

**National Research University – Higher School of Economics**  
Faculty of Humanities  
**Syllabus of the course: “Analytic Ethics”**  
Bachelor’s program “Philosophy”

**Government of the Russian Federation**

**National Research University “Higher School of Economics”**

Faculty of Humanities

School of Philosophy

Syllabus of the course:

**Analytic Ethics**

Bachelor’s program “Philosophy (47.03.01)”

Author of the syllabus: Boris Kashnikov, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor.

Approved by the Department of Practical Philosophy

day/month/year «\_\_»\_\_\_\_\_ 2016

Head of the school:

(signature)

**National Research University – Higher School of Economics**  
Faculty of Humanities  
**Syllabus of the course: “Analytic Ethics”**  
Bachelor’s program “Philosophy”

Moscow, 2016

*This syllabus cannot be used by other university departments and other higher education institutions without the explicit permission of the Faculty of Humanities.*

## 1 Scope of the Use

The current program outlines the requirements for the studies and the content of the course. The syllabus is developed for the department, responsible for teaching the course, professors and teaching assistants, students of the bachelor’s program ‘Philosophy’. This syllabus meets the standards required by: Academic Standards of National Research University “Higher School of Economics”. Curriculum of the bachelor’s program ‘Philosophy’ (47.03.01). Although currently developed for the philosophers, the course is interdisciplinary and can be taught with little modifications at the department of Economics, Law, Political Science, International Relation and Psychology, simply because morality is interdisciplinary and moral discourse is widely present within the practical and theoretical discourses of all these spheres of knowledge. The contemporary economic as well as political discourse presupposes moral arguments and those who are able to use these arguments well are better equipped for it.

## 2 The purpose of the course

- The students are getting some basic skills of ethical analysis. The analysis will be based of both descriptive and prescriptive approach.
- They are getting some positive knowledge related to this much disputed sphere.
- They are supposed to work out some firm and everlasting personal moral values.

## 3 Supposed results.

The students are supposed to adopt the following competences:

System competencies

<b>Code (RUS)</b>	<b>Code (ENG)</b>	<b>Competence description</b>
<b>CK-1</b>	<b>SC-1</b>	Ability to analyze and improve familiar research methods and professional skills
<b>CK-2</b>	<b>SC-2</b>	Ability to generate concepts and theoretical

**National Research University – Higher School of Economics**  
Faculty of Humanities  
**Syllabus of the course: “Analytic Ethics”**  
Bachelor’s program “Philosophy”

		models, to test new methods and tools for professional activities
<b>CK-3</b>	<b>SC-3</b>	Ability to learn new research methods and approaches on his/her own, to evolve professionally
<b>CK-8</b>	<b>SC-8</b>	Ability to carry out research and other professional activities in an international environment

Professional competencies

<b>Code (RUS)</b>	<b>Code (ENG)</b>	<b>Competence description</b>
<b>ПК-1</b>	<b>PC-1</b>	Ability to organize research and analytical teamwork
<b>ПК-2</b>	<b>PC-2</b>	Ability to use organizational and managerial skills in her/his research and social projects, consulting activities, analytical work.
<b>ПК-3</b>	<b>PC-3</b>	Ability to freely use foreign languages for professional communication
<b>ПК-4</b>	<b>PC-4</b>	Ability to communicate effectively with different audiences, to deliver her/his message clearly and to tailor it depending on the audience’s age, education, attitude to the speaker, etc.
<b>ПК-5</b>	<b>PC-5</b>	Ability to report the work results and present them according to required standards
<b>ПК-6</b>	<b>PC-6</b>	Ability to prepare analytical materials (reviews, notes, reports, recommendations, etc) and policy proposals for decision-makers.
<b>ПК-8</b>	<b>PC-8</b>	Ability to analyze political, economic and sociological data using different qualitative and quantitative methods.

