

**EMOTION VERSUS REASON
IN WESTERN ETHICS**

PhD DISSERTATION

MAI TIN MOE KHAING

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITY OF YANGON
MYANMAR**

MAY, 2016

EMOTION VERSUS REASON IN WESTERN ETHICS

MAI TIN MOE KHAING

THIS DISSERTATION IS SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS IN PHILOSOPHY, UNIVERSITY OF YANGON FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.



EXTERNAL EXAMINER

Dr. Nilar Win
Professor and Head
Department of Philosophy
Yangon University of Distance
Education



CHAIRPERSON

&

SUPERVISOR

Dr. Lé Lé Wynn
Professor and Head
Department of Philosophy
University of Yangon



REFEREE

Dr. Aye Aye Mar
Professor and Head
Department of Philosophy
Meiktila University



MEMBER

Dr. Mar Mar Kyi
Professor
Department of Philosophy
University of Yangon



MEMBER

Professor Dr. Tin Tin Tun
Part-time Professor
Department of Philosophy
University of Yangon



CO-SUPERVISOR

Dr. Tha Bye
Associate Professor
Department of Philosophy
Hinthada University

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I: THE ROLE OF EMOTION AND REASON IN GREEK ETHICS	9
1.1. Ethical View of Socrates	9
1.2. Ethical View of Plato	15
1.3. Ethical View of Aristotle	20
CHAPTER II: THE ROLE OF EMOTION AND REASON IN MEDIEVAL ETHICS	28
2.1. Ethical View of St. Augustine	28
2.2. Ethical View of St. Thomas Aquinas	32
2.3. Ethical View of William of Ockham	40
CHAPTER III: THE ROLE OF EMOTION AND REASON IN MODERN ETHICS	45
3.1. The Role of Emotion and Reason in the Ethical View of Rationalists	46
3.1.1. Ethical View of René Descartes	46
3.1.2. Ethical View of Baruch Spinoza	50
3.1.3. Ethical View of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz	54
3.2. The Role of Emotion and Reason in the Ethical View of Empiricists	57
3.2.1. Ethical View of John Locke	58
3.2.2. Ethical View of George Berkeley	61
3.2.3. Ethical View of David Hume	64
3.3. The Role of Emotion and Reason in Kant's Ethics	66
3.3.1. The Role of Reason	67
3.3.2. The Role of Emotion	69
CHAPTER IV: THE ROLE OF EMOTION AND REASON IN TWENTIETH CENTURY ETHICS	73
4.1. The Role of Emotion and Reason in the Ethical View of Pragmatists	73
4.1.1. Ethical View of Charles Sanders Peirce	74
4.1.2. Ethical View of William James	78
4.1.3. Ethical View of John Dewey	82
4.2. The Role of Emotion and Reason in the Ethical View of Existentialists	86
4.2.1. Ethical View of Søren Kierkegaard	87
4.2.2. Ethical View of Martin Heidegger	92
4.2.3. Ethical View of Jean-Paul Sartre	95
CONCLUSION	100
NOTES	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	

EMOTION VERSUS REASON IN WESTERN ETHICS

ABSTRACT

This dissertation focuses on the view that both emotion and reason play a significant role in Western ethics. The research problem therefore attempts to answer the question "Why it can be considered that both emotion and reason play an important role in the life of each individual in Western ethics?"¹ It undertakes a study of some Western ethics to show that although moral philosophers are different in their ontological and epistemological emphasis neither emotion nor reason is denied in their ethics. They generally accept that both emotion and reason are important in making moral decisions and for educating people to have ethical considerations. The idea that a proper balance between emotion and reason can lead to a common good and happiness, has been rooted in their thoughts.² The descriptive method and the evaluative method are used to achieve the aim of the research.³ An evaluation is made by the principle of reciprocity.⁴ This dissertation contributes towards an understanding that human behavior is basically driven by emotion and that with reason these emotions can be developed and controlled for the benefit of good human relations. The role of emotions should therefore be acknowledged and thus only a proper balance between the two can achieve morality.⁵

Key words: Emotion, Reason, Western Ethics, Morality

¹ Research Problem

² Research Finding

³ Research Method

⁴ Research Principle

⁵ Contribution

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is an attempt to solve the problem why morality depends on a proper balance between emotion and reason in the life of an individual. In order to achieve the aim, it is focused on the two concepts such as 'emotion' and 'reason' because both are noteworthy as core concepts in Western moral problems since ancient times. Indeed, it cannot deny that eradicating personal feelings and emotions is not easy for most human beings although they understand that reason can give proper guidance to be a morally good person. For that reason, striking a balance between emotion and reason becomes important in moral actions.

In Western traditions, there are many teachings that reason should be emphasized so as to make man an ethical being since the Greek period. But many philosophers have come to realize that human behavior is motivated by reason alone and that human emotions also play a considerable role. Human beings recognize that reason is essential for cultivating one's moral behavior but sometimes they make their moral decisions based on their personal emotion. This implies that although reason plays a vital role in ethics, human action is sometimes done by emotion alone or by emotion in conjunction with reason or by emotion which sometimes dominates reason and or by emotion which is sometimes under the control of reason. This shows that however one tries to reduce emotion and tries to show the importance of reason; both emotion and reason should be considered as crucial in moral life of human being. Thus, an attempt should be made by acknowledging the respective roles of both emotion and reason.

A proper balance of emotion and reason can benefit not only an individual but also his society. Those who emphasize emotion alone may not be free from personal prejudices or biases or group prejudices because they are under the control of emotion alone, without understanding the role of moral wisdom which is associated with reason and good will that

cannot be totally separated from emotion. Although there are both emotion and reason in human nature, synthesis of self-interest and benefit of society is possible only when one can make a proper balance between them. Only then there is conformity between individual interest and the welfare of his society that can lead to individual happiness and a moral society. Thus, people should find out the ethical way which leads to happiness, by studying the role of both emotion and reason.

With regard to emotion, there are good and bad emotions. Bad emotion is emotion which can motivate man to do bad conduct. As bad conduct produces or generates bad consequences or results, it contradicts human happiness, and leads to suffering. If one is jealous of others, he is more likely to do bad conduct. If one is angry with others, he is more likely to do harm. If one hates others, it is hard for him to do good which benefits others. One's emotion that motivates him to do what is not beneficial for others is also bad emotion. In short, emotions of jealousy, anger, hatred and being unable to be pleased with another's success or are joyful at other people's misfortunes are to be regarded as bad emotions.

Otherwise, good emotion is emotion which can motivate man to do good conduct. As good conduct produces or generates good consequences or results, it can lead to human happiness. If one is able to cultivate loving kindness, his mental, verbal and physical actions are more likely to be actions that produce common good of society in which self-interest and public-interest are balanced. Emotion which is concomitant with loving kindness is to be conceived as good emotions. Similarly, emotion which is concomitant with compassion or sympathy and joy at another's success can motivate people to do good deed that leads to good consequences. Hence, loving kindness, sympathy, compassion and joy at another's success are good emotions. It is accepted that both good and bad emotions are concerned with human nature, and that is most important is that people are required to

cultivate good emotion and to decrease bad emotion as much as they can. In other words, even if people are unable to remove bad emotion totally as it is human nature, bad emotion should be controlled by moral wisdom in order not to be motivated to do bad conduct.

Good emotion and bad emotion can function or serve as good will and bad will respectively. However, whether one can cultivate good will which is associated with good emotion depends on his social environment. This means that one who lives in a good social environment is more likely to cultivate good will because he is influenced to some extent by his environment. On the other hand, one who lives in a bad social environment may face some difficulty when he tries to cultivate good will. This is because the bad social environment may affect him. This shows that one's ability to cultivate good will is more or less determined by the society which he lives.

Thus, it is necessary for an individual to make not only himself or herself but also one's society ethically good. If he is able to do so, his conduct will be ethically and socially acceptable. This implies that in a society in which the majority of people do not value or appreciate what is ethically good, and distinguish what is social from what is ethical, one who lives in such a society, even if he wants to do something ethically and socially acceptable, may not be free from the influences of an ethically bad environment. Perhaps, he may regard what is ethically bad as good. So, it is clear that an individual as part of society is ethically and socially responsive.

For an individual, it is necessary to understand that an ethically good society cannot be built if an individual is unable to distinguish bad emotions from good ones and good will from bad will, and that an individual as a member of society has ethical and social responsibility or obligation to contribute to the welfare and stability of a society. To know one's ethical and social responsibilities is to have not only ethical consciousness but also social consciousness. Having ethical consciousness and social consciousness depends

on an understanding the role of emotion, and the role of reason.

Moreover, the ability to distinguish good emotion from bad emotion, good will from bad will depends on reason by which one can know what is the cause of an action, and can predict what sort of consequences it will lead to. With the help of reason, one can know that he needs to cultivate good will, good emotion, to do good conduct which will lead to good consequences. In order to build an ethically good society and to achieve the ethical objective of human happiness, it is very important not to emphasize only non-consequentialist ethics which emphasizes good will, good motive, good emotion or only consequentialist ethics which emphasizes consequences alone. One has to acknowledge the role of both reason and emotion in making ethical choices and decisions.

It is found that reason and emotions are reciprocal. Although they are different and opposed to each other they are interrelated and interdependent in human nature. Man is sometimes emotional rather than rational, and sometimes he is more rational depending on the extent of his knowledge and wisdom. The reciprocity between emotion and reason depends on his understanding of the importance of both reason and emotion not making one exclude the other.

The emphasis of the dissertation is on the history of Western moral thought from the Greek, Medieval, and Modern Periods up to the Twentieth Century. In the West, ontological and epistemological views are related with ethical views. This means that one's ontological and epistemological conception can determine his or her ethical views to some degree. However, these philosophies that happen to agree that both emotion and reason as part of human nature play an important role in ethics. It is due to fact that the philosophers selected to argue the main idea of the dissertation accept that people are required to distinguish good emotion from bad emotion, and that only when emotion can be balanced with reason, can both an individual and his society be ethically good. That is the reason

"Why not only reason but also emotion plays an important role in Western ethics."

Form of the Dissertation

To solve the main problem, the dissertation comprises four chapters. The first chapter deals with Greek ethics and how Socrates (470BC-399BC), Plato (427BC-347BC) and Aristotle (384BC-322BC) treat reason and emotion in their ethics. For Socrates, it is accepted that wisdom and happiness are inseparable. This is because only when one is able to know what is good, can he do right thing. As happiness is to be regarded as the ultimate end of human beings, people are required to make reasoned choices by which they can achieve happiness. Plato accepts wisdom, temperance, courage and justice as the main virtues and asserts that human emotion and appetites should be under the control of reason. People can choose the greater good through knowledge. Knowledge of how to achieve pleasure and how to avoid pain is necessary and sufficient to be virtuous. For Aristotle, rational desires must be in line with the Golden Mean. Without virtue or the golden mean which is composed of both reason and emotion, men's feelings or emotion can be extreme. So, in the first chapter these three Greek philosophers' conceptions of emotion and reason are discussed.

The second chapter deals with Medieval ethics specifically, the ethics of Augustine, Aquinas and Ockham concerning the conception of reason and emotion. St. Augustine (354AD-430AD) emphasizes God's will by following which, people can be a lover of good and a hater of evil. He accepts that there are two cities. One is the earthly city, and the other is the heavenly city. People have freedom of choice to choose those two cities. St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) accepts that the source of all actions arise from the will. Human goodness depends on behavior that is in accordance with good will. He believes that human beings should live in accordance with reason and God's will. William of Ockham (1285-1347) states that good or evil deeds of human beings are determined by

their intentions. Therefore, the will of human being should conform itself to right reason and God's will.

The third chapter deals with Modern ethics. The ethics of the rationalists, empiricists and Kant concerning the conception of reason and emotion are selected for discussion. René Descartes (1596-1650) as a rationalist recognizes that the knowledge of differentiating the good and the bad which is called 'pure intellect' is necessary for moral actions. In this respect, it can be said that he emphasizes the role of 'reason' in his moral thought. However, he also accepts 'generosity' as an important ethical concept in his moral thought. As a rationalist, Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) accepts that the only source of knowledge is 'reason' but he also accepts the role of 'emotion' like 'love' as well as 'love of God' in his moral thought. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) holds that wisdom and good will are necessary for people to build good character. In Leibniz's thought it can be said that virtue, the highest moral character, is not only related with reason but also with emotion because his concept of charity or justice are commonly associating with the love or love of God which is somehow interpreted as good will and empathetic feeling towards others. The three rationalists recognize not only the role of reason but also the role of emotion in their moral thoughts.

As an empiricist, John Locke (1632-1704) accepts pleasure and pain as the primary motivating factors for all human actions. Locke took compliance as the requirement of morality for people to attain happiness. This is why he accepts the 'natural law' which contains God's will. If one wishes happiness, one should have the emotion of love. It is necessary for people to cultivate love in order to attain or practice what is morally good. Locke accepts that positive emotion can make people behave morally because the emotion of love is equated with pleasure. George Berkeley (1685-1753) emphasizes that God alone can make people possess happiness by showing them what is good and what is evil. For

Berkeley, people should behave in accordance with the 'laws of nature' because it is in conformity with the will of God. David Hume (1711-1776) accepts that reason alone is not sufficient to motivate human action. For him, reason can arouse one's passion, a kind of emotion, to behave morally or not. Moreover, he accepts that reason and emotion should be in the same direction so as to gain pleasure. For that reason, there may not be no substantial conflict between reason and passion in his moral thought.

