel Tower when I first ‘grasped** the concept of a table, gave myself directions for what I meant by ‘table’? And even if I did think of the Tower, cannot any directions I gave myself mentioning it be reinterpreted compatibly with the sceptic’s hypothesis? Most important for the ‘private language’ argument, the point of course applies to predicates of sensations, visual impressions, and the like, as well: “ How do I know that in working out the series -f 2 I must write “ 20,004, 20,006” and not “ 20,004, 20,008” ? - (The question: “ H ow do I know that this color is - ‘red’?” is similar.)” (Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics, I, §3.) The passage strikingly illustrates a central thesis of this essay: that Wittgenstein regards the fundamental problems of the philosophy of mathematics and of the ‘private language argument’ - the problem of sensation language ~ as at root identical, stemming from his paradox. The whole of §3 is a succinct and beautiful statement of the Wittgensteinian paradox; indeed the whole initial section of part I of Remarks' on the Foundations of Mathematics is a development of the problem with special reference to mathematics and logical inference. It has been supposed that all I need to do to determine my use of the word ‘green’ is to have an image, a sample, **of green that I bring to mind whenever I apply** the word in the future. When I use this to justify my application of ‘green’ to a new object, should not the sceptical problem be obvious to any reader of Goodman? Perhaps by ‘green’, in the past I meant grue,15 and the color image, which indeed was grue, was meant to direct me to apply the word ‘green’ to grue objects always. If the blue object before me now is grue, then it falls in the extension of ‘green’, as I meant it in the past. It is no help to suppose that in the past I stipulated that ‘green’ was to apply to all and only those things ‘of the same color as’ the sample. The sceptic can reinterpret ‘same color’ as same schmolor, l6 where things have the same schmolor if . . . Let us return to the example of ‘plus’ and ‘quus’ . We have just summarized the problem in terms of the basis of my present particular response: what tells me that I should say ‘125’ and not ‘5’? Of course the problem can be put equivalently in terms of the sceptical query regarding my present intent: nothing in my mental history establishes whether I meant plus or quus. So formulated, the problem may appear to be epistemological - how can anyone know which of these I meant? Given, however, that everything in my mental history is compatible both with the conclusion that I meant plus and with the conclusion that I meant quus, it is clear that the sceptical challenge is not really an epistemological one. It purports to show that nothing in my mental history of past behavior - not even what an omniscient God would know ~ could establish whether I meant plus or quus. But then it appears to follow that there was no fact about me that constituted my having meant plus rather than quus. **How could** there be, if nothing in my internal mental history or external behavior will answer the sceptic who supposes that in fact I meant quus? **If** there was no such thing as my meaning plus rather than quus in the past, neither can there be any such thing in the present. When we initially presented the paradox, we perforce used language, taking present meanings for granted. Now we see, as we expected, that this provisional concession was indeed fictive. There can be no fact as to what I meant by ‘plus’, or any other word at any time. The ladder must finally be kicked away.This, then, is the sceptical paradox. **When I respond in one way rather than another to such a problem as ‘68-l-57’,** I can have no justification for one response rather than another. Since the sceptic who supposes that I meant quus cannot be answered, there is no fact about me that distinguishes between my meaning plus and my meaning quus.Indeed, there is no fact about me that distinguishesbetween **my** meaning a definite function **by ‘plus’ (which determines my responses in new cases)** and **my meaning** nothing at all.