**National Research University – Higher School of Economics**  
Faculty of Humanities  
**Syllabus of the course: “Analytic Ethics”**  
Bachelor’s program “Philosophy”

<b>ПК-9</b>	<b>PC-9</b>	Ability to use deep knowledge of legal and ethical standards in assessing the impact of his/her professional decisions, especially when working on important social issues.
<b>ПК-10</b>	<b>PC-10</b>	Ability to apply knowledge of contemporary research methods, to interpret the results of research and to present them in an ethical manner

Personal and social competencies

<b>Code (RUS)</b>	<b>Code (ENG)</b>	<b>Competence description</b>
<b>ПК-11</b>	<b>PC-11</b>	Ability to define and spread legal and ethical standards in her/his professional and social activities.
<b>ПК-12</b>	<b>PC-12</b>	Ability to leverage social and multicultural differences to solve problems in professional and social activities
<b>ПК-16</b>	<b>PC-16</b>	Ability to address ideological, social and personal challenges and issues
<b>ПК-17</b>	<b>PC-17</b>	Ability to act according to the principles of social responsibility in her/his professional activity

#### **4 Role of the discipline within the structure of Bachelor’s program**

*The course is mandatory. It is taught in the fourth year of bachelor’s program ‘Philosophy’. It requires prior knowledge in the basics of the history of philosophy, general ethics and elementary logic. In addition to that some basic knowledge of history, economics, politics and psychology is welcome. The course is both a theoretical a practical. The contemporary analytic ethics is a foundation for the contemporary applied ethics, which is widely used in all spheres of contemporary life from war to engineering, from social work to economic distribution. The course is designed as a link to bridge the gap between the theoretical and practical knowledge. Ethics is generally regarded as a practical philosophy.*

**National Research University – Higher School of Economics**  
Faculty of Humanities  
**Syllabus of the course: “Analytic Ethics”**  
Bachelor’s program “Philosophy”

*Analytic ethics is even more practical. It rejects any metaphysics and is based solely on logic, language, common sense and science, which is why it is by and large interdisciplinary. The students know some of the theories of the contemporary analytic ethics, like “A Theory of Justice” by John Rawls or “Anarchy, State and Utopia” by Robert Nozick (both translated in Russian). Usually, those who study these works cannot understand them fully, because of the lack of the deeper understanding of the foundations of the analytic ethics. The course is taught in English because very little amount of literature is translated into Russian.*

## 5 Course Plan

№	Topic	Total hours	Work in the class		Home work
			Lectures	Seminars	
1.	Moral discourse and theories of language and meaning	10	2		8
2.	The intuitionism	10	2	2	6
3.	The emotivism	10	2	2	6
4.	Prescriptivism	12	2	2	8
5.	Descriptivism. The deduction of “Ought” from “Is”. Searle and Gewirth.	10	2	2	6
6.	Descriptivism. Morality grounded in human wants.	12	2	2	6
7.	Descriptivism. Morality grounded in human telos.	14	2	4	8
8.	Neo-intuitionism and “multi-level theories”.	10	2	2	6
9.	Science and morality	12	2	2	8
10.	The beginning theory. Evolution and morality.	10	2	2	6
<b>Total:</b>		108	20	20	68

## 6 Requirements and Grading

Type of grading	Type of work	Parameters
Current	Final Research Paper	20 thousand characters paper by the end of the first module is due to give an analyses of one of the basic theories

**National Research University – Higher School of Economics**  
Faculty of Humanities  
**Syllabus of the course: “Analytic Ethics”**  
Bachelor’s program “Philosophy”

	Homework	Weekly homework is due. Oral presentation of the main thesis of the paper by the end of the term
Final	Exam	

### 6.1 Course Evaluation Criteria

Class attendance is required. Unexcused absences will lower the participation grade. Students are expected to regularly do the homework reading and study according to the lists of sources provided by the instructor. On seminars students are expected to take active part at the discussion and demonstrate good acquaintance with content of lectures and respective literature. The deadlines should be met. In case of the missed deadline the instructor will extract one point off the grade for each day missed. The Research Paper will be evaluated on the basis of the text written and oral presentation of it. The paper should contain the analyses of literature on the subject as well as personal attitude to the subject matter. The oral exam by the end of the course will be provided in the form of a conversation of the student with the course instructor on one of the topics of the course.