In Modern ethics, the ethics of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) is based on the view that the only intrinsically good thing is a good will. Central to Kant's construction of the moral law is the categorical imperative, which acts on people, regardless of their desires. Kant bases his ethical theory on the belief that reason should be used to determine how people ought to act.

The fourth chapter deals with Twentieth Century ethics which is an attempt to discuss the ethics of pragmatists such as Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914), William James (1842-1910) and John Dewey (1859-1952) and that of existentialists such as Søren Kierkegaard (1813-1855), Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) and Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980). Pragmatists and existentialists are chosen to discuss because they attempt to solve the problem of irrationality and the rationality or the problem of emotion and reason. Only when an individual is able to cultivate good will as well as good emotion, and to control bad emotion like anger, hate, jealousy by reasoning can building ethically good society through good social relationship be successful. Thus, it can be considered that not only reason but also emotion plays an important role in Western ethics.

The Problem of the Dissertation

This dissertation is an attempt to solve the problem, "Why it can be considered that both emotion and reason play an important role in the life of each individual in Western

ethics?"

The Methods of the Dissertation

To solve the problem, Western ethics starting from some moral philosophies of the Greeks, Medieval, Modern and Twentieth Century are discussed. Thus, the descriptive method and evaluative method are used in discussing their ethical conceptions of emotion and reason.

The Principle of the Dissertation

An evaluation will be made in the light of the principle of reciprocity.

Contribution of the Dissertation

This dissertation contributes towards an understanding that human behavior is basically emotion driven and that with reason these emotions can be developed and controlled for the benefit of good human relations. The role of emotions must therefore be acknowledged and only a proper balance between the two can achieve morality.

CHAPTER I

THE ROLE OF EMOTION AND REASON IN GREEK ETHICS

Socrates, Plato and Aristotle are the first Greek philosophers who believe that what matter most is how we ought to live. It can be said that their ethics emphasizes the good life. Happiness or living well is the desire of everyone. But they assume that happiness should not be the goal of action because one should not seek pleasure as the end of life. They argue that happiness cannot consist simply in external goods because a happy life is a life of reason.

Although Greek philosophers emphasize reason, they do not reject human emotions such as happiness, feelings, desires, appetites, pain, pleasure, and so forth. Reason is only a part of man. A good life is one in which reason and emotions are in harmony in which reason rules and emotions such as feelings and desires obey. The life of reason brings happiness. Hence, the full realization of man's reason will be accompanied by pleasure. They argue that happiness requires virtue and hence a person should have virtuous traits of character. Virtuous traits of character are the excellences of a human being in that they are the best exercise of reason, which is the characteristic of human beings. Under this heading, the significant ideas of emotion and reason advocated by Socrates, Plato and Aristotle are discussed.

1.1. Ethical View of Socrates

Socrates can be said to be the founder of moral philosophy. Socrates was very influential both in his thought and the example of his life. He did not merely preach the morality of the wise man because he lived as one throughout his life. The basic question of Socrates, the most famous of all Greek philosophers is 'What is justice?' Without appealing to religion, revelation, authority and tradition, Socrates taught people to use

their own reason and think for themselves. The most important thing for Socrates is how to conduct their lives and themselves. So the most important questions are 'What is good?', 'What is right?', and 'What is just?' and so forth.

Socrates tries to understand the meaning of morality. He also tries to discover a rational principle of right and wrong which is a criterion by which to decide moral issues. So, he asks such questions like 'How shall I order my life?', 'What is the rational way of living?' and 'How ought a human being to act?' For him, the Sophists are not right in saying that whatever pleases one is right for that person because it means as if there is no universal good. For Socrates, there must be some principle or standard or good, which all rational creatures accept when they try to solve the problems 'What is the good?' and 'What is the highest good?'

Socrates answered that knowledge is the highest good. In his ethics he stated that 'Knowledge is Virtue.' Hence, right thinking is essential for right action. If a man does not know what virtue is and if he does not know the meaning of self-control, courage, justice, piety and their opposites he cannot be virtuous. For Socrates, knowledge is both the necessary and sufficient condition of virtue because without knowledge, virtue is impossible.

Socrates holds that knowledge is virtue, and it leads to happiness. If one knows right from wrong, then he might be able to choose to do what he knows to be right. It also makes sense of the notion that human beliefs about right and wrong influence their decisions. Self-knowledge is a sufficient condition to the good life. Knowledge is virtue and ignorance is evil. This view is stated in *Routledge Philosophy Guide Book to Plato and the Trial of Socrates* as follows;

"Virtue is always a good thing for its possessor" and "It is always rational to pursue happiness as one's ultimate goal" would qualify in this category.¹

It means that knowledge itself is a virtue and virtue is necessary for the good life. People must choose the good but only if they know what is good. If people know what the right thing to do is, they would do it. Moreover, the best way for people to live is to focus on wisdom. Wisdom is a centrally important component of happiness. Happiness could only be attained if a person is morally good. In order to be morally good, people have to know what is good because people often change their minds about what makes them happy, without knowing what happiness is. To achieve happiness a person must know themselves. Concerning this point, Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicolas D. Smith comment that,

Socrates thinks of virtue as the best condition that the soul can be in, and that condition is wisdom about how to conduct one's life in such a way that one will be happy. Because it is the power to ensure that the other things one seeks will be good, wisdom is the most important good anyone can acquire.²

This means that wisdom can help one to a virtuous life of happiness. The greatest achievement of Socrates's thought is happiness and happiness is equated with having harmony in oneself. Virtue lies in a person's best interest. Virtue cannot be taught but it still requires knowledge, the knowledge of one's true self. Virtue and happiness are intertwined for Socrates because each of them needs knowledge to be achieved. No one can be happy who is not temperate, brave, wise and just. Socrates believes that knowledge is the most important key to living a happy and virtuous life.

With virtue one can pursue happiness as one's ultimate goal. Socrates seems to accept that reason is the way to the good life. True happiness is promoted by doing what is right. People will naturally do what is good, if they know what is right. Evil or bad actions are the result of ignorance. If a criminal was truly aware of the mental and spiritual consequences of his actions, he would neither commit nor even consider committing those actions. Knowledge and virtue are one, in the sense that the wise man will know what is

right, and does what is good. Therefore, he or she will be happy.

For Socrates living with knowledge is sufficient for living in happiness. Happiness is only a matter of leading one's life in the right way. So, the best life is to seek knowledge about what is right and what is good.

Socrates asserts that everyone desires what is actually good. The bad desires often compete with the good desires. The bad desires may cause harm to self and to others. Socrates asserts that human beings need the knowledge of what is good and bad to control their bad desires. Virtue is knowledge of what is good and bad. Thus, if people know what is good and bad, they behave morally. According to Socrates, knowledge of the good does not remove non desire. It rather produces a desire or motivational force that is stronger than any non rational desire or emotion. Hence, Socrates believes that moral knowledge is necessary and sufficient to be virtuous.

Socrates maintains that appetites and passions have some motivational influence on the virtuous person which he or she must combat. Appetites for things like drink, food, and sex, and passions such as love, fear, and anger could sometimes overwhelm a person, and drive him or her like a beast to do or enact what the appetite or passion craves. Socrates accepts that the appetites and passions can be both good and bad and they play a role in how people behave. Brickhouse and Nicholas states Socrates's thought as follows;

Socrates' explanation of how he came to be on trial, it seems to us, requires that he believes that the experience of the passions he mentions – pride, humiliation, and anger – can play a causal role in people doing what they would not otherwise have done, things they also should not do.³

It can be understood that Socrates mentions how passions such as pride, humiliation, and anger influence human action. These passions play a causal role in actions. A person's pride is injured, when he feels publicly humiliated, and becomes angry. The person's anger leads one to speak a false statement. Humiliation and pride

cannot reveal the truth. According to Socrates, it is ignorance that leads him or her to make somebody feel ashamed or disturbed.

Moreover, Socrates asserts that knowledge may not be possible when desire, pleasure, pain, love, and the like are dominant. Socrates accepts that if someone knows what is good and evil, then he could not be forced by anything to act contrary to what knowledge says. Socrates recognizes that there may be effects in human behavior because of appetites for pleasure, aversions to pain, and emotions, such as fear or love. Socrates accepts the fact that some kinds of wrongdoing aim at the satisfaction of some appetite or other non rational passion in the soul.

Socrates believes that appetites and emotion can be either strong or weak and that a strong appetite or emotion is more likely to cause an ignorant person to believe that the pleasure at which he aims is in fact a good. People will face desires in their physical lives. Socrates believes that whenever something appears good to people, it appears good only because they have already judged it to be good and judgment may be prejudiced that is emotional.

The appetites and passions play a role to a certain extent in the formation of human beliefs about what is good for them. Socrates believes that, when people act for the sake of pleasure, their appetites are strengthened. As a result, it becomes increasingly difficult for their souls to consider which action is really good.

Socrates's point is that some desires adjust to the person's beliefs about what is the best means to their ultimate end. The only way to alter intentional action is to alter the agent's belief about what is best for him or her. The effects of unruly appetites and passions increase the false beliefs about how to act and how to live, when false beliefs influence one's cognitive processes. Hence, it can be said that for Socrates moral education and punishment are designed to prevent the wrongdoing of the soul.

Socrates holds that everyone always desires what is good for them, and that everyone always acts in the ways they think will be best for them. But he argues that there are potentials within the soul such as appetites that aim only at pleasure. If these potentials are not kept in check, they can erode the cognitive functioning of the soul. It will damage the soul by making it increasingly difficult for the agent to judge accurately what is best for the agent under the circumstances.

For Socrates, knowledge is virtue that makes people behave morally. Socrates believes that the only good thing is happiness and the only bad thing is misery. He holds virtue to be identical to knowledge. He holds that living a good life is a matter of living in accordance with knowledge. For him, when a person does what is morally wrong, that moral failure is due to emotion. If only the person exercised his intellect well, he would not do what is wrong. However, emotional attitudes are an integral part of knowledge which is virtue.

Socrates's greatest love was for the practical wisdom that enables a human being to live well, which is of unconditional importance. Socrates' love for wisdom is a religious benevolence towards other human beings.⁴

Socrates accepts that music can make one gentle. Its harmony is dominated in universe, where there is separateness and opposition. Musical education gives passions even to the warrior so that without it a man cannot be trusted.⁵ Therefore, Socrates accepts that emotions influence human behavior in some degree. In this respect, it can be said that Socrates seemed to recognize the role of emotion in human moral behavior. That is the reason why axiology aesthetics and ethics are interconnected in philosophical studies.

Socrates asserts that people desire what they think is good. Moreover, human behavior is motivated by emotional reactions. Socrates does not ignore the emotional side

of human nature, although he focuses on the intellectual side. It can be understood that not only emotion but also reason plays an important role in Socrates' ethics.

It can be concluded that the virtuous person may have their appetites and passions in a condition which they are less important and responsive to the dictates of reason. Socrates believes that virtue guarantees happiness for its possessor. People are virtuous if they possess moral knowledge. Socrates tries to find out the nature of moral concepts as essence. This view was developed by Plato who was his disciple.

1.2. Ethical View of Plato

Plato constructs a comprehensive and integrated system of thought in line with the humanistic insight of Socrates. Plato takes up the Socratic problems, 'What is good?', 'What is the good life?', 'How can we justify such a life to reason?' and so forth. Plato tries to solve these problems in his ethics. Like his theory of knowledge, Plato's ethics is based on his metaphysics. For Plato, the universe is a rational universe which is a spiritual system. Material objects are changing shadows of the ideas. Because man can know the real world through his reason, reason is the highest good for man. The rational part of man is the true part. The ideal of man is to cultivate his reason.

Socrates had tried to find out the nature of abstract reality or some sort of essence or concepts such as justice, courage, friendship, piety and so forth. His work can be said to encourage his disciple Plato to believe in abstract ideas as the perfect form or reality. Plato argues that human beings are both partly rational and irrational. Moreover, they have appetitive desires, and that these desires tend to lead them in the wrong direction. Plato accepts that people can overcome appetitive desires in accord with reason which is a powerful motivational force in those who are not virtuous because reason can guide those who are not virtuous to be virtuous.

Plato argues that some desires, including desires for pleasure are distinct from and can conflict with desires for the good. He holds that vice as mental disorders so that it is not mere ignorance. Virtue can be achieved only when the parts of the soul with the wrong kind of desires are ruled by reason which is another part of the soul.

Plato uses the term soul, which often corresponds closely to the modern term 'mind.' According to Plato there are three elements of the soul. These are reason, passion and desire.⁶ He places appetite under desire. For Plato, reason is directed to attain truth. Reason evaluates especially what is ethically good for human beings. Thus, reason does not care about money and reputation. Reason knows what is morally good both for oneself and that of the others. Ambition, feeling for others and love of reputation are included in passion. Emotion is obvious when one is angry, in love and when one hates the other. Appetites are greed or excessive desires and sensual appetite such as greed for food, drink, sex and so forth.

Because each of the parts has a function respectively as each characteristic, each has a peculiar excellence. The function of appetite or desire is to motivate that person strongly to achieve his aim. The function of passion is to animate so that life will be enjoyable and worth living. Then one can determine what and how to act with courage, pride and satisfaction. But the action may have been done the wrong way. It is the task of the rational part of the soul to pursue wisdom by making judgments backed by reasons. The task is performed with excellence when the act is judged in accord with knowledge. That is the reason why it can be said that the rational part of the soul works out the best course of action by reasoning. The soul is excellent when each part is functioning well. Hence, a human being is happy if he is motivated strongly by desire, his emotions are lively and is ruled by his reason.