And **KRIPKE (2)**[[5]](#footnote-5)explains the skeptical solution: Finally, we can turn to Wittgenstein’s sceptical solution and to the consequent argument against ‘private’ rules. We have to see under what circumstances attributions of meaning are made and what role these attributions play in our lives. Following Wittgenstein’s exhortation not to think but to look, we will not reason a priori about the role such statements ought to play; rather we will find out what circumstances actually license such assertions and what role this license actually plays. It is important to realize that we are not looking for necessary and sufficient conditions (truth conditions) for following a rule, or an analysis of what such rule-following ‘consists in’ Indeed such conditions would constitute a ‘straight’ solution ’ to the sceptical problem, and have been rejected. First, consider what is true of one person considered in isolation. The ' most obvious fact is one that might have escaped us after long contemplation of the sceptical paradox. It holds no terrors in our daily lives; one actually hesitates when asked to produce an answer to an addition problem! Almost all of us unhesitatingly produce the answer ‘125’ when asked for the sum of 68 and 57, without any thought to the theoretical possibility that a quus-like rule might have been appropriate! And we do so without justification. Of course, if asked why we said ‘125’, most of us will say that we added 8 and 7 to get 15, that we put down 5 and carried 1 and so on. But then, what will we say if asked why we ‘carried’ as we do? Might our past intention not have been that ‘carry’ meant quarry; where to ‘quarry’ is . . .? The entire point of the sceptical argument is that ultimately we reach a level where we act without any reason in terms of which we can justify our action. We act unhesitatingly; but Blindly. This then is an important case of what Wittgenstein calls speaking without ‘justification’ (‘Rechtfertigung1), but not wrongfully’ ([german I could not reproduce]).75 It is part of our language game of speaking of rules that a speaker may, without ultimately giving any justification, follow his own confident inclination that this way (say, responding ‘125’) is the right way to respond, rather than another way (e.g. responding ‘5’). That is, the ‘assertability conditions’ that license an individual to say that, on a given occasion, he ought to follow his rule this way rather than that, are, ultimately, that he does what he is inclined to do. The important thing about this case is that, if we confine ourselves to looking at one person alone, his psychological states and his external behavior, this is as far as we can go. We can say that [s]he acts confidently at each application of a rule; that he says - without further justification - that the way he acts, rather than some quus-like alternative, is the way to respond. There are no circumstances under which we can say that, even if he inclines to say ‘125’, [they] should have said ‘5’, or vice versa. By definition, [they] is licensed to give, without further justification, the answer that strikes him [them] as natural and inevitable. Under what circumstances can he be wrong, say, following the wrong rule? No one else by looking at his mind; and behavior alone can say something like, “He is wrong if he does not accord with his own past intentions”; the whole point of the sceptical argument was that there can be facts about him [her] in virtue of which [s]he accords with his [her] intentions or not. All we can say, if we consider a single person in isolation, is that our ordinary practice licenses him to apply the rule in the way it strikes him. But of course this is not our usual concept of following a rule. It is by no means the case that, just because someone thinks [s]he is following a rule, there is no room for a judgement that [s]he is not really doing so. Someone - a child, an individual muddled by a drug - may think he is following a rule even though he is actually acting at random, in accordance with no rule at all. Alternatively, he may, under the influence of a drug, suddenly act in accordance with a quus-like rule changing from his first intentions. If there could be no justification for anyone to say of a person of the first type that his confidence that he is following some rule is misplaced, or of a person of the second type that he is no longer in accord with the rule that he previously followed, there would be little content to our idea that a rule, or past intention, binds future choices. We are inclined to accept conditionals of such a rough type as, ‘‘If someone means addition by ‘ + ’ then, if he remembers his past intention and wishes to conform to it, when he is queried about ‘68 + 57’, he will answer ‘125’.” The question is what substantive content such conditionals can have. If our considerations so far are correct, the answer is that, if one person is considered in isolation, the notion of a rule as guiding the person who adopts it can have no substantive content. There are, we have seen, no truth conditions or facts in virtue of which it can be the case that he accords with his past intentions or not. As long as we regard him as following a rule ‘privately’, so that we pay attention to his justification conditions alone, all we can say is that he is licensed to follow the rule as it strikes him. This is why Wittgenstein says, “To think one is obeying a rule is not to obey a rule. Hence it is not possible to obey a rule ‘privately’; otherwise thinking one was obeying a rule would be the same thing as obeying it. ” (§202) The situation is very different if we widen our gaze **from consideration of the rule follower alone** and allow ourselvesto consider him as interacting with a wider community. Others will then have justification conditions for attributing correct or incorrect rule following to the subject, and these will not be simply that the subject’s own authority is unconditionally to be accepted. Consider the example of a small child learning addition. It is obvious that his teacher will not accept just any response from the child. On **the** contrary, the child must fulfill various conditions if the teacher is to ascribe to him mastery of the concept of addition. First, for small enough examples, the child must produce, almost all the time, the ‘right’ answer. If a child insists the answer ‘7’ to the query ‘2 + 3’, and a ‘3’ to ‘2 + 2 ’, and makes various **other** elementary mistakes, the teacher will say to him, “ You are not adding. Either you are computing another function” - I suppose he would not really talk quite this way to a child! - “ or, more probably, you are as yet following no rule at all, but only giving whatever random answer enters your head. ” Suppose, however, the child gets almost all ‘small’ addition problems right. For larger computations, the child can make more mistakes **than for ‘small’** problems, but it must get a certain number right and, when it is wrong, it must recognizably be ‘trying to follow’ the proper procedure, not a quus-like procedure, even though it makes mistakes. (Remember, the teacher is not judging how accurate or adept the child is as an adder, but whether he can be said to be following the rule for adding.) Now, what do I mean when I say that the teacher judges that, for certain cases, the pupil must give the ‘right’ answer? I mean that the teacher judges that the child has given the same answer that [they] him[them]self would give.

*This takes out self-legislation; if one gives rules to oneself one is both legislature and judge and can interpret any self-given rule to accord with any action. Only public rules are meaningful.*