## 7 Course Description. The content of the course.

### 1. Moral discourse and theories of meaning

The meaning of the terms ‘morals’ and ‘ethics’, ‘good’, ‘right’ and ‘ought’. Moral Psychology. Lawrence Kohlberg's stages of moral development. The difference of prescriptive and descriptive statements. The history of morality. The sociology of morals. Religious and secular ethics and morality. Positive law and the need of moral foundations of legality. Etiquette. Customs. Customary and reflective morality. The difference of morals and rationality. Traits of moral principles: Prescriptivity, Universalizability, Overridingness, Publicity, Practicability. The purpose of morality. The structure of morality. Moral Rules, Principles, Virtues and Actions. Metaethics, Normative morality, Applied ethics, Theoretical ethics. Ethical relativism and objectivism. Egoism and altruism. Psychological Egoism. The paradox of Egoism. The meaning of metaethics. Metaethical intuitionism. Other forms of intuitionisms. Emotivism and prescriptivism. Naturalism. Metaethics and morals. Reportive definition. Stipulative definition. Theoretical definitions: Analytical and ostensive definition. The logic of moral reasoning. Moral Relativism. Egoism. Virtue. Religious Ethics. Ethics of Conscience. Convention. Legalism. The Natural Law. Elitism. Deontology. Bureaucratic Ethics. Particularism. Sentimentalism. Utilitarianism. Relations between fact and value. The debate about naturalism. Non-cognitivism. Cognitivism. The classification of the main approaches in analytic ethics.

**Required readings:**

My lectures. From # 1 to # 4.

**Optional readings:**

Fotion, Nick. *Theory vs Anti-Theory in Ethics. A Misconceived Conflict.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

Pojman, Louis. *Ethics. Discovering Right and Wrong.* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing company, 1999)

Narveson, Jan. *This is Ethical Theory.* (Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 2009)

Williams, Bernard. *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy.* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1985)

Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy.* (The Macmillan Press, LTD, 1983)

Baron, Peter. *Meta-ethics: Ethics Study Guide.* (Southover, Wells: PuSHMe Press, 2014)

Miller, Alexander. *An Introduction to Contemporary Metaethics.* (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003)

Wilson, A. *An Introduction to Contemporary Meta-ethics.* (Polity Press, 2003)

*Moral Discourse and Practice. Some Philosophical Approaches.* Ed. by Stephen Darwall, Allan Gibbard and Peter Railton. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

## **2. The intuitionism**

The basic idea of Moore’s intuitionism. The impossibility to define goodness. Intuition as a form of Aposteriory perception of a simply quality, which must be “clearly and distinctively true”. The parallel between apprehending of color and of moral goodness. The definition of “Naturalistic fallacy” (turning a feature of goodness into a definition of goodness). An open question argument. Objectivist objection to the naturalistic fallacy. Comments on Moore’s view. The confusion of complex ideas with simple ones.

Prichard on intuitive duties. “Does moral philosophy rest on a mistake”? Our obligations do not beg moral reasoning. Ross’s intuitionism. The rejection of a single criterion of intrinsic goodness. The rejection of absolute duties. Seven Prima Facie Duties. Fidelity, Reparation, Gratitude, Non-injury, Harm-prevention, Beneficence, Self-improvement, Justice. The quality of intuition and the possibility of reassessment. The link with naturalism. Cognitivism. Three more prima facie duties: respect for freedom, care and non-parasitism. Practical application. Skeptical attack on intuitive ethics. The argument from queerness. Synderesis rule of Aquinas and its similarity with intuitionism. Practical application of intuitionism in applied ethics.



**Required readings:**

My lectures. # 5.

Prichard, H. L. *Does Moral Philosophy Rest on a Mistake?* // Mind. Vol. 21, # 81, (Jan. 1912), 21-37.

Ross, David. *The Right and the Good*. (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002).

Moore, J. E. *Principia Ethica*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1922).

**Optional readings:**

Pojman, Louis. *Ethics. Discovering Right and Wrong*. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing company, 1999)

Narveson, Jan. *This is Ethical Theory*. (Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 2009)

Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy*. (The Macmillan Press, LTD, 1983)

Baron, Peter. *Meta-ethics: Ethics Study Guide*. (Southover, Wells: PuSHMe Press, 2014)

Miller, Alexander. *An Introduction to Contemporary Metaethics*. (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003)

Wilson, A. *An Introduction to Contemporary Meta-ethics*. (Polity Press, 2003)