Plato states that reason is the part of the mind capable of reasoning, so that it

pursues truth and knowledge. It is the only part capable of governing one well. Wisdom is the virtue of reason. Reason is one of the greatest values while emotions especially appetite is regarded as the lower passions. The soul that is ordered is governed by reason and keeps one's emotions and one's appetites under control. For Plato, the idea or form or concept comprehends the essential qualities common to many particulars. There is a great variety of forms. There are forms of mathematics and forms of natural science. There are other forms as well. These are piety, justice, beauty and the good. For Plato, the form of the good is the first principle because the ultimate explanation of everything must be in terms of the form of the good.

According to Plato, justice is the supreme virtue. An individual is brave when the soul's spirited part holds fast through pain and pleasure. That is the individual is brave whenever there is instructions of reason as to what is to be feared and what is not. An individual is temperate when spirit and appetite yield to reason. Temperance is self-control and it can rule desires and pleasures. A man is just only when courage, temperance do their work properly.

In Plato's thought, there are four special virtues namely wisdom, temperance, courage and justice. These are four cardinal virtues. Wisdom is that knowledge about how to govern the soul as a whole and this knowledge is found in the rational part of the soul, which is the best part of the soul. As it has been said it is a virtue of reason. Courage is a unique virtue that follows the directions of reason about what should or should not be feared. Courage is holding firm on one's views of right and wrong in the face of the temptations of pleasure or fear. The virtue of courage is located in the spirited part of the soul. Temperance is the balance of human desires. Desires should be satisfied to some extent, but not be allowed to get out of control. Temperance is a harmony that arises out of the agreement of all three parts of the soul that the rational part should govern the other

two parts. It determines how the parts of the soul work together.

Thus, one is temperate when one has internal harmony under the guidance of a higher element, justice. Justice is a virtue which settles order and harmony between those three elements and it is the most important virtue. Virtue is the knowledge of what is right for human or the knowledge of the idea of rightness, and is mainly identified with wisdom or prudence. Thus, one's soul has justice when reason does the best.

Plato accepts that there are those whose irrational desires govern the soul. These desires are originated in the irrational parts of the soul, and to bring the person to act contrary to the good desires come from the rational part of the soul. The function of human being is supplying the means to happiness because happiness is the end of human being. The virtue of a human is being good at supplying the means to happiness. People want the good and they find out the truth about the best means to it. Then their initial desire for the good is redirected towards the just, so that they act accordingly.

For Plato, a part of the soul with rational desires for whatever is best is one which adjusts to a change in belief. A part with irrational desires is one which does not so adjust to changes of belief. The desire persists through all changes of belief and can overpower rational desires. His ethics lays great emphasis on the rational part of the soul. The irrational part is something to be cast out. Since virtue is the highest good the individual cannot attain the good in isolation. The good can only be attained only in society. The mission of the society is to promote virtue and happiness.

When the irrational desires govern the soul, all the virtues vanish. Since a person is ruled by desires, reason loses its wisdom. Then the spirit lacks courage because it cannot distinguish between 'what should be feared' and 'what should not be feared.' Hence, the soul is no longer temperate because the lowest element rules the higher elements. In the

virtue of justice, the irrational desires do not assume a role because they are not fitted for the rule of the soul. For Plato, a bad person is one whose irrational desires govern the soul.

Moreover, Plato accepts that pleasure is good and pain is bad. Concerning this point, Hugh H. Benson states as follows;

If pleasures and pains are commensurable, and if pleasure is identical with the good and pain with the bad, then all goods and bads are commensurable; and they can be ranked, not only ordinally and intuitively, but by measuring them and deducing the rankings from their cardinal values.⁷

It means that pleasure is good and pain is bad. Just as wealth can be defined as anything that can be measured by money, so the good can be defined as anything that can be measured by pleasure. Further, knowledge is also sufficient for choosing the greater good. All men desire pleasure and seek to avoid pain. The knowledge of pleasures and pains can be attained by the rational part. Knowledge of pleasure and pain would be necessary and sufficient for virtue. Finally, the highest good of happiness or pleasure is dependent upon rational desires and these desires lead people to be virtuous.

Plato considers virtue to be an excellence of the soul insofar as the soul has several components. The excellence of reason is wisdom. The excellence of the passions is attributed to courage and the excellence of the spirit is temperance. Finally, justice is that excellence which consists in a harmonious relation of the other three parts. Virtue is a sort of knowledge that is required to reach the ultimate good, which is what all human desires and actions aim to achieve. Therefore, in Plato's thought, reason is a necessary component of a morality and it must be consciously and conspicuously active in every good action. So, a good life requires rational control, and moral behavior is guided by reason. Plato asserts that reason is a necessary component in human life. Moreover, like Socrates, he asserts that the highest good of human beings is happiness.

The irrational part of the soul has impulses such as anger, ambition, and love of

power. Another part is desire in which there are the lower appetites or passions. The presence of the impulses and desires is a hindrance to the ethical supremacy of reason. For Plato, reason must try to overcome the impulses and desires. Man's ideal must be to cultivate his reason, which is the immortal side of the soul. The rational part is wise. The individual is wise when reason rules and overcomes the impulses.

Plato tries to show the connection between love and wisdom. For Plato, there are steps in love. First, through perception one will fall in love with the beauty of another individual body and his passion is concerned with this body. Next he must consider the relation between this body and the beauty of others, finding that everybody is the same. When he reached this step he must set himself to be the lover of every lovely body. In this way, he can grasp the idea of beauty and the good through his passion that leads to his happiness. Hence, form of love is intimately connected with forms of beauty and the good.⁸

To sum up, the point Plato makes is that not only reason but also emotions are involved in the morality of human beings. It can be said that Plato accepts the necessity of balancing between emotion and reason.

1.3. Ethical View of Aristotle

Plato thinks that one can get the same kind of certainty in moral rules just as one has in mathematics. Reasoning about forms can lead to moral truths. But Aristotle does not think about certainty through reasoning. So, he discusses particular virtue instead of universals.

The *Nicomachean Ethics* is Aristotle's main treatise on ethics. For him, every action or choice of action aims at some good as its object. That is the reason why good is defined as the object of all human endeavors. The highest good in all matters of action is

happiness. Hence, people even identify happiness with the good life and successful living.⁹

For him, everyone wants a happy life. What gives man a happy life is the development and exercise of one's capacity that is compatible with living in a society. Aristotle develops the doctrine of the golden mean. According to the doctrine, a virtue is a midway point between two extremes which are vices. For him, it is the way to achieve happiness.

In his *Nicomachean Ethics*, an important ethical question is raised: 'What is the purpose of human life?' For Aristotle, the purpose of human life is to achieve happiness. He argues that the highest good is happiness and people can gain happiness through activity in accordance with virtue. For him, people attain moral virtue by habitually choosing moderate actions that are neither excessive nor defective. Hence, happiness is the exercise of virtue.

People have intellects, and theoretical and practical wisdom are the virtues of the soul. There is also a desiring part of the soul. The soul in turn divides into an appetitive soul that explains why human beings have appetites such as lust and hunger. It is a kind of soul that Aristotle explains why human beings feel emotions such as anger and pride and rational desires which he calls 'wish' and 'choice.' The virtues of the desiring part of the soul are virtues of character such as courage temperance and liberality. A virtue is exercised or actualized in actions and emotions. A virtue of character is a potentiality actualized in virtuous acts and emotions. The virtue of character is a mean between excess and deficiency. It means that virtue, a potentiality, is a mean because it is productive of what is intermediate between action and emotion. Therefore, it can be concluded that Aristotle does not ignore emotion though he emphasizes reason in his thought.

Like Socrates and Plato, Aristotle emphasizes the importance of reason for human

beings. He holds that human beings consist of rational and irrational parts. Aristotle says that,

Every skill and every inquiry, and similarly every action and rational choice, is thought to aim at some good; and so the good has been aptly described as that at which everything aims.¹⁰

In Aristotle's thought, it is asserted that everything humans do is aimed at some good. There are different ends for different actions. For instance, the end of medicine is health and of economic is wealth. Aristotle says that there is only one end to which all ends aim. All people always act with the aim to this end, namely 'happiness'.

Aristotle holds that there are differences of opinion about what is best for human beings. For him, the end of human life is happiness. But happiness or flourishing has nothing to do with physical pleasure, but it is an activity of the mind or the soul in accordance with virtue. Aristotle points out that happiness is not a virtue, but it is a virtuous activity. Concerning this point Aristotle explains that,

Since happiness is a certain kind of activity of the soul in accordance with complete virtue, we ought to look at virtue.¹¹

It means that to live well consists in doing something, not just being in a certain condition. It consists in those lifelong activities that actualize the virtues of the rational part of the soul. Aristotle says that,

Virtue, then, is a state involving rational choice, consisting in a mean relative to us and determined by reason - the reason, that is, by reference to which the practically wise person would determine it. It is a mean between two vices, one of excess, the other of deficiency. It is a mean also in that some vices fall short of what is right in feelings and actions, and others exceed it, while virtue both attains and chooses the mean. So, in respect of its essence and the definition of its substance, virtue is a mean, while with regard to what is best and good it is an extreme.¹²

In this sense, virtue is a mean between two extremes. The mean is not necessarily the average or half way point, but rather changes in relation to each individual. Hence, the

mean is not the same for everyone. The middle course is not easy to determine so that it can vary for each individual. It is very difficult to discover the mean, to discover the exact point between the two extremes which is the best suited for human beings. Human excellence steers a middle course between extremes. But unlike Plato, Aristotle holds that the middle course between excess and deficiency cannot be determined mathematically. There are many ways which can be wrong and there is only one way to be correct. Even virtue can exist only when there is proper amount of feelings and actions. That is what is meant by the Golden Mean of Aristotle's philosophy.

According to Aristotle, the highest good and the end toward which all human activity is directed is happiness. Happiness could be defined as continuous contemplation of eternal and universal truth. One can attain happiness by a virtuous life, and the development of reason. So the Golden Mean is Aristotle's rule for ethical action. There is no excess or deficiency in virtue. It means that too much bravery is rashness, too little bravery is cowardice. Therefore, the excess and defect are vicious or wrong and the mean is virtue. Aristotle describes the relationship between intellectual and moral character of human excellence as follows;

Human Excellence is of two kinds, Intellectual and Moral: now the Intellectual springs originally, and is increased subsequently, from teaching, and needs therefore experience and time; whereas the Moral comes from custom.¹³

It can be understood that for him, there are two kinds of virtue, intellectual and moral. Intellectual virtue is the result of teaching and needs, while moral virtue is the result of custom. People become just by doing just acts, temperate by doing temperate acts, brave by doing brave acts. But there are conditions between fear and confidence, anger and pity, and pain and pleasure that may be felt both too much and too little. But, to feel them, people must act at the right time, with the right object, towards the right people,

with right motive, and in the right way. This is the characteristics of virtue. Hence, it can be said that virtue is related with emotion and virtue is a state of character which concerns choice.

According to Aristotle, human happiness is achieved only when there is excellent use of human reason. Excellent use can be done by choosing the mean between excess and deficiency. So making wise choices is important in one's life because there are three choices, doing too much, too little and doing just the right amount.

It can be said that if one uses reason well, he or she will live well as a human being. Happiness consists in a life that uses reason well. Virtue is required whenever one has to do anything well. Living well consists in activities caused by reason in accordance with virtue. A virtuous person aims at the end or happiness by means of rationality whereas the common people aim at the end by means of feelings or emotions. To be a virtuous person, rationality is indispensable in human life. Therefore, real happiness can only be obtained by rationality.

Aristotle accepts that there are three forms of desire which are appetite, energetic emotion, and rational desire. For him, human choice is a deliberate action which is based on these three forms of desire. There is also an important connection between any form of desire and the good. Appetite can lead to good which is only apparent. Rational desire alone can attain good which is real. Energetic emotion rests on the thought that its object is good in some way. A person who acts from energetic or spirited emotion acts in haste, so, he may act for the sake of what is only apparently good.

Rational desire arises from the thought that its object is on the whole good. For many people this may still only be the apparent good, for they may be mistaken about what is on the whole good. But rational desire naturally has what is actually good. Thus,

rational desire can lead a person with the aim to be good. Georgios Anagnostopoulos states Aristotle's thought in *A Companion to Aristotle* as follows;

Practical reason exists when desires and actions can be rational or irrational. A desire or action will be rational if a good exercise of reason would indicate that one should have that desire or perform that action.¹⁴

Aristotle's point is that the rational desire should be motivated, and a rational action will be an action motivated by a rational desire. For Aristotle, ethical behavior comes from rational behavior that achieves the human good. Practical wisdom is a virtue of the part of the soul that listens to reason, and so its exercise would seem to be rational as opposed to irrational activity. For Aristotle, ethical virtue is a specific virtue which disposes a person to act as reason directs. Finally, for Aristotle, one cannot have ethical virtue without wisdom and that with wisdom all of the ethical virtues come. Practical wisdom is a state conjoined with reason. That is the reason why Aristotle, regards ethical behavior to be rational as opposed to irrational behavior. According to Aristotle, ethical virtue makes a person's aim or choice right while practical wisdom provides the means for this aim or choice.

