

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	xv
INTRODUCTION	xvii
CHAPTER ONE: A BRENTANIST THEORY OF MORAL JUDGMENTS	1
1.1. The Theory	1
1.1.1. <i>Brentano's Analysis of the Meaning of Moral Judgments</i>	1
1.1.2. <i>My Own Revised Account – 'The Brentanist Theory'</i>	4
1.2. Grounds for Preferring the Brentanist Theory to the Standard Non-Cognitivist Theories	10
1.2.1. <i>Cognitivism and Non-Cognitivism</i>	10
1.2.2. <i>Emotivism</i>	11
1.2.3. <i>Emotivism and Moral Disagreement</i>	12
1.2.4. <i>Can Emotivism Explain the Difference Between Moral Judgments and Non-Moral Judgments?</i>	13
1.2.5. <i>Emotivism Cannot Give a Satisfactory Account of What Happens When People Change Their Views About Moral Questions</i>	15
1.2.6. <i>According to Emotivism a Favorable (Unfavorable) Moral Judgment About Something Is Insincere Unless One Has a Favorable (Unfavorable) Attitude About It</i>	16
1.2.7. <i>Prescriptivism Denies the Possibility of Moral Weakness</i>	17

1.2.8. <i>Prescriptivism and Emotivism Are Unable to Account for the Fact that There Are People Who Are Completely Indifferent to Moral Considerations (Amoralists)</i>	18
1.2.9. <i>Prescriptivism and Emotivism Are Unable to Account for the Fact that There Are People Who Are Moved by Anti-Moral Considerations (Immoralists)</i>	19
1.2.10. <i>Non-Cognitivist Views Cannot Account for the Fact that Moral Judgments Purport to Be Objectively Correct</i>	21
1.3. <i>Grounds for Preferring the Brentanist Theory to the Standard Cognitivist Theories</i>	24
1.3.1 <i>Cognitivist Theories Avoid the Problems Discussed in Sections 1.2.3 and 1.2.4</i>	24
1.3.2. <i>Cognitivist Theories Cannot Account for the Practical and Emotive Force of Moral Judgments</i>	25
1.3.3. <i>Intuitionist Theories such as Moore's Are Unintelligible Unless Understood in Terms of Something Like the Brentanist Theory</i>	29
1.3.4. <i>The Brentanist Theory Implies that the Question 'Is It Rational to Be Moral?' Makes No Sense</i>	29
1.3.5. <i>Some Criticisms of Foot's Version of Cognitivism</i>	30
1.3.6. <i>Reflection on the Question of What Would Constitute an Adequate Answer to Moral Skepticism Supports the Brentanist Theory</i>	34
1.3.7. <i>Conclusion of Sections 1.2 and 1.3</i>	35
1.4. <i>Answers to Some Objections to the Brentanist Theory</i>	35
1.4.1. <i>Can the Brentanist Theory Provide a Satisfactory Account of the Difference Between Moral and Non-Moral Judgments?</i>	35
1.4.2. <i>Can the Brentanist Theory Distinguish Between the Good and the Right, and the Bad and the Wrong?</i>	37

1.4.3. <i>Would It Be an Objection to the Brentanist Theory if Attitudes Cannot Be Objectively Correct?</i>	41
CHAPTER TWO: THE IDEAL OBSERVER THEORY AND MORAL OBJECTIVISM	43
2.1. An Argument for Accepting the Ideal Observer Theory as a Standard for Determining the Correctness of Moral Judgments	43
2.1.1. <i>There Do Not Seem to Be Any Moral Facts in the Sense Allowed by the Brentanist Theory</i>	43
2.1.2. <i>Together, the Brentanist Theory and the (Apparent) Fact that There Are No Moral Facts Commit Us to a Version of the Ideal Observer Theory</i>	47
2.2. Firth's Version of the Ideal Observer Theory	48
2.2.1. <i>Firth's Theory</i>	49
2.2.2. <i>Firth's Theory Contrasted with Brandt's Version of the IOT</i>	50
2.2.3. <i>Ideal Observers Might Disagree in Their Views or Attitudes About Certain Moral Issues; Therefore, Firth's Theory Fails to Support a Strong Version of Moral Objectivism</i>	51
2.2.4. <i>Duncker's Attempt to Show that All Disagreements About Moral Questions Are Dependent on Disagreements About Matters of Fact</i>	52
2.2.5. <i>Firth's Ideal Observers Would Not All Agree in Their Attitudes About Any Moral Questions; Therefore, Firth Is Committed to an Extreme Version of Relativism</i>	54
2.3. My Characterization of the Ideal Observer	56
2.3.1. <i>An Ideal Observer Must Be Fully Informed</i>	56
(a) Some difficulties in formulating the requirement of full information	57