### **3. The emotivism**

The background of emotivism in Hume. Hume’s fork. Language about the real world: either analytic or synthetic. Analytic statement is true by definitions. Synthetic statement can only be verified by experience. The emotivism of Ayer. “Language, Truth and Logic”. Moral statements are neither analytic nor synthetic. Principle of Verification. Impossibility to verify moral statements. The threefold target for Ayer: Utilitarianism, Subjectivism and Intuitionism. Ayer on Open Question Argument. Pseudo-concepts. Ethical statements are not analyzable. The challenge of subjectivism. Is amoral argument impossible if moral statements are calculated to arouse feelings and to stimulate action? Implications of Ayer’s theory. Boo/Hooray theory. Criticisms of Ayer. Ethics as a branch of Psychology. MacIntyre’s criticism of emotivism. All our contemporary culture as the culture of emotivism. Stevenson’s emotivism. Beliefs and attitudes. The meaning of good. Moral disagreement. The analysis of ethical language must include its persuasive force. The non-rational nature of moral discourse.

**Required readings:**

My lectures. # 6.

Ayer, A.J. *Language, Truth and Logic* (New York: Dover, 1946).

Stevenson, Charles. *The Emotive Meaning of Ethical Terms // Moral Discourse and Practice. Some Philosophical Approaches*. Ed. by Stephen Darwall, Allan Gibbard and Peter Railton. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997) 71-83.

Hume, David. *Enquiries Concerning the Principles of Morals*. Any edition.

**Optional readings:**

Pojman, Louis. *Ethics. Discovering Right and Wrong*. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing company, 1999)

Narveson, Jan. *This is Ethical Theory*. (Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 2009)

Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy*. (The Macmillan Press, LTD, 1983)

Baron, Peter. *Meta-ethics: Ethics Study Guide*. (Southover, Wells: PuSHMe Press, 2014)

Miller, Alexander. *An Introduction to Contemporary Metaethics*. (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003)

Wilson, A. *An Introduction to Contemporary Meta-ethics*. (Polity Press, 2003)

## **4. Prescriptivism**

Richard Hare and the idea of prescriptivism. Rationality of ethical discourse. Moral language as a language of a special type which has its own rules of use. Three essential features of prescriptivism. Logical connection between moral language and universalizability and between universalizability and preference utilitarianism. The general logic of moral statements. The meaning of moral statements is to guide reasonable actions. Illocutionary force of moral utterings. Supervenience. Moral principles. Prescriptivity, Universalizability and Overridingness of moral principles. The elements of Kantian deontology. Moral syllogism. Moral statements as rational commitments to action. Nonfactual proposition. Prescriptive and descriptive meaning of ethical statements. Hare’s link with utilitarian ethics. Preference utilitarianism. The greatest cumulative preference. Maximization of happiness as the only reasonable purpose of morality. Moral and Special meaning of Goodness. Implications of prescriptivism. The elements of naturalism. Evaluation of prescriptivism. The possibility of “Moral fanaticism”. Moral reductionism. The threat of moral subjectivism.

**Required readings:**

My lecture # 7.

Hare, R.M. *The Language of Morals* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952)

Hare, R.M. *Freedom and Reason* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977)

**Optional readings:**

- Pojman, Louis. *Ethics. Discovering Right and Wrong*. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing company, 1999)
- Narveson, Jan. *This is Ethical Theory*. (Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 2009)
- Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy*. (The Macmillan Press, LTD, 1983)
- Baron, Peter. *Meta-ethics: Ethics Study Guide*. (Southover, Wells: PuSHMe Press, 2014)
- Miller, Alexander. *An Introduction to Contemporary Metaethics*. (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003)
- Wilson, A. *An Introduction to Contemporary Meta-ethics*. (Polity Press, 2003)

**5. Descriptivism. The deduction of Ought from Is. Searle and Gewirth.**

Hume’s early attempts of the derivation. Different interpretations of the gap between facts and values. The attempts to claim the possibility to bridge the gap. 1964 Article by Searle “How to Derive ‘Ought’ from ‘Is’”. The distinction between description and evaluation, fact and value. A conflation of different kinds of illocutionary force in the writings of the previous authors on the matter. Factual premises can entail evaluative conclusions. The ‘Brute Facts’ and ‘Institutional Facts’. The classification of facts. Institutional facts and their constitutive rules. The institution of promising. Empirical assumptions, tautologies and descriptions of word usage as the necessary assumption of the transition from ‘Is’ to ‘Ought’. The further development of the basic ideas in the ‘Speech Acts’.