There are three possible goals for human life. These goals are distinguished by Aristotle as physical pleasure, fame and wisdom. Aristotle does not accept physical pleasure as goal for life because human life is something which is more noble than other living beings such as animals. He does not accept fame as goal for life because since one's fame depends upon others it is not one's unique excellence. For Aristotle, wisdom is life's highest goal.

Moreover, in the *Poetics*, Aristotle discusses literature and drama. For him, a person has emotional experience when he or she watches a tragedy. The emotional experience which he calls catharsis is the process of releasing strong feelings. For Aristotle, catharsis is defined as cleansing by pity and terror. Aristotle claims that poetry is

more worthy of serious attention than the study of history because it can give one more insight into life.¹⁵ For that reason, poetry, as a kind of art, can lead human emotion to be moral.

Socrates, Plato and Aristotle form the foundations of rational thinking. Socrates proposes the moral doctrine that no man does wrong voluntarily. His point is that if one really understands that a certain action is wrong he does not do it. So, conversely, if he does it, this shows that he has not fully understood that it is wrong. It follows that virtue becomes a matter of knowledge.

Socrates's contention is that everyone seeks happiness because he believes that it is his own good. The wrong doing is done because of ignorance. It follows that the wise man acts morally because he has knowledge of the good. A rational desire is one that always adjusts to one's beliefs about what is best for him or her. But other than rational desire there are appetites, which aim at pleasure and wish which aims at what is good and love. Socrates also recognizes the existence of appetites and passions which play a role in how people behave.

For Plato, reason is familiar with the highest good so that reason has absolute worth. The rational part of man is the true part. But there are passions, desires and appetites which are treated as emotions. These are irrational aspects of the soul. Plato also accepts the emotions which play a role in how people behave.

Aristotle attempts to give a definitive answer to the Socratic question of the highest good. For him, all human actions have some end. He tries to find out a supreme end or purpose, an ultimate principle or good. He holds that the human soul possesses the power of conceptual thought. So, the soul has the faculty of thinking about universals and necessary essence of particulars. But the soul does not consist of reason alone. It also has

an irrational part. The irrational part includes feelings, desires and appetites. Different part of the soul must act in the right way so that the body can function properly. Aristotle believes that a virtuous soul is a well-ordered soul in which there is the right relation between reason, feeling and desire. Hence, these three philosophers do not ignore the role of emotional side of human nature, although they focus on human reason. It should be understood that in the ethics of these three philosophers, not only reason but also emotion plays an important role. The implication is that emotion must be tempered by reason to be ethical. In order to discuss about both concepts in wider sense, in the second chapter, the role of emotion and reason in medieval ethics will be focused.

CHAPTER II

THE ROLE OF EMOTION AND REASON IN MEDIEVAL ETHICS

The aim of the Greek philosophers had been to give a rational explanation of the universe and man, independent of religion. Medieval moral thought start with a religious orientation. It can be said that Medieval moral thought cannot be separated from religious thoughts. Human beings strive for what is good for them. If one is going against the obligation of moral law and the commands of their conscience and God's will, this behavior is considered evil.

Scholasticism is a system of philosophy based on religious principles and writings in the middle ages. The title 'scholar' or 'scholastic' was even given to any learned person whether in the science or in philosophy as a title of respect at the time. Scholasticism and Medieval philosophy were philosophically identified.

2.1. Ethical View of St. Augustine

There are some philosophers from time to time who hold that there is connection between emotions and morality. St. Augustine was the most influential teacher of the early Christian church. Augustine holds that to understand that one must believe and only if one believes one will come to understand. Augustine states that the will is the cause of good or evil is a significant example of such a theory. He believes that in all things people seek what they think is good for them. Generally human being seeks good things such as wealth, fame in accordance with their own desires. Personal desires motivate human being to make wrong decisions and do evil things. Hence, St. Augustine says that people ought to live according to God's will. Augustine tried to discuss the controversy between faith and reason, will or intellect which are the two faculties of the soul for him of his time and the related question 'whether the will or the intellect is higher.' For him, love of God is the

highest function and he considers faith as the gift of grace. The will is involved both in faith and the love of God. In his thought of love and faith, there is voluntaristic element. At the same time Augustine is closer to the intellectualistic position because he accepts that in moral and cognitive acts, the intellect has priority over the will. In human life, possession of intellect is a higher activity than possession of will. Hence, for Augustine, it is better to know than to believe. In this respect, it can be said that he does not neglect 'the role of reason.'

There can be no belief if there is no understanding. One cannot believe anything if he or she does not understand it. Similarly one does not understand a thing if he or she does not believe in it. Intelligence is needed for understanding for what one believes. Faith is needed for believing what intelligence understands. The function of this pursuit is insight or wisdom. Wisdom is the highest function of reason.

Augustine accepts that wisdom involves knowing the truth about human and divine matters. He maintains that it is fundamentally true that all human beings want the highest good for themselves, want to be happy. But he acknowledges the obvious truth that different people have different views about what the highest good is. They seek their happiness in different forms of life. He argues that happiness must be secure and stable. The happy life will essentially involve satisfaction, fulfillment and tranquility. He accepts that people whose desires are radically misdirected are unhappy and are made unhappy when their misdirected desires are fulfilled. The happy person will desire and possess genuinely fulfilling goods. People whose beliefs about the highest good are mistaken and whose deepest desires and loves aim at what is not in fact the highest good must remain ultimately unhappy.

For him, God is the highest good and human beings whose happiness consists in finding and possessing the highest good, can find true happiness only in knowing and

loving God. On the other hand, he accepts that a morally upright person is the one whose soul is perfectly ordered under the rule of reason.¹ Hence, it can be said that to build good moral character, people ought to live in accordance with God's will and reason.

Every human being has desires which may be good or evil and in daily life they have to make choices which may be good or evil. For the sake of peace and harmony in human society they should conduct themselves morally. Morality is a code of values to guide one's choices and actions that determine the purpose and the course of his life. When people fail to obey the moral code, their choices and actions become disordered leading to evil actions.

Augustine believes that human behavior arises from the will. Moral behavior depends on good will. Good will is only a matter of leading one's life in the right way. Augustine holds that evil has no positive nature. Evil is simply the absence of goodness. Evil is the deviation from the norm of good action. Augustine asserts that the will of human beings is the first cause of evil and an evil will is the cause of all evils. Human beings should conduct themselves in accordance with God's will. It can be said that Augustine tries to explain the possibility of controlling the will by religious teaching or God's will. To put it in his words;

Wherefore the man who lives according to God, and not according to man, ought to be a lover of good and therefore a hater of evil.²

For Augustine, the person who lives according to God's will and not the will of human beings, is really a lover of good and a hater of evil. The human will he said is characterized as the state of morally bad if it is not in accordance with the will of God. Human beings are motivated by desire for what they consider good. Sometimes people cannot see the difference between good and bad. Although people choose and do what they think is good they may make mistakes and do what is not good.

Human beings want to live happily according to their personal desires. Augustine maintains that there are two cities namely the earthly city and the heavenly city. People who want to live in the earthly city are those who choose their life style in accordance with their desires. But the person who wants to live in the heavenly city must live according to God's will. Augustine states that,

Accordingly, two cities have been formed by two loves: the earthly by the love of self, even to the contempt of God the heavenly by the love of God, even to the content of self.³

So, Augustine maintains that those two cities have been formed by two loves. The first one is the earthly love of self, which refuses to obey the order of God and the second is heavenly love of God, which sacrifices even the essence of self. According to him, people have the freedom of choice to choose those two cities. The earthly city leads people to immorality, vice, crime, and other evil conduct whereas the heavenly city leads people to morality, love, sympathy, and the eternal good. People live in the heavenly city or holy city of God by way of faith. Concerning the way of faith, Augustine explains as follows;

According to the sacred scriptures and sound doctrine, the citizens of the holy city of God, who live according to God in the pilgrimage of this life, both fear and desire and grieve and rejoice.⁴

Human beings who want to live in God's city will fear eternal punishment and they will desire eternal life. So, people avoid evil out of a feeling of fear. At the same time, people desire eternal life in order to keep away from anxiety about death. For that reason, human beings want to live in God's city. Hence, they grieve about their evil deeds and rejoice in good works. These religious emotions such as grief about evil conduct and joy in good conduct arise from faith, feeling and desire.

People of the heavenly city are obviously forced to live on the earth among rival members of the earthly city. However they consider themselves as resident aliens and follow the law of God. T.C. Denise refers to Augustine's thought in his book *Great*

Traditions in Ethics as follows;

Everyone earnestly desires peace, but the misdirected methods of the City of Man fail to achieve it. Those who dwell in God's city know that peace is achieved not by war but by love. Hence everyone should obey and teach the precepts of Jesus "love God" and "love thy neighbor as thyself".⁵

In fact, everyone seriously desires peace but people fail to achieve it because they are misdirected by the ways and means of the earthly city. Only people in God's city can know the real peace that is achieved not by war but by love. Hence, everyone must obey and spread the word of 'love'. In Augustine's moral philosophy, moral goodness is possible only if human being live in accordance with God's will.

To sum up, according to Augustine good or evil conduct emerges from human will when it does or does not follow God's will. Augustine states two ways of life such as obeying the divine will and following one's desires. For Augustine, people are moral if they obey the divine will. In other words, if people want to behave morally, they have to obey divine will, by having faith. By way of faith, people can obtain good religious emotions which guide them to good moral behavior. Hence, it can be said that Augustine emphasizes the importance of emotion in his moral thought even though he acknowledges the relation between will and intellect.

2.2. Ethical View of St. Thomas Aquinas

Thomas Aquinas maintains that there is connection of faith and reason. He insists that faith can help the intellect to penetrate deeply and there are only a few things reason cannot attain. For example, the Trinity cannot be understood by reason though it is accepted by faith. So faith so that faith is not quite distinct from reason but reason and faith are connected and continuous.

Another problem of scholasticism is the relation between the will and intellect. It is the related question of whether the will and intellect are the two principal faculties of the

soul. According to the philosophy of the Middle Ages, faith is primarily engaging the will whereas reasoning engages the intellect. So the point is to examine whether the action of the will is able to generate intellectual ideas or whether the intellect able to give the will intellectual ideas. The answers of the scholastic philosophy including Aquinas are complicated because of the connection between the will and the divine grace which is supposed to move the will. Concerning this controversy Augustine and William of Ockham are regarded as the advocates of the will whereas Aquinas is regarded as the advocate of the intellect. But Aquinas does not put too much emphasis on the intellect since he insists on the importance of faith and love of God.

Generally, everyone wishes for good things even though not everyone can do good. Therefore, to be able to judge make the judge one's action as good or evil, it is in need of a moral code or moral law so that an act is judged as morally good when it is in conformity with moral laws. For that reason, in order to obtain the good things people need to understand the nature of human actions and how to conduct morally good actions. Concerning the nature of human voluntary action Aquinas states that,

An act is voluntary in two ways: as commanded by the will, such as speaking or walking; and as elicited from the will, such as the act of volition itself.⁶

Accordingly, Aquinas holds that there are two kinds of action such as elicited action and commanded action. Elicited action includes wish, intention, consent, election, use, fruition and so forth. When mental or physical action is under the control of the will, it is called commanded action such as speaking, walking, eating, and so forth. Therefore, these two kinds of voluntary action merely commanded by the will cannot guide the people on how to differentiate the good actions from the evil action.

Human actions are either in agreement or in disagreement with the dictates of reason. When they are in harmony with the dictates of right reason, they are good, and

they are evil when they are in opposition to these dictates.

In Aquinas's thought, human actions constitute freedom and voluntariness. Human actions proceed from the deliberate will. It means that human action must be free or that human actions must be the result of free will. In other words, human action is determined by the will. Voluntariness is an essential quality of human actions. But no human actions are good if they are not directed by rule of reason. In this respect, even though human actions are essentially produced from free will, it must be in the light of intellectual knowledge.

On the topic of happiness and supreme good, Aquinas states that richness, pleasure, power, and knowledge are all goods but they cannot produce a person's deepest happiness because they do not possess the character of the universal good or supreme good. The supreme good is merely found in God. Aquinas's view on supreme good can be found in his explanation of wealth as follows;

Wealth is of two kinds natural and artificial. Natural wealth, such as food, drink, clothing, and shelter, supplies natural needs. Artificial wealth, such as money, does not directly serve nature, but is invented by art to facilitate the exchange of goods.⁷

Aquinas makes a distinction between natural and artificial wealth. Natural wealth results from the fulfillment of natural desires. Such desires are food, clothing, shelter, love, community, freedom, etc. People need natural wealth. Aquinas said that artificial wealth is not natural. The desire for artificial wealth is a result of cultural conditioning such as money, power, and designation. Such desires vary from person to person, and culture to culture. Although people have a preoccupation with infinite artificial desires, they cannot fulfill all of. People cannot possess everything. Accordingly, Aquinas seemed to maintain that attaining natural wealth alone leads people to well-being. In *Great Traditions in Ethics*, Denise states Aquinas's thought about good or bad action as follows;

The difference between good acts of will and bad acts of will derive from the goodness or badness of the object to which reason directs the will.⁸

In this sense, good action or bad action is derived from human will. The rightness or wrongness of will is determined by reason which directs the will. In other words, it can be said that moral behavior or the character of an action, whether good or bad, depends on the intention of the agent. Generally, it is believed that reason gives directions on how to have good intention or good will. For that reason, moral constitution consists of will and reason. In order to be of good moral character, one should obey the moral laws in Aquinas's moral thought.