3)only virtue paradigms can both provide principles that can extend in application and be socially bounded. **MAYO:[[6]](#footnote-6)** No doubt the fundamental moral question is just ‘What ought I to do?’ And according to the philosophy of moral principles, the answer (which must be an imperative ‘Do this’) must be derived from a conjunction of premisses consisting (in the simplest case) firstly of a rule, or universal imperative, enjoining (or forbidding) all actions of a certain type in situations of a certain type, and, secondly, a statement to the effect that this is a situation of that type, falling under that rule. In practice the emphasis may be on supplying only one of these premisses, the other being assumed or taken for granted: one may answer the question ‘What ought I to do?’ either by quoting a rule which I am to adopt, or by showing that my case is legislated for by a rule which I do adopt. To take a previous example of moral per plexity,1 if I am in doubt whether to tell the truth about his condition to a dying man, my doubt may be resolved by showing that the case comes under a rule about the avoidance of unnecessary suffering, which I am assumed to accept. But if the case is without precedent in my moral career, my problem may be soluble only by adopting a new principle about what I am to do now and in the future about cases of this kind. This second possibility offers a connection with moral ideals. Suppose my perplexity is not merely an unprecedented situation which I could cope with by adopting a new rule. Suppose the new rule is thoroughly inconsistent with my existing moral code. This may happen, for instance, if the moral code is one to which I only pay lip-service; if (in the language of IX , 7) its ; authority is not yet internalised, or if it has ceased to be so; it is i ready for rejection, but its final rejection awaits a moral crisis such as we are assuming to occur. What I now need is not a rule for deciding how to act in this situation and others of its kind. I need a whole set of rules, a complete morality, new principles to live by. Now according to the philosophy of moral character, there is another way of answering the fundamental question **‘What ; ought I to do?’** Instead of quoting a rule, we quote a quality of ' character, a virtue: we say ‘Be brave’, or ‘Be patient’ or ‘Be lenient’. We may even say ‘Be a man’: if I am in doubt, say, whether to take a risk, and someone says ‘Be a man’, meaning a morally sound man, in this case a man of sufficient courage. (Compare the very different ideal invoked in ‘Be a gentleman’. I shall not discuss whether this is a moral ideal.) Here, too, we have the extreme cases, where a man’s moral perplexity extends not merely to a particular situation but to his whole way of living. And now the question ‘What ought I to do?**’** turns into the question ‘What ought I to be?’ — as, indeed, it was treated in the first place. (‘Be brave.’) It is answered, not by quoting a rule **or a set of rules,** but **by** describing a quality of character or a type of person. And here the ethics of character gains a practical simplicity which offsets the greater logical simplicity of the ethics of principles. We do not have to give a list of characteristics or virtues, as we might list a set of principles. We can give a unity to our answer. Of course we can in theory give a unity to our principles: this is implied by speaking of a set of principles. But if such a set is to be a system and not a mere aggregate, the unity we are looking for is a logical one, namely the possibility that some principles are deducible from others, and ultimately from one. But the attempt to construct a deductive moral system is notoriously difficult, and in any case ill-founded. Why should we expect that all rules of conduct should be ultimately reducible to a few? 9. Saints and Heroes But when we are asked ‘What shall I be?’ we can readily give a unity to **our answer**, though not a logical unity. It is the unity of character. A person’s character is not merely a list of dispositions; it has the organic unity of something that is more than the sum of its parts.And We can say, in answer to our morally perplexed questioner, not only ‘Be this’ and ‘Be that’, but also ‘Be like So-and-So’ — where So-and-So is either an ideal type of character, or else an actual person taken as representative of the ideal, an exemplar. Examples of the first are Plato’s ‘just man’ in the Republic; Aristotle’s man of practical wisdom, in the Nicomachean Ethics; Augustine’s citizen of the City of God; the good Communist; the American way of life (which is a co lective expression for a type of character). Examples of the second kind, the exemplar, are Socrates, Christ, Buddha, St. Francis, the heroes of epic writers and of novelists. Indeed the idea of the Hero, as well as the idea of the Saint, are very much the expression of this attitude to morality. Heroes and saints are not merely people who did things. They are people whom we are expected, and expect ourselves, to imitate. And imitating them means not merely doing what they did; it means being like them. Their status is not in the least like that of legislators whose laws we admire; for the character of a legislator is irrelevant to our judgment about his legislation. The heroes and saints did not merely give us principles to live by (though some of them did that as well): they gave us examples to follow.

*Social interpretation is not enough to grasp deontic rules, because I cannot be made aware of socially defined rules to legislate action in all moral contexts.*

contention level frontlines:

**AT uniqueness press:**

1) The NC would evaluate maxims or actions, not worlds. It’s not like the neg world has to be good, you just don’t need to take this action or this additional action is illegitimate. In not doing that, we’re better. There are better things we could be doing, but no need for a counterplan.

2) the argument is comparative – attaching even more value to money is probably even worse since money is a variable good, so claiming that more money is a legitimate object of pursuit is definitively better than the status quo.

3) I don’t need to fiat an orientation of the will – certain orientations toward wealth are good and we should take actions that promote such an orientation rather than get farther away from Epicureanism.

weighing for contention 1:

Your concession of impact calculus under the standard is devastating – it is not about promoting virtue, as that is a consequence that is uncertain or could be perverted. In promoting virtues, you’re making virtues the object of the will as opposed to the structure of the will but *any* object or pursuit has only variable value. For example, in trying to be courageous, I might become foolhardy. This trick excludes your consequentialist turns – the most relevant consideration is the orientation of government policies and the structure of government will. At that point extend [contention 1]
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