Alan Gewirth’s derivation of ‘Ought’ from ‘Is’ in his ‘Reason and Morality’. Human action as voluntary and purposive. The principle of ‘Generic Consistency’. The defining characteristics of ‘ought’: other-regarding, prescriptive, egalitarian, determinate, categorical. Rational and conative features of moral agents. 7 stages of derivation of ‘Ought’ from ‘Is’. Criticism of Gewirth. ‘Begging the question’ nature of the main argument of the institutional facts. The criticism of ‘trivialization of morality’. Misunderstanding of the function of reason.

**Required readings:**

- My lecture # 8.
- Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy*. (The Macmillan Press, LTD, 1983). Chapter 6.
- Searle, John. *Terrorism. Speech Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1969)
- Gewirth, Alan. *Reason and Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1978)
- Hume, David. *Enquiries Concerning the Principles of Morals*. Any edition.

**Optional readings:**

- Narveson, Jan. *This is Ethical Theory*. (Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 2009)
- Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy*. (The Macmillan Press, LTD, 1983)
- Baron, Peter. *Meta-ethics: Ethics Study Guide*. (Southover, Wells: PuSHMe Press, 2014)
- Miller, Alexander. *An Introduction to Contemporary Metaethics*. (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003)
- Wilson, A. *An Introduction to Contemporary Meta-ethics*. (Polity Press, 2003)

**6. Descriptivism. Morality grounded in human wants.**

Philippa Foot’s earlier views. The basic wants of a human being. A good human being as a human being with characteristics that promote the four ends of survival, reproduction, pleasure and group flourishing. The rationality of these promotions. The concept of Eudaimonia. The universalizability of want. The classification of wants. The problematic nature of ‘justice’ in the structure of wants. Justice as the interest of the other. Justice as the interest of the self. The contradiction of the two. Criticism based on incompatible nature of ought and want.

Philippa Foot’s later views. The well-being of other instead of personal interest. ‘Conclusive and universal’ nature of wants, which makes them compatible to moral oughts. The sense of identification with others. Justice as acting against personal interests. Comparison of morality and etiquette. Criticism. The problems of teaching morality.

**Required readings:**

- My lecture #9.
- Foot, Philippa. *Virtues and vices and other essays in moral philosophy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978)
- Foot, Philippa. *Natural Goodness* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001)

**Optional readings:**

- Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy*. (The Macmillan Press, LTD, 1983)
- Baron, Peter. *Meta-ethics: Ethics Study Guide*. (Southover, Wells: PuSHMe Press, 2014)
- Miller, Alexander. *An Introduction to Contemporary Metaethics*. (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003)
- Wilson, A. *An Introduction to Contemporary Meta-ethics*. (Polity Press, 2003)

## **7. Descriptivism. Morality grounded in human telos**

Alasdair MacIntyre. The resurgence of cognitivist naturalism in the form of Virtue Ethics. The return to Aristotle and Aquinas, by the way of detaching them from their metaphysics. The basis for morality grounded in objective facts of life. Why MacIntyre rejects utilitarianism? The greatest happiness principle as reducible to intuitionism and emotivism. The irreducibly heterogeneous nature of objects of desire. The return to Aristotelian concept of man as having an essential nature and an essential purpose.

Peter Geach and attributive goodness. Good as attributive in comparison to predicative adjective. A meaning of a ‘good man’. ‘Man’ as a functional noun. The status of the four cardinal virtues. Criticism of Geach. The reduction of morality to mere expediency. The abandonment of the central idea of the teleological ethics.

Stuart Hampshire on the connection between attributive and predicative uses of “good”. Goodness in terms of choice, interest and satisfaction. The hierarchy of values in human activities.