Aquinas's moral laws are divided into four kinds of law such as the **eternal law**, the **natural law**, the **divine law** and the **human law**. Eternal law is God's law. Divine law comes from God. The human law is instituted by governments. Natural law, for him, is a subset of eternal law and includes only general rules of conduct, such as "Murder is wrong." Regarding this point, James Fieser makes the comment on Aquinas's moral laws as follows;

Aquinas argues that there are four distinct kinds of law: eternal law, natural law, human law, and divine law. Eternal law is the most perfect and complete set of God's laws, which govern "the whole community of the universe." From a moral standpoint, these laws include both general moral rules of conduct, such as "Murder is wrong," and more particular rules, such as "Angry employees shouldn't gun down their bosses."⁹

Law is a system of rules and guidelines which are enforced through social institutions to govern people's behavior for controlling peace and order of a country. Thus, it is obvious that law is a command which must be reasonable and must be directed towards the common good. In other words, Law is a rule and measure of human behavior which is based on reason so that Law is the first principle of actions.

On the other hand, Aquinas holds that the human will is constrained by three orders. Concerning this point he clearly illustrates that,

The human will is constrained by three orders; its own system of reason; the external law of human government, both spiritual and temporal, political and domestic; the comprehensive scheme of divine rule.¹⁰

For Aquinas, human beings are obliged by three orders such as **reason, external law** and **divine law**. However, people are not forced by the law but are meant to recognize it by reason and to follow it freely. Human behaviors which are in harmony with the laws are good. Those which are not in harmony with it are evil. Thus, morally good or bad of the people have to be judged by which they agree to, or conflict with the laws. In this respect, it is obvious that external law and divine laws are known by reason or by conscience.

Aquinas holds that human behavior may be measured by the norm. To be morally good actions, human behaviors must be compatible with the norms of morality. Human actions are evil if it fails to conform to the norms of morality in any one of the determinants. A thing to be good must be entirely good and it must not include any defect. Regarding this he points out that,

A fourfold good can be considered in any human act: first, its fundamental goodness considered as an activity; second, its specific moral goodness which is taken from its appropriate object; third, its accidental goodness according to its circumstances; fourth, its relationship to the cause of goodness which is judged by its end.¹¹

In this sense, he states four aspects of human action. The four aspects are **good activity, good object, good end, and good circumstances**. By means of the four aspects human action can be determined as either good or bad. Certain actions in themselves are good whereas some are intrinsically evil. According to this principle, human beings firstly choose the good object or intrinsically good action. Those actions are determined by the end for which it is performed and the circumstances which affect it.

Aquinas holds that the concept of good end is the intention. Human action which is good in itself may still be evil because of one's intention. Hence, an intrinsically good

action done for a good end will bring about a new good end. An intrinsically bad action performed for evil purpose will bring about a new evil. An intrinsically evil behavior can never become to be good because of its intention itself is evil. Morally good or bad behavior may become better or worse by circumstance.

Moreover, Aquinas distinguishes three aspects of goodness that can be apprehended in general and with respect to which a human action can be determined either good or bad. They are the befitting or **virtuous good**, the **pleasant good** and the **useful good**. Passions or desires are said to be direct responses to a thing apprehended as it is seen in its pleasant or useful aspects.

Aquinas accepts that human actions are voluntary and depend on human choice. Human behavior based on the intention and apprehended by reason can be classified as morally good or bad. Different people make different decisions. In order to make the decisions, they must know what should or should not be done. Hence, people need to cultivate the will under reason and God's will.

Human beings naturally desire goodness. The good action is in conformity with moral laws. These good actions are described as virtues, which are helped by good habits. Aquinas claims that "Virtue is a good habit."¹²

In fact, virtue is a habit through which human beings wish for good things. But virtue gives both the inclination and the power to do readily what is morally good. The virtues are regarded as morally good because one performs them with knowledge, freedom and voluntariness. If people possess virtue they will be steady in doing good. Virtue is not something abstract and detached from life. Virtues are divided into natural and supernatural. In Aquinas's thought, the natural virtues are courage, temperance, justice and prudence. Courage is a strength that overcomes the fear of not doing the right. It is

manifested in the character of an individual who acts rightly and does not surrender to temptation. It aids in the effort demanded by a good action. It helps to eliminate the fear of not doing the good and provides the will to continue to perform the good action. Courage helps people to face all these difficulties with equanimity and to overcome them according to the dictates of right reason.

Temperance regulates the desire and use of food, drink, venereal pleasure, etc. One should not eat or drink and desire more than what is necessary for the proper health of mind and body. Human desires do not overcome reason by temperance. According to Aquinas,

Justice and courage are more immediately related to the common good than temperance is, for justice controls transactions with others, while courage rides the danger to be undergone for the common good. Temperance moderates merely one's own personal lusts and pleasures. Therefore the others are greater virtues, and prudence and the divine virtues are more potent still.¹³

People are more inclined to fulfill their desires for physical pleasure. Instead of self-control, temperance is better described as the proper ordering of sensual desires. Temperance is not so much about the suppression of feeling as a matter of properly directing human emotions. Justice is the fundamental principle how to live as individual and live together in the communities and societies. Prudence is right reason applied to practice. Prudence is that one knows what is to be done or what is to be avoided. Prudence helps one to choose the right way to achieve the right end.

With prudence, people learn to make good choices that bring peace and happiness. By it, people obtain the goodness. It helps to make daily decisions as best as they can. Prudence is opposed to recklessness, the tendency to rush into a decision without pondering the situation adequately. Prudence is a mean between two extremes. Prudence enables people to choose a middle way between the extreme of rash and hasty action.

Aquinas believed that these virtues cause a human to tend towards good as determined by reason. The cardinal virtues are directed to the good under the rule of reason.

Aquinas maintains that the source of all actions arise from the will. Human goodness depends on behavior that is in accordance with good will. He says that human beings should live in accordance with reason and God's will. People can freely choose their goals in various ways and their choices are made with purpose. If people make the wrong choices, it is because of ignorance, distraction and self-deception.

The good actions which are done directed toward God are called supernatural virtues. They are faith, hope, and charity. These emotions come from personal belief. There cannot be hope and love without faith. Without love, there can be faith and hope but they are imperfect. Among three virtues, the greatest one is love. Aquinas states that,

"Love is the form, mover, and root of virtues."¹⁴

Besides, faith is the theological virtue by which people believe in God. By that faith, people seek to know and do what God wills. Hope is the theological virtue by which people desire heaven and eternal life. Love is the theological virtue by which people love God and their neighbor as themselves. According to Aquinas, "The object of charity is not the common good, but the highest good."¹⁵

In this respect, charity is a kind of emotion which is chiefly concerned with patience and kindness and, rejects jealousy and pride. Charity upholds and purifies human ability to love, and raises it to the supernatural perfection of divine love. The fruits of charity are joy, peace, and mercy. It fosters reciprocity and generosity. It can give friendship and communion. Every moral virtue lies in a mean between extremes such as excess and defect. Therefore these emotions can help people to do good actions. It can be

said that 'reason' as well as 'emotion' are accepted at different levels of moral judgment in his moral philosophy.

2.3. Ethical View of William of Ockham

Ockham asserts that the human mind has a sensitive soul such as sense perception and bodily desires and an intellectual soul such as understanding and willing.¹⁶ It can be said that his moral thoughts are chiefly focused on the opinion that human beings should control their bodily desires and emotions under the dictates of right reason and God's will. Ockham states that good or evil deeds of human beings are determined by their intentions. Therefore, the will of the human being should conform itself to right reason and God's will.

Ockham holds that morally good or bad actions depend on the agent's intentions. The goodness or badness of the agent's will depends on its conformity to the dictates of right reason in the first stage and to God's will in the final stage. People should pursue the right thing and they should avoid the wrong thing according to right reason. Paul Vincent Spade explains Ockham's thought as follows;

He distinguishes two parts of ethical theory: (1) positive moral knowledge, which "contains human and divine laws that obligate one to pursue or to avoid things that are good or evil only because they are prohibited or commanded by a superior whose role it is to establish the laws," namely a superior such as a legislator or God; (2) nonpositive moral knowledge, which "directs human actions without any precept from a superior, as principles that are either known per se or by experience direct them."¹⁷

According to Spade, Ockham advocates two kinds of moral doctrines, **positive moral knowledge** and **non-positive moral knowledge**. Positive moral knowledge contains human law and divine law. Human beings are obligated to obey these laws to pursue good and to avoid evil. Positive moral knowledge can provide substantive moral content to human action. Non-positive moral knowledge is that which directs action without a basis from a superior such as God or a legislator. Non-positive moral knowledge

is derived from experience. This principle does not tell people what is right or wrong but it is discoverable by reason. It does not provide people with substantive moral content. Ockham holds that reason aids one in determining the moral rightness or wrongness of an action.

Ockham describes the will as the bearer of moral worth. There must be some actions that are intrinsically virtuous. Someone wills to do good deeds in conformity with right reason. The agent's intention is not against right reason. Reason is an individual cognitive capacity. The agent performs an action precisely because it is dictated by right reason and the law of God.

Ockham accepts the fact that people require faith but faith cannot be proved by reason. Faith helps to guide human behavior. Ockham argues that even God is more perfect than right reason. Paul states that,

The highest stage of moral behavior, then, is to act out of the love of God above all else for his own sake For Ockham, then, the core of ethics is the love of God (the intrinsically good act), and the love of God is a matter of conforming one's own will to God's will.¹⁸

Like Aquinas, Ockham holds that there are two kinds of virtues, **theological** and **moral**. The theological virtues are faith, hope and charity and the moral virtues include justice, temperance and fortitude. The only thing that can properly be called a virtue is act which is strictly virtuous and the will of the act is virtuous. Hence, virtue must be a habit of the will. It shows that moral law cannot force one to choose against one's will. The will of an agent conforms to the dictates of right reason and God's will. Human will plays a fundamental role and it freely chooses moral law. Therefore, it can be said that emotions of faith, hope and charity were considered as ways to guide human behavior in moral thought.

In Augustine's thought, good or evil emerges from human will. He states that there are personal desires and God's will. People should not live in accordance with personal

desires. To build good moral character, people ought to live in accordance with God's will. Aquinas holds that all choices are made under the lead of human intention and that. Good will play a fundamental role in moral behavior. Aquinas argues that human beings should live in accordance with reason and God's will.

In Ockham's thought, the agent's will is the fundamental role and it freely chooses moral law. Therefore, good or evil depends on the agent's good will. God's will is a way to reach the place of limitless good.

Therefore the preceding studies show that in the Medieval Age, people maintained that there is a connection between morality and religious faith. Religious faith motivates and guides people to behave in a morally good way. The moral rules of right or wrong come from the commands of God. Besides emotions of virtues such as faith, hope and charity dispose people to be morally good. They also believed that the rightness or wrongness of an action depends on God's commands. An act is right if it conforms to God's will but an act is wrong if it goes against God's will. People are turned away from evil and are induced to perform good deeds by two emotions. The first is fear and it serves as incentive to avoid evil with the threat of God's punishment. The second is love which helps people to do good. For that reason, it can be said that religious thought and morality seemed to be closely intertwined in the Western Medieval thought.

From the study of Western medieval moral thoughts, it becomes to realize that religious disciplines tried to steer 'the will' of people to be good pathway. According to these medieval philosophers, to develop a morally good character, people must have good will, because human actions arise from human will. To have good will, religious faith, hope of eternal life, fear of eternal punishment, love of God and neighbors, and the spirit of charity can promote moral behaviors of human beings. Therefore, it can be said that emotions were considered as a guide to human behavior. These kinds of emotions

are considered to play an auxiliary role at the lower level of moral development in Western Medieval moral thoughts.

Augustine's dictum "Believe in order that you may understand" is different from the extreme dualism which opposes faith and reason. Because Augustine believes that reason must first decide whether a revelation has actually been stated and when a relation has been decided it can be regarded as authentic. Frank Thilly remarks that it is the same as saying that faith affirms the relation and reason seeks to understand and interpret it.¹⁹

For Augustine, the supreme goal of human conduct is a religious, mystical idea because for him the human mind can be united with God. But it can be united not in this earthly imperfect world but only in future life which he assumes to be the true life.

Concerning virtues, he tries to bridge the gap between heavenly good and earthly morality. Since with 'love' one can unite with God, he regards love as the supreme virtue, the source of other virtues.

The ethics of Thomas Aquinas is a combination of Aristotelian and Christian elements. Both of these elements assume that God makes everything for a purpose of revealing his goodness in creation. So for both of them the highest good is God. For Aristotle, the supreme good is speculative knowledge and the contemplation of God. For Aquinas, knowledge of God is the highest good and it is gained by intuition. Aquinas agrees with Aristotle that the supreme good for man is to realize his true self. Irrational beings have sensuous impulses whereas rational beings try to realize their happiness consciously and voluntarily. There are many ways of knowing God. Speculation and contemplation are the highest. Natural, immediate, unreflective knowledge of God cannot give people complete happiness because it is not perfect. Knowledge can be attained by reason. But one may know God by faith but since faith depends on will, it is not self-

evident. Hence, knowledge of God can be attained intuitively and that intuitive knowledge endures forever.