(b)	Having full information requires a knowledge and vivid representation of the experiences of other people	58
(c)	Some ways in which the requirement that ideal observers must adequately represent other people's experiences helps to insure that they will agree in their attitudes	59
(d)	What is involved in 'adequately representing' another person's experiences?	60
(e)	Is the ability to represent adequately the experiences of other people compatible with one's being human?	65
(f)	Will an ideal observer be too squeamish in his reactions?	65
2.3.2.	<i>A Way of Strengthening Firth's Requirement that Ideal Observers Be Fully Informed</i>	66
2.3.3.	<i>The Views and Attitudes of an Ideal Observer Cannot Be Dependent on His Having Been Influenced by Others Who Are Not Ideal Observers</i>	68
2.3.4.	<i>An Ideal Observer Must Have Full Knowledge of All Relevant Moral Principles</i>	69
2.3.5.	<i>The Attitudes and Judgments of an Ideal Observer Cannot Involve 'Emotional Displacement'</i>	70
2.3.6.	<i>The Views and Attitudes of an Ideal Observer Cannot Involve Self-Deception</i>	72
2.3.7.	<i>An Ideal Observer Must Be a Human Being</i>	75
2.3.8.	<i>An Ideal Observer Need Not Be Impartial, Disinterested, or Dispassionate</i>	76
2.3.9.	<i>An Ideal Observer Need Not Be "Normal"</i>	79
2.4	Three Versions of the Ideal Observer Theory and Their Implications for the Objectivity of Moral Judgments	80
2.4.1.	<i>The Version of the IOT According to Which the Correctness of a Moral Judgment Is Determined by Its Acceptability to Ideal Observers</i>	81

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xi

2.4.2. <i>The Version of the IOT According to Which the Correctness of a Moral Judgment About Something Is Determined by the Attitudes that Ideal Observers Would Have About It</i>	82
2.4.3. <i>Some Difficulties with the Second Version of the IOT</i>	83
2.4.4. <i>What Counts as a Favorable or Unfavorable Attitude?</i>	86
2.4.5. <i>The Implications of the Second Version of the IOT for Questions About the Objectivity of Morals</i>	91
2.4.6. <i>The IOT as a Standard for the Correctness of an Individual Person's Moral Judgments</i>	94
2.5. Sermonette on the Importance of Empathy	98
2.6. Intuitionism and the Ideal Observer Theory	100
CHAPTER THREE: RELATIVISM AND NIHILISM	103
3.1 Some Different Meanings of the Term 'Ethical Relativism'	105
3.1.1. <i>Cultural Relativism</i>	106
3.1.2. <i>Situational Relativism</i>	106
3.1.3. <i>Normative Relativism</i>	108
3.1.4. <i>Meta-Ethical Relativism</i>	109
3.1.5. <i>Meta-Ethical Relativism Contrasted with Moral Skepticism</i>	110
3.2. The Definition of 'Meta-Ethical Relativism'	110
3.2.1. <i>An Objection to the Standard Definition</i>	110
3.2.2. <i>A Revised Definition</i>	111
3.2.3. <i>Some Derivative Notions</i>	114
3.3. Some Necessary Conditions of One's Accepting a Moral Judgment or a Moral Principle	115
3.3.1. <i>A Moral Judgment</i>	116
3.3.2. <i>A Moral Principle</i>	116

3.4. Meta-Ethical Relativism and Nihilism	118
3.4.1. <i>A Preliminary Argument</i>	119
3.4.2. <i>An Objection Considered</i>	120
3.4.3. <i>The Concept of Subjective Truth</i>	120
3.5. A Non-Nihilistic Version of Meta-Ethical Relativism	121
3.5.1. <i>Two Necessary Conditions for a Non-Nihilistic Version of Meta-Ethical Relativism</i>	121
3.5.2. <i>That the View Defended in Chapter Two Constitutes a Non-Nihilistic Version of Meta-Ethical Relativism</i>	123
3.5.3. <i>Other Non-Nihilistic Versions of Meta-Ethical Relativism</i>	124
3.6. Conclusion	126
3.6.1. <i>My Theory Is Not a Rejection of Morality in Toto</i>	126
3.6.2. <i>An Objection Considered</i>	128
 CHAPTER FOUR: THE WAGES OF RELATIVISM	 132
4.1. What Sorts of Attitudes and Commitments Presuppose a Belief in the Objectivity of Normative Judgments?	133
4.1.1. <i>Normative Judgments Are Statements About the Correctness of Attitudes</i>	133
4.1.2. <i>HMER Does Not Commit One to Being Indifferent to Everything</i>	134
4.1.3. <i>Attitudes Such as Guilt, Resentment, and “Moral Seriousness” Presuppose the Falsity of HMER</i>	137
(a) Guilt	137
(b) Resentment	139
(c) Taking moral questions seriously	139
4.2. Causal or Psychological Connections Between Meta-Ethical Views and Attitudes and First-Order Normative Standards	141

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xiii

4.2.1. <i>The Status of Aesthetic Standards</i>	141
4.2.2. <i>The Likely Consequences of One's Adopting HMER</i>	142
4.2.3. <i>The Effects of Accepting SMER</i>	145
 APPENDIX I: NIETZSCHE ON THE GENEALOGY OF MORALS	 147
I.1. Nietzsche's Claims Concerning the Genealogy of Morals	148
I.2. What Are Nietzsche's Genetic Claims Intended to Show?	152
 APPENDIX II: NORMATIVE RELATIVISM AND NIHIL- ISM	 157
 APPENDIX III: HARE'S VERSION OF THE IDEAL OB- SERVER THEORY	 163
 NOTES	 171
 SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	 191
 INDEX	 197