### **Required readings:**

My lecture # 10.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981)

Geach, Peter. *Logic Matters* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972)

Hampshire, Stuart. *Public and Private Morality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978)

### **Optional readings:**

Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy*. (The Macmillan Press, LTD, 1983)

Baron, Peter. *Meta-ethics: Ethics Study Guide*. (Southover, Wells: PuSHMe Press, 2014)

Miller, Alexander. *An Introduction to Contemporary Metaethics*. (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003)

Wilson, A. *An Introduction to Contemporary Meta-ethics*. (Polity Press, 2003)

## **8. Neo-intuitionism and “multi-level theories”**

G.E.M. Anscombe. Prohibition on certain practices in every particular culture as a starting point for moral description. Hebrew-Christian ethics as an example of certain intuitively accepted values and unsequential prohibitions. The criticism of utilitarianism and prescriptivism.

Stuart Hampshire. The nature of moral impossibility. Conflict of obligations as endemic in human life. The religious foundations for moral intuitions. The single way of life as a necessary requirement for common intuitions. The absolute respect for human life.

John Rawls. The intuitive assumptions of justice in the original position behind the veil of ignorance. The principles of justice to be chosen in the original position.

The criticism of intuitionism by Fletcher in his “Situation Ethics”.

Hare’s latest moral philosophy in “Freedom and Reason”. Critical Thinking and Non-critical thinking as complementary levels. Derived and Underived principles. The norms we intuitively conceive as background of our lives. The affected parties in any decision making to be taken into account. A new form of descriptivism. The utilitarianism of an unbiased observer. “Proles and Archangels”. Impure and pure moral fanaticism.

**Required readings:**

Hare, R.M. *Moral Thinking: Its Levels, Method and Point*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981)

**Optional readings:**

Fotion, Nick. *Theory vs Anti-Theory in Ethics. A Misconceived Conflict*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

Pojman, Louis. *Ethics. Discovering Right and Wrong*. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing company, 1999)

Narveson, Jan. *This is Ethical Theory*. (Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 2009)

Williams, Bernard. *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*. (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1985)

Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy*. (The Macmillan Press, LTD, 1983)

Baron, Peter. *Meta-ethics: Ethics Study Guide*. (Southover, Wells: PuSHMe Press, 2014)

Miller, Alexander. *An Introduction to Contemporary Metaethics*. (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003)

Wilson, A. *An Introduction to Contemporary Meta-ethics*. (Polity Press, 2003)

*Moral Discourse and Practice. Some Philosophical Approaches*. Ed. by Stephen Darwall, Allan Gibbard and Peter Railton. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

## **9. Science and morality**

Sam Harris in his “Moral Landscape” presents three issues: how to derive an ought from an is, whether there is such thing as objective morality and whether a fact can be a moral fact. Science of morality is possible. Facts inform values. Values are certain sort of facts. Neuroscience can give us measurable standards of human well-being. The rejection of the naturalistic fallacy and moral relativism. The insights of Darwinists. Well-being as the ultimate good for morality. Every value can be reduced to conscious

experience. A good life is a matter of empirical observations. In general terms, morality is a cooperative activity. The deep opposition to religion. The rejection of moral relativism.

**Required readings:**

My lectures # 10.

Harris, Sam. *The Moral Landscape. How Science Can Determine Human Values* (New York: Free Press, 2010)

**Optional readings:**

Fotion, Nick. *Theory vs Anti-Theory in Ethics. A Misconceived Conflict*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

Pojman, Louis. *Ethics. Discovering Right and Wrong*. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing company, 1999)

Narveson, Jan. *This is Ethical Theory*. (Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 2009)

Williams, Bernard. *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*. (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1985)

Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy*. (The Macmillan Press, LTD, 1983)

Baron, Peter. *Meta-ethics: Ethics Study Guide*. (Southover, Wells: PuSHMe Press, 2014)

Miller, Alexander. *An Introduction to Contemporary Metaethics*. (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003)

Wilson, A. *An Introduction to Contemporary Meta-ethics*. (Polity Press, 2003)

*Moral Discourse and Practice. Some Philosophical Approaches*. Ed. by Stephen Darwall, Allan Gibbard and Peter Railton. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

## **10. The beginning theory. Evolution and morality**

The problem of the starting point of morality. How did moral intuition emerge? Certain social animals such as chimpanzees, capuchins and/or bonobos exhibit the patterns of behavior very close to morality.

Expressions of empathy. Expressions of sympathy. Expressions of gratitude. Consolation behavior.

Reconciliation behavior. Sense of Fairness. Punishment behavior. Evolution was providing advantages to the social and cooperative forms of behavior. The emergence of the cluster of behavioral tendencies

forming an ethical realm. The missing features of animal “morality”: universalizability and autonomy.