At this juncture, it can be concluded that most philosophers in the Western Medieval Age have generally agreed that emotion can lead people to do good or evil. In fact, positive emotions can promote moral behavior and negative emotion can cause harmful effect on others. Nevertheless, people cannot follow reason when they are overwhelmed by negative emotions or desires. Extreme emotions can cause great damage to individual and society. If one adopts extremely negative attitudes toward another, then it leads to consequences such as hatred and even violence. Although Augustine, Aquinas and William of Ockham emphasize religious belief, they do not totally ignore the role of reason. Augustine accepts that morally upright person is perfectly under the rule of reason. William of Ockham holds that a person wills to do good actions in conformity with right reason. Aquinas accepts that the role of reason in their moral thought because moral behavior includes good activity, good object, good end and good circumstance. So, people can choose the four aspects in accordance with reason. Accordingly, it can be said that these three philosophers accept reason as an important guidance to lead human behavior to be good or to avoid evil deeds. In the third chapter, the role of emotion and reason in Modern ethics will be discussed in order to study both concepts from wider perspective.

CHAPTER III

THE ROLE OF EMOTION AND REASON IN MODERN ETHICS

In the West, Modern philosophy is a revolt against authority and tradition of medieval philosophy. In its beginnings Modern philosophy accepts reason as the authority in science and philosophy. The physical and mental world, society, human institutions and religion are explained by natural causes. Modern philosophers are interested in the practical applications of the results of scientific investigation. They are looking forward to wonderful achievements in the fields of technology, medicine as well as political and social reform.

So far as Modern ethics is concerned, it cannot be said that rationalists emphasize reason alone in the context of morality whereas empiricists emphasize emotion alone that is directly concerned with empirical experience in the context of morality. Although rationalists focus on reason and empiricists focus on experience, they do not deny the role of emotion in their moral thoughts.

Even though rationalists emphasize the role of reason, they recognize the necessity of emotion such as generosity, love, and charity in relation to morality. In fact, rationality may not always be associated with virtue and virtue may not always be associated with rationality because reason or reasoning may not always be associated with the welfare or happiness of humankind. However, it is an undeniable fact that knowledge through reason is necessary to enhance virtuous action which has a positive influence on the wellbeing of human beings.

Empiricists emphasize the relationship between morality and the will of God. Specifically, they emphasize the emotions of love and sympathy because these are the necessities of moral virtue. However, it is not easy to motivate people to act morally against their personal emotions. For that reason, even though they are empiricists, they

cannot reject the role of reason in order to control the negative emotions of human beings in whatever they do. Hence, it can be said that with regard to morality both empiricists and rationalists are similar in assuming that both reason and emotion are necessary in order to promote the moral lives of human beings even though they probably maintain their respective views of rationalism or empiricism in the context of epistemological thought.

Moreover, in modern ethics, the ethics of Kant is based on the view that the only intrinsically good thing is good will. What is central to Kant's construction of the moral law is the categorical imperative, which acts on people, regardless of their desires. Kant bases his ethical theory on the belief that reason should be used to determine how people ought to act. An action is only good if the maxim of the action, the reason and principles behind it, is duty to the moral law and therefore performed out of a good will.

3.1. The Role of Emotion and Reason in the Ethical View of Rationalists

As rationalists, Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz believe that people can gain knowledge from reason. Moreover, they hold that human beings can grasp happiness through knowledge and understanding of what good means. From this point, it can be said that even though they are rationalists, they accept not only reason but also appreciate emotion such as generosity, love, love of God, and charity with respect to moral behaviors in their thoughts.

3.1.1. Ethical View of René Descartes

As a rationalist, Descartes emphasizes reason, but he also appreciates the importance of emotion in conjunction with 'generosity'. The term generosity in his thought can be identified as a kind of emotion. Therefore, the relationship between reason and generosity or emotion will be shown under this heading.

Descartes asserts that doing what is good depends on the knowledge of what is good

and of what is bad. Hence, if one has the knowledge of deciding what is good and what is bad, he is more likely to avoid doing bad. By one's capacity of distinguishing good and bad, one can be a morally good person. Only when one's conduct is good, it will generate happiness or spiritual pleasure. For Descartes, the ability to distinguish what is good from what is bad can enhance the contentment and inner satisfaction of one's mind which are different from sensual pleasure but associated with spiritual pleasure. Therefore, there are two kinds of pleasure in Descartes's moral thought such as 'spiritual pleasure' and 'sensual pleasure'.

For Descartes, 'pure intellect' alone can distinguish between spiritual pleasure and sensual pleasure because one can get the knowledge of good or bad only through pure intellect or by means of reason. Accordingly, 'spiritual pleasure' or true happiness can be obtained only through pure intellect in his thought. For example, although one should abstain from sexual misconduct or killing living beings, according to moral precepts, it is not easy to follow these moral precepts perfectly. It means that if one cannot control his emotions due to the lack of pure intellect, he may easily violate moral precepts. In Descartes's moral thought, there are two usages of the term 'reason'. The first one is common reason associated with sensual pleasure and the second one is the reason that can lead to pure intellect associated with spiritual pleasure. For him, pure intellect, a kind of reason, associated with spiritual pleasure is more important than common reason associated with sensual pleasure. Nevertheless, 'reason' is the primary cause of spiritual pleasure as well as sensual pleasure in his moral thought. If one's 'will' is under the guidance of pure intellect, one is able to discover what morally good is. Descartes believes that pure intellect is a clear and distinct kind of reason. Concerning this point, Descartes states that,

The will is safe from error or sin when it is governed by clear and distinct

knowledge, and is in danger only when it pursues obscure and confused intellectual conceptions.¹

This point is that the will is governed by clear and distinct knowledge called pure intellect which comes from a higher level of reason. Furthermore, it can also be said that pure intellect plays a vital role in an attempt to be virtuous, and in an attempt to have true happiness or spiritual pleasure. He also accepts the role of 'human (good) will' which is associated with virtue. Hence, in order to have true happiness or spiritual pleasure, one must have virtue or good will. However, the virtue or good will that transcends appetite or passion can only be obtained through pure intellect which is regarded as knowledge that can differentiate the good from the bad.

Thus, the virtue obtained from pure intellect alone is sufficient to make people content in their life. For Descartes, virtue can be attained or occurs in one's mind by means of pure intellect which is related with reason. Hence, 'pure intellect' plays an important role in his moral thought because of human (good) will or virtue that can give true happiness. Concerning this point Descartes explains as follows;

For our will tends to pursue (or avoid) only what our intellect represents as good (or bad), so all we need in order to act well is to judge well; and judging as well as we can is all we need to act as well as we can - that is to say, to acquire all the virtues and in general all the other attainable goods. With this certainty, one cannot fail to be happy.²

Descartes' point is that human 'will' which is under the control of pure intellect can help people to make a distinction between good and bad. Otherwise, it can tend to passion or appetite. For that reason, Descartes seemed to assert that since sensational feeling or sensual pleasure can change somebody's mind to immoral acts, reason or pure intellect is necessary to control the human mind for leading people to act morally. In Descartes's moral thought, pursuing virtue or being content is the only way to gain the greatest kind of happiness because contentment of the mind alone can lead people to true happiness or

spiritual pleasure. Descartes did not deny the role of emotion (sensational feeling or sensual pleasure) in his moral thought because it is a primary or innate mental faculty of human beings.

In his moral thought, he accepts that emotion plays a vital role in motivating human beings to do good or bad. For him, happiness is the perfect contentment of mind and inner satisfaction. Although Descartes emphasizes pure intellect, he acknowledges the fact that it may be hard for ordinary people to remove bodily pleasure totally. Thus, he realizes that it is important not to neglect the role of passions or emotion. Descartes states that,

Those who are generous in this way are naturally led to do great things while not undertaking anything that they don't feel capable of doing. And because they don't rate anything higher than doing good to others and contemning their own self-interest, they are always perfectly courteous, gracious and obliging to everyone. And along with this they have complete command over their passions, especially over desires.³

It can be inferred that as he accepts the relationship between bodily pleasure and the spiritual pleasure, he realizes that the role of passion or emotion cannot easily be eliminated. Although the knowledge of deciding what is good and what is bad is regarded as pure intellect, generosity is also regarded as the key to all other virtues. This implies that if one is really generous, he is more likely to do good conduct, and it is possible for him to benefit others and to avoid doing harm. Generosity can be regarded as the origin of altruistic spirit so that it is associated with virtue in its moral sense. The generous mind can also be regarded as the innate nature of some people so that it is associated with the primary mental faculty of human emotion. This is the reason why it can be said that even though Descartes emphasizes the pure intellect through the right use of reason, 'generosity' as virtue or a kind of emotion can lead someone completely get over his or her passions or desires. So it necessarily has a place in his moral thought.

Generosity is associated with attitudes and character traits. A generous person can

easily use his will in a good way and he treats others with respect. Generosity leads to develop virtues such as respect for others, humility, courage, kindness, affability, helpfulness and so forth as well as temperance that comes with regulation of the passions or desires. Generosity can overcome the bad desires so that it can develop good character.

From above mentioned, it can be concluded that Descartes as a rationalist recognizes pure intellect as necessary for differentiating good and bad. In this respect, he seemed to assert the importance of 'reason' in his moral thought. However, he also accepts 'generosity' as an important ethical concept. As generosity is fundamentally related with the innate nature of human mental faculty, it is a kind of emotion. In this respect, it can be said that he cannot reject the role of human emotion. Nevertheless, 'pure intellect' as well as 'generosity' is necessary to become a virtuous or morally good person.

3.1.2. Ethical View of Baruch Spinoza

As a rationalist, Spinoza accepts that the only source of knowledge is 'reason' but he also accepts the role of 'emotion' like 'love' as well as 'love of God' in his moral thought. In his philosophy, it is noteworthy that he accepts the intuitive knowledge of God or love of God as the highest virtue. His thought is ethical and religious. For him, the mind's highest good is the knowledge of God. The mind's highest virtue is to know God. In this respect, it can be said that even though he is a rationalist, he cannot give a rational explanation of the existence of God. He seemed to prove the existence of God by means of its related conceptions of 'Love' or 'Love of God' which is somehow emotional as well as virtuous.

In order to explain Spinoza's moral thought, it is necessary to present his theory of knowledge because it is related to what is good or bad, pain and pleasure. Spinoza states that there are three different levels of knowledge. They are inadequate knowledge, adequate knowledge and intuitive knowledge. Inadequate knowledge is the lowest level of

human knowledge. It depends on sense perception. Adequate knowledge is rational knowledge. Intuitive knowledge is the highest kind of knowledge which God possesses. Everyone has such kinds of knowledge. Human beings are limited in their knowledge. If human knowledge becomes clear, they will be more rational and will attain more comprehensive knowledge. Hence, people come to know the true causes of their decision and they will be less dependent on passions.

Moreover, Spinoza accepts that good is advantageous and evil is disadvantageous. Concerning this point, Spinoza states that,

By good I mean that which we certainly know to be useful to us. By evil I mean that which we certainly know to be a hindrance to us in the attainment of any good.⁴

It can be explained that the good for human beings is to be useful which is appropriate for doing what is good or doing what gives pleasure. It is somehow similar to utilitarianism. But it is to be noted that what Spinoza emphasizes is the knowledge of good. The ultimate end of human beings is self-preservation. Without self-preservation, it may not be easy for man to do what is morally good. When people want something, such desires arise from self-interest. Spinoza mentions about this idea as follows;

To act absolutely in obedience to virtue is in us the same thing as to act, to live, or to preserve one's being in accordance with the dictates of reason on the basis of seeking what is useful to one's self.⁵

Accordingly, Spinoza seemed to assert that it is possible for human beings to behave under the guidance of reason. Reason could provide human beings a more reliable kind of knowledge and reason could make people a better kind of life. If man acts according to reason, his emotion will be associated with doing what is morally good. According to Spinoza,

Man, in so far as he is determined to a particular action because he has inadequate ideas, cannot be absolutely said to act in obedience to virtue; he

can only be so described, in so far as he is determined for the action because he understands.⁶

It means that, with adequate knowledge of morality as well as knowledge of deciding what is good and what is bad, people are more likely to avoid sensual pleasure because irrational desires lead to immoral conduct. Many other immoral passions are associated with irrational desires. Spinoza accepts that when someone wishes for sensual pleasure, he or she is irrational. Therefore, if someone acts according to reason or adequate knowledge, then he or she can promote what is good not only for himself but for others.

Concerning Spinoza's view on emotion, he accepts that there are three primary emotions such as desire, pleasure, and pain. All emotions arise from desire, pleasure, or pain. Desire may arise from either pleasure or pain. According to Spinoza,

The knowledge of good and evil is nothing else but the emotions of pleasure or pain, in so far as we are conscious thereof.⁷

It means that knowledge of good and evil arises from the awareness of what causes pleasure and pain. In fact, all emotions may not necessarily conflict with reason. Emotions which agree with reason may cause pleasure, while emotions which do not agree with reason may cause pain. This means that pleasure arises only when there is balance between emotions and reason. If one is able to do so, his knowledge is to be regarded as synthesis of reason and emotion, or as adequate ideas of morality. If he is unable to do so due to the lack of the ability to reconcile emotion and reason, his knowledge of morality cannot be regarded as adequate knowledge of morality but as inadequate knowledge of morality. In order to live along with reason is a kind of living that leads to pleasure.