Proto-humans and the evolution of moral attitude. Non-critical nature of the early morality. The lack of moral language. The network of normative principles to be shared uncritically. Survival as the basic good.

The embedded social norms as the framework for moral intuitions and non-critical thinking.

**National Research University – Higher School of Economics**  
Faculty of Humanities  
**Syllabus of the course: “Analytic Ethics”**  
Bachelor’s program “Philosophy”

**Required readings:**

My lectures # 11.

Joyce, Richard. *The Evolution of Morality*, Cambridge (Mass. and London: A Bradford Book, MIT Press, 2007)

Waal, Frans de. *Good Natured. The Origins of Right and Wrong in Humans and Other Animals* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003)

**Optional readings:**

Fotion, Nick. *Theory vs Anti-Theory in Ethics. A Misconceived Conflict*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

Pojman, Louis. *Ethics. Discovering Right and Wrong*. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing company, 1999)

Narveson, Jan. *This is Ethical Theory*. (Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 2009)

Williams, Bernard. *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*. (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1985)

Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy*. (The Macmillan Press, LTD, 1983)

Baron, Peter. *Meta-ethics: Ethics Study Guide*. (Southover, Wells: PuSHMe Press, 2014)

Miller, Alexander. *An Introduction to Contemporary Metaethics*. (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003)

Wilson, A. *An Introduction to Contemporary Meta-ethics*. (Polity Press, 2003)

*Moral Discourse and Practice. Some Philosophical Approaches*. Ed. by Stephen Darwall, Allan Gibbard and Peter Railton. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

## **8 Teaching Methods and Recommendations**

The course requires a lot of readings for every weekly class meeting. The starting point for the reading are the lectures covering all the topics. From the very beginning of the course you have to choose the research paper. Each research paper is based on the analyses of one of the basic theories related to this or that theory of analytic ethics.



### 8.1 The tentative topics of the research papers.

The students will pick up one of the books and prepare an analysis of its basic arguments. The list is not finite. Some other theories may be added. The required length of the paper based on the analysis of the theory is 20 thousand characters. The deadline is the end of the term before the beginning of the last week.

Waal, Frans de. *Good Natured. The Origins of Right and Wrong in Humans and Other Animals* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003)

Harris, Sam. *The Moral Landscape. How Science Can Determine Human Values* (New York: Free Press, 2010)

MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981) Foot, Philippa. *Natural Goodness* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001)

Ayer, A.J. *Language, Truth and Logic* (New York: Dover, 1946).

Ross, David. *The Right and the Good*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Finnis, John. *Natural Law and Natural Rights* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011)

Slote, Michael. *From Morality to Virtue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA, 1995)

Hampshire, Stuart. *Public and Private Morality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978)

Ross, David. *The Right and the Good*. (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002).

Moore, J. E. *Principia Ethica*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1922).

The topic of the research paper should be coordinated with the course instructor.

## 9 Grading

The current work will be graded based on the effort and quality of the presentations at class. The quality of the papers will be graded too based on both the quality of the text and the ability to present orally. The final exam will be based on the student presentation of one of the 15 topics of the content of the course.

## 10 The pattern of forming the final grade

O stands for “grade”. The final grade  $O_{\text{final}}$  will be formed based on the results of the final oral exam ( $O_{\text{exam}}$ ) and accumulated grade ( $O_{\text{acc}}$ ). The accumulated grade ( $O_{\text{acc}}$ ) in its turn is formed of two parts, namely ( research paper ( $O_{\text{paper}}$ ) and current class work work ( $O_{\text{current}}$ ). The formula for the accumulated grade is the following

$$O_{\text{acc}} = 0,5 O_{\text{current}} + 0,5 O_{\text{paper}}$$

The formula for the final grade is the following

$$O_{\text{final}} = 0,5 O_{\text{acc}} + 0,5 O_{\text{exam}}$$

## **11 Reading and Materials**

### **11.1 Textbooks and Readers**

See above. Electronic versions of the books will be provided

### **11.2 Required Reading and Optional Reading**

See the course description, after each topic you will find it

## **12 Equipment**

Overhead projector will be needed for each lecture.