Moreover, Spinoza explains that good or evil is related with the emotion of love and hate. Love is a union with the object which understanding judges to be good and glorious. Hatred is an inclination that causes people some harm. On the other hand, he

accepts that the highest good of mind is to know God and that it is a virtue. Spinoza explains it as follows;

The mind's highest good is the knowledge of God, and the mind's highest virtue is to know God.⁸

Although the mind is not capable of understanding everything, the highest good of the mind is the knowledge of God. The highest virtue of the mind is to know God. Moreover, the emotion of hatred is evil. Therefore one who lives under the guidance of reason will try to avoid these evil emotions. But it can be considered that if one has the adequate knowledge of good and bad, and of love and hate, it is possible for him to have or understand the mind's highest good as well as highest virtue. Otherwise, the emotion of hatred may increase. On the contrary, if one is able to cultivate love with the help of the adequate knowledge of morality, it is possible for him to have the mind's highest good, the knowledge of God as well as the mind's highest virtue.

Therefore, one who lives under the guidance of reason will attempt to repay hatred with love and kindness. Pleasure is bad when it is not under the guidance of reason. Pleasure is good, when it is in harmony with reason. An action is bad, when it arises from evil emotion. For Spinoza, reason motivates evil emotion to transform into good emotions. It guides human behavior.

As mentioned above, it can be said that Spinoza recognizes the role of 'reason' as the driving force to lead people to obtain adequate knowledge of morality, the knowledge of deciding what is good and what is bad. If human beings behave according to such reason, they can conquer the influence of evil emotions and extreme desires by controlling it with reasoning. By means of reason, an individual may understand how to avoid immoral passions associated with hate or evil and how to cultivate morally good attitudes like Love or Love of God. If an individual acts in accordance with the adequate

knowledge, he or she can be regarded as one who tries to promote love not only for him or her but for others. In addition, Spinoza believes that the highest good of the mind is 'to know God'. In this respect, Spinoza recognizes not only reason but also emotion in his moral thought.

To sum up, Spinoza recognizes not only the role of reason but he emphasizes the 'role of Love' or 'Love of God' which transcends the scope of 'reason'. If it is supposed that Love or Love of God is a kind of 'emotion' associated with the notion of 'personal belief' in its social or religious sense, it can be said that emotion is a primary or crucial factor in considering morality of human beings. For that reason, moral conduct is somehow associated with emotions including not only personal desire, pleasure, and pain, but also Love of God or Love as strongly emphasized in Spinoza's moral thought.

3.1.3. Ethical View of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz

Like Descartes, Leibniz is a mathematician who believes that mathematics provides reliable knowledge. In his monadology, he asserts that the world is composed of an infinite number of dynamic monads in which God is the supreme monad. God creates this universe because it is the best of all possible worlds. However the world is not perfect because there is evil. For Leibniz virtue can be gained by combating evil.

Leibniz maintains that the highest good of human beings is the greatest happiness. He believes that happiness can be attained by virtuous action. Only a virtuous person is able to distinguish 'apparent good' from 'real good' and resist harmful passions by their wisdom. For him, the right action to be taken in practical life has to be discovered through reasoning. So, it can clearly be seen that what is ethically good implies the greatest happiness. It is because whatever is ethically good is to be regarded as spiritual happiness rather than bodily pleasure. This shows that the ability to do what is ethical and moral

depends on the understanding of ethical virtue. If a man is able to do so, he will be able to understand what contradicts the highest good as well as the greatest happiness.

Consequently, he can understand that bodily pleasure is sometimes associated with what is unethical. By understanding of this association, he is more likely to avoid doing whatever leads to the greatest evil which is contradictory to moral virtue. He can also understand the highest good. To be able to distinguish what is ethically good and what is ethically bad is moral reasoning or moral wisdom. Only when one possesses such moral wisdom, he can control bodily pleasures which are not ethical. Leibniz explains it as follows;

It will have perfect power, knowledge, and will; that is to say, it will have omnipotence, omniscience, and supreme goodness. And as justice, taken in a very general sense, is nothing other than goodness in conformity with wisdom, there must clearly also be supreme justice in God.⁹

Leibniz's point is that if one has perfect power, knowledge and will, one can obtain supreme good. In his moral thought, it is asserted that 'pleasure is knowledge of perfection' and 'pain is the knowledge of imperfection'. However, it should be noted that sensual pleasure comes from the knowledge of imperfection because it is always accompanied with pain. Leibniz assumes that virtue is the habit of behaving morally and justice is the habit of loving which are promoted by wisdom. Therefore, charity or love is associated with knowledge of perfection and practice of virtuous persons.

In Leibniz's moral thought, it is found that there are different types of goodness and evil. Goodness is of three kinds. The first one is physical goodness which is associated with pleasure. The second kind is moral goodness which includes virtue. The third kind is metaphysical goodness which is of reality. Evil can also be classified into three kinds. Physical evil is concerned with pain, moral evil deals with sin or vice, and metaphysical evil deals with privation of reality. It can be understood that physical, moral and

metaphysical dimensions are involved in whatever is good or bad. It is necessary to remove evil and to have goodness. Thus, Leibniz mentions that,

Evil may be taken metaphysically, physically and morally. Metaphysical evil consists in mere imperfection, physical evil in suffering, and moral evil in sin. This account of metaphysical evil accords with his identification of perfection with quantity of essence, or positive reality. From the other definitions, one can infer that physical perfection is the opposite of suffering and moral perfection the opposite of sin. Moral perfection, however, requires justice, which Leibniz says entails a loving concern for the happiness of all those one can affect. Since he defines happiness as a state of lasting joy, it follows that God cares about the lasting joy of all spirits.¹⁰

It can be understood that in Leibniz's moral thought, there is a matter of degree concerning moral perfection. One's moral consciousness can increase or can be perfect depending on his knowledge of God. For him, whenever one is rational, he is necessarily virtuous because virtue depends on loving God and neighbors. Therefore, in his moral thought, love of God or virtue is directly related to happiness which is regarded as a kind of emotion. Concerning the concept of 'Love of God', Leibniz states that,

And apart from the present pleasure, nothing could be more useful for the future, for the love of God also fulfils our hopes, and leads us in the way of supreme happiness. Thus although reason cannot teach us the details of the great future, which are reserved for revelation, we can rest assured by this same reason that things are accomplished in a manner which exceeds our desires. Since, too, God is the most perfect and the most happy and consequently the most lovable of substances, and since pure true love consists in the state which causes pleasure to be felt in the perfections and happiness of the beloved, this love ought to give us the greatest pleasure of which a man is capable, when God is the object of it.¹¹

It means that human beings should search for their pleasure as well as goodness through love of God. Loving God and loving neighbors give people the greatest pleasure. Moreover, he explains that the sentiment of increasing perfection connects to the pleasure of the mind. Striving for goodness or pursuing joy may eventually lead to happiness. People can attain true happiness only when they understand the perfection and they practice moral goodness. However, to regard happiness as virtuous, people are always

required to behave in accordance with the knowledge of perfection and Love of God. Although reason cannot teach human beings all the details of the future, which are kept for revelation, reason can control extreme desires. In this respect, Leibniz seems to assert that true happiness can be attained only by knowledge of perfection or virtue associated with reason.

From the statements mentioned above, it can be said that Leibniz holds that wisdom and good will make people try to achieve the good character. From studying Leibniz's thought it can be said that virtue, the highest moral character, is not only related with reason but also related with emotion because his concept of charity or justice is associated with the Love or Love of God which is somehow interpreted as good will or empathetic feeling towards others.

To sum up, the three rationalists namely Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibniz recognize not only the role of reason but also the role of emotion in their views on morality. It can be noted that although one can think rationally and possesses wisdom, a person's conduct may not always be virtuous or morally good, because no one can achieve the highest level of moral goodness or true happiness through lack of altruistic or good tendencies such as generosity, charity and love which are commonly associated with the feelings of love and sympathy. As a final point, it can be said that as rationalists, they tried to reinforce the role of 'reason', but they cannot reject entirely the role of 'emotion' like generosity, love and charity because these are ordinarily found in the innate nature of human mind.

3.2. The Role of Emotion and Reason in the Ethical View of Empiricists

The three famous empiricists namely Locke, Berkeley and Hume insisted that the external world can be known only through the senses. The mind has to organize the information drawing inferences from it. But the primary source of the data can be only

sensory experience. Moreover, these three philosophers recognize the role of both ‘reason’ and ‘emotion’ in cultivating morally good character of human being.

3.2.1. Ethical View of John Locke

Locke offers an empirical theory of ethics in harmony with his empiricism. For him, there are no innate moral truths. People attain knowledge of moral rules and their obligations in the same way they come to know other things by means of experience. By means of education, environment and customs, they come to learn moral rules.

As an empiricist, Locke accepts pleasure and pain as the primary motivating factors for all human actions. Locke took compliance with the requirement of morality to be important for such happiness as people can attain happiness. This is why he accepts the ‘natural law’ which God's will contain.

For Locke, the concept of ‘good’ can be divided into two kinds such as ‘natural good’ and ‘moral good’. Natural good involves the physical pleasure and moral good which is pleasure arising from one's conformity to moral dictates. Contrary to moral good, moral evil is pain arising from the failure to conform. Good or evil is the conformity or nonconformity of human voluntary actions to some law from the will of the law maker.

Locke maintains that ‘moral law’ is an obligatory set of rules, because it reflects the will of a superior authority. Besides, people are obliged to obey moral rules because these rules arise from authority and control human conduct to be good. Locke says that,

Moral good and evil, then, is only the conformity or disagreement of our voluntary actions to some law, whereby good or evil is drawn on us, from the will and power of the lawmaker; which good and evil, pleasure or pain, attending our observance or breach of the law by the decree of the lawmaker, is that we call reward and punishment. The laws that men generally prefer their actions to, to judge of their rectitude or obliquity, seem to me to be these three: 1. The divine law 2. The civil law 3. The law of opinion or reputation.¹²

From the above citation, Locke seems to explain that apart from the laws which

refer to the system of rules for governing the country, there are three basic types of 'moral law'. These are 'divine law', 'civil law', and the 'law of opinion' or reputation and these are needed to judge human conducts. Of these three moral laws, the first law is the divine law given by God. God has the power to enforce it by reward and punishment which are of pain and pleasure. This means that reward and punishment depend on whether one obeys the divine law or not. One has the choice of either being given an eternal reward and of being punished with eternal pain and punishment for one's immoral deeds. According to Locke, the emotion of pleasure is generally considered good, but the highest form of pleasure would always be what is pleasing to God.

The second moral law namely 'civil law' is set up of rules and enforcements by government. It is accompanied by legal rewards and punishments. For Locke, the majority is used to governing themselves by the opinions and rules of those with whom they converse because no man can escape from the fashion and opinion of their fellows. Hence, the third kind of law, law of opinion is that people may be influenced by certain aspects of religion, and at the same time they will also often reflect the opinion of the people.

Locke holds that men's actions are compared with the three moral laws and according to the agreement or disagreement with them they are judged as good or evil. However, virtue is the will of God and virtues and vices correspond with the unchangeable rule of right and wrong established by the law of God.¹³

The divine law is concerned with what leads to rewards or punishment, pleasure or pain. However, human beings have a variety of desires so that the desires of people are not identical with the pleasure recommended by God at all times. Therefore, human beings always strive for their unlimited desires which are usually related to sensual pleasures. Therefore, human beings need to understand how to keep away from doing evil and how

to promote doing good actions for attaining true happiness.

Locke holds that there are two ways to avoid evil or to attain happiness. One way is to behave in accordance with 'God's will', and the other is to behave rationally because with reason people can think what is better for their actions. In short, these laws guide people toward what is best. As an empiricist, Locke holds that moral knowledge can be derived from experience. He also believes that moral knowledge can also be reached by reasoning from certain principles by means of demonstration. For him, there are different modes of moral knowledge. These are an empirical knowledge of right and wrong, demonstrative knowledge and revealed knowledge. God has endowed men with reason. So, with reason men are able to acquire moral truth by demonstration. In Locke's view, even though human beings know that they should strive for virtue or true happiness by obeying divine law, he cannot reject the driving force of sensual pleasure which sometimes overwhelm the real goods.

Concerning the concept of 'emotion', Locke accepts that a good thing produces pleasure and an evil thing produces pain. In this way, good and evil arise from emotive reaction in his moral thought. According to Locke, human beings crave a variety of things and when they get them, they feel pleasure and in an opposite case, they feel pain. Concerning this point, Locke states that,

Things then are good or evil, only in reference to pleasure or pain. That we call good, which is apt to cause or increase pleasure, or diminish pain in us; or else to procure or preserve us the possession of any other good or absence of any evil.¹⁴

It seems that good is whatever produces pleasure or diminishes pain for human beings. An evil is whatever produces pain or diminishes pleasure. Thus, pain and pleasure are the primary motivating factors of human conduct. Locke contrasts pain with pleasure. Positive emotion such as love is described as pleasure whereas hate or sorrow is described

as pain. According to Locke,

Were it my business here to inquire any further than into the bare ideas of our passions, as they depend on different modifications of pleasure and pain, I should remark, that our love and hatred of inanimate insensible beings is commonly founded on that pleasure and pain which we receive from their use and application any way to our senses, though with their destruction. But hatred or love, to beings capable of happiness or misery, is often the uneasiness or delight which we find in ourselves, arising from a consideration of their very being or happiness. Thus the being and welfare of a man's children or friends, producing constant delight in him, he is said constantly to love them.¹⁵

It means that if one wishes for happiness, one should have the emotion of love. This is because the emotion of love can promote happiness and the emotion of hatred is contradictory to happiness. Thus, he emphasizes loving each other. It is necessary for people to cultivate love in order to attain or practice what is morally good. Locke accepts that positive emotion can make people behave morally because the emotion of love is equated with pleasure. That is the reason why it can be said that Locke accepts both the role of emotion and the role of reason for promoting moral conduct of human beings.

3.2.2. Ethical View of George Berkeley

The chief concepts in Berkeley's moral thought deals with the acceptance of 'natural law' and 'God's will'. For him, the greatest good is mainly associated with intellectual pleasure. In order to have intellectual pleasure, people are required to obey God's will. By means of obeying God's will, they can overlook sensual pleasure and aims for the greatest good. As an empiricist, he recognizes the role of pleasure obtained through physical faculty but he also emphasizes the role of intellect for understanding the authenticity of pleasures.

Even though Berkeley is an empiricist, he accepts the role of reason in his moral thought. It is obvious in his usage of the term 'intellectual pleasure'. All human desires are directed towards gaining happiness or avoiding misery. Berkeley accepts that human

actions are derived from 'self-interest'. According to Berkeley,

If we are to make a true estimate of pleasure that great spring of action from which the conduct of life gets its direction we have to compute intellectual pleasures.¹⁶

It can be understood that Berkeley accepts intellectual pleasure as the grounds of true happiness. As people learn from experience about the nature of things, it is natural for them to feel sensual pleasure. But they also learn that intellectual pleasures give them greater satisfactions than those of sensual pleasure. Having their greatest good as their end, a wise man is obliged to overlook sensual pleasure. Moreover, a wise man can avoid what is miserable and attain what is morally good by reason. Berkeley states that,

They have other uses, such as raising proper emotions, producing certain dispositions or habits of mind, and directing our actions in pursuit of the happiness that is the ultimate end and design, the primary spring and motive that sets rational agents at work.¹⁷

It can be explained that people should seek true happiness according to reason. He maintains that proper emotion arises from reason. Rational agents evaluate and choose their actions on the basis of self-interest whether good or bad. Hence, it can be said that Berkeley admits the role of reason in promoting human beings to be morally good persons.

Berkeley emphasized the point that God alone can make people real happy by showing them what is good and what is evil. For Berkeley, people should behave in accordance with the 'laws of nature' because it is in conformity with the will of God. These laws are associated with what people should do because natural laws and morality cannot be separated. As they are not man-made laws, natural laws do not directly regulate human conduct as man-made laws do. But Berkeley accepts the necessity of natural laws because these laws can guide people to behave morally and avoid doing immoral deeds. Concerning this point, Berkeley explains as follows;

There will be great beauty in a system of spirits that are subordinate to

God's will and under his direction, with him governing them by laws, and directing them by methods, that are suitable to wise and good ends. A man is conscious that his will is inwardly conformed to God's will, which produces order and harmony in the universe and conducts the whole by the most just methods to the best end.¹⁸

It can be explained that in order to decide what is morally good or bad deeds can be made clear by natural laws that are derived from the will of God. In other words, obeying the natural laws in association with God's will is to promote what is morally good for people. However, it is noteworthy that people have a moral obligation or moral duty to obey natural laws, because it is directly concerned with something that should morally be done, and because it is conformed to God's will. Berkeley's moral thought therefore maintains that moral rule is based on God's will. God's will is the foundation of morality which cannot be separated from an attempt to make an individual ethically good and to make people to do whatever leads to public good.

In addition, Berkeley recognizes the fact that religious expression can arouse the positive emotions such as love, hope, gratitude, and obedience. If one appreciates gratitude of others, he or she is more likely to obey them. Obeying moral laws or natural laws is related with awakening and promoting these positive emotions. However, as far as emotion is concerned, people are required to distinguish between appropriate emotions and sensual pleasure. It is important to note that human passions are sometimes morally undesirable because they may lead people to do what is morally unacceptable. Berkeley says that,

Reason, religion and law are all together little enough to get people to act in accordance with their consciences; and that it would be downright stupid to think that without reason, religion and law men would be in love with the golden mean, i.e. in love with a temperate way of life, one in which extremes are avoided.¹⁹

It means that reason, religion and law all together can guide people to behave well. People can overcome extreme or negative emotions by cultivating the positive emotion of

'love'. It is also found in Berkeley's moral thought that ethically positive emotion such as love plays a vital role in making civil peace. To sum up, although Berkeley is an empiricist, his moral thought is rooted in the acceptance of God's will, and he also accepts the role of morally good emotions such as love. Reason, religion, and law are considered as the indispensable factors for welfare and the betterment of human life or civil peace.

3.2.3. Ethical View of David Hume

Locke believes that one can have demonstrative knowledge of God and of morality. Berkeley limits human knowledge to ideas, perception and God. The most important thing for him is to inquire into the nature of human understanding.

Hume accepts that reason alone is not sufficient to motivate human action. For him, reason can arouse one's passion to behave or conduct himself morally and avoid immoral acts. Moreover, he accepts that reason and emotion should be in the same direction so as to gain pleasure. For that reason, there is no substantial conflict between reason and passion in his moral thought.

Although Hume emphasizes the role of emotion in his moral thought, he does not reject the role of reason. He says that reason may promote the expression of passion rather than suppress it. Reason may allow passion to provide a motivating force for moral conduct. Hume explains it in his book *A Treatise of Human Nature* as follows;

It has been observed, that reason, in a strict and philosophical sense, can have an influence on our conduct only after two ways: Either when it excites a passion by informing us of the existence of something which is a proper object of it; or when it discovers the connexion of causes and effects, so as to afford us means of exerting any passion.²⁰

It can be understood that Hume states that reason by itself can never prevent or produce any action or affection. However, reason can influence human conduct in only two ways. First, reason can inform people of the existence of something which is the proper

object of a passion, and thereby arouse it. Second, reason can discover the relation between cause and effect so that it can give means of exertion of passion. Hence, rationality is needed to bring about a morally good action. It is because rationality can sometimes change bad emotions to be good.

Concerning Hume's view on emotion, he holds that emotions or passions lead to pleasurable actions of pleasure. Hume argues that morality does not base on reason alone. He states that emotions, if they are in conjunction with reason, can motivate human beings to behave morally. Hume maintains that moral actions are derived from emotion such as sympathy, and not from reason alone. Hume states that,

Since morals, therefore, have an influence on the actions and affections, it follows, that they cannot be derived from reason; and that because reason alone, as we have already proved, can never have any such influence. Morals excite passions, and produce or prevent actions. Reason of itself is utterly impotent in this particular. The rules of morality, therefore, are not conclusions of our reason.²¹

That is to say morality does not come from reason. Actions are determined by emotions. There can be the case that some actions are motivated by emotions such as sympathy. Sympathy may motivate virtuous actions, while others may motivate non-virtuous actions. The moral action is determined by whether it brings pleasure, and it is the source of the emotion which motivates the action. The moral sentiments arise from sympathy and regarding this point, Hume states as follow;

Now as the means to an end can only be agreeable, where the end is agreeable; and as the good of society, where our own interest is not concerned, or that of our friends, pleases only by sympathy: It follows, that sympathy is the source of the esteem, which we pay to all the artificial virtues.²²

In this sense, sympathy is a concern for others so that it is moral virtue. Sympathy may be a source of moral virtues and may enable people to express concern for others, and may help people to be more aware of the feelings of others. Sympathy may also be an

important factor in the development of moral understanding, and may produce a desire to promote the public good. As sympathy can be understood as an emotion, it can be said that human actions are motivated by emotions or passions.

To sum up, Hume asserts that reason alone is not sufficient enough to bring about moral conduct because most human actions are habitually under the influence of emotions. On the other hand, he accepts that emotions are also not sufficient enough for moral conduct because reason is necessary in order to change negative emotion to positive emotion or from egoistic tendency to altruistic tendency. Hence, it can be said that for Hume both reason and emotion have the potentiality to motivate people to behave morally with emotion such as sympathy as well as caring for others.

As it is mentioned above, one can draw the conclusion that the three empiricists emphasize the role of both reason and emotion in their moral thought.

3.3. The Role of Emotion and Reason in Kant's Ethics

The fundamental problem of Kant's moral philosophy is to discover the meaning of goodness, right and wrong, and duty and their implications.

Kant accepts that intelligence, wit, judgment and the other talents of mind are good. But they may become extremely bad and mischievous if there is no good will. Moreover, Kant says that power, riches, honor, health, the general well being and contentment with one's condition can lead to happiness. Kant states that all actions that come from human natural inclinations, desires and emotions, are non-moral because moral actions must always be performed from a sense of duty. Moreover, if a man's will is good, his conduct will be good. Moral judgments must be based on human will. One should perform his action not only in accordance with duty but also good will. Duty is the obligation to act from reverence for law.

In Kant's ethics, human behavior may be motivated by non-rational elements. Moral

behavior can only be motivated by good will. On the other hand, Kant accepts that rational faculty can motivate people to have a good will. So, it can be considered that not only emotion such as good will but also reason plays a vital role in promoting human moral character.

3.3.1. The Role of Reason

Human nature possesses subjective impulses, desires and inclinations. Kant accepts that the only good thing is good will. Other things which are described as good, such as power, richness and the general well being, are not always good because they can be used for immoral purpose by the person who possesses them. So, a good will is the only thing that is always good. Kant states as follows;

A good will is good not because of what it performs or effects, not by its aptness for the attainment of some proposed end, but simply by virtue of the volition; that is, it is good in itself, and considered by itself is to be esteemed much higher than all that can be brought about by it in favour of any inclination, nay even of the sum total of all inclination.²³

For Kant, nothing is good in this world except a good will. A good will is good not because of the consequences which follow from it. It is good so long as the motive of the agent is good. Hence, although a good will often does not produce good effect, it is moral virtue. Human will is good when it wills the good and only good will is good. Human action is good or bad depending on the motivation of their action and not on the goodness of the consequences of those actions. When actions are determined by reason, people are self determined because reason is innermost human nature. When one acts according to his desires, feelings and emotions he is determined by the phenomenal mind.

Kant accepts that morals require freedom. Freedom is self-determination or rational determination. Moral determination is not external causal determination. In moral determination people are not pushed by external forces. In moral determination people

choose actions after conscious and intelligent valuation, reasoning and deliberating every aspect of the various alternative actions. People can choose to perform a certain action. Choice is made by one's own self. Hence moral actions are self chosen. Human choice involves reasoning and deliberation of the different aspects of the different alternative actions. So, reasoning plays an important part in moral choice. When human actions are determined by impulses, feelings and emotions, people cannot choose such actions.

Moreover, Kant accepts that actions must be performed in accordance with a sense of duty. Duty is action under the dictates of reason. Kant describes that duty is moral law. The moral law is a categorical imperative. The moral law is universal and they apply everyone in the same way. Kant says that,

That will is absolutely good which cannot be evil in other words, whose maxim, if made a universal law, could never contradict itself. This principle, then, is its supreme law: "Act always on such a maxim as thou canst at the same time will to be a universal law".²⁴

So for Kant, a will is good when it is determined by respect for the moral law or there is consciousness of duty. A good will is the only intrinsically good thing and that an action is only good if it is performed out of duty, rather than out of practical need or desire. Kant bases his ethical thought on the idea of duty. He believes that, using reason, an individual could work out what one's duty was. Practical reason is better suited to the development and guidance of a good will. Actions are morally right in virtue of their motives, which must derive more from duty than from inclination. So duty is the necessity to act out of reverence for the law.

Although everything naturally acts in accordance with law only rational beings do so consciously, in obedience to the objective principles determined by practical reason. Of course, human beings also have subjective impulses, desires and inclinations that may contradict the dictates of reason. So, people experience the claim of reason as an

obligation, a command that people must act in a particular way, an imperative. Such imperatives may occur in either of two distinct forms, hypothetical or categorical. Kant mentions that,

The categorical imperative would be that which represented an action as necessary of itself without reference to another end, i.e., as objectively necessary. If now the action is good only as a means to something else, then the imperative is hypothetical; if it is conceived as good in itself and consequently as being necessarily the principle of a will which of itself conforms to reason, then it is categorical.²⁵

It means that an imperative is a command. A hypothetical imperative is a command that applies if human beings want to attain a particular outcome. The following conditional sentence expresses a hypothetical imperative: “If one wants to pass the exam, then one must attend the class regularly”. A categorical imperative is absolutely binding regardless of personal interest or desire. A categorical imperative is unconditional. When someone says you must not lie or steal and so on it means that human beings must avoid stealing and lying whether they want it or not. Kant considers categorical imperative alone as a moral law.

It can be concluded that Kant accepts reason as a necessary condition for human moral conduct. Emotions and feelings are irrational. If one does not use reason, his or her behavior or conduct is motivated by irrational factors such as emotion, feeling and desire. To become a morally good action, human beings have to reduce their emotions. Therefore, moral behavior should be motivated by reason.

3.3.2. The Role of Emotion

Concerning the role of emotion in Kant's ethics, Kant holds that emotion is opposed to prudential as well as moral reason. In Kant's view, human character is decisively influenced, for good or bad, both by natural constitution and by the society. Emotion is always the result of competitive social relations with other human beings.

Moreover, he accepts that human actions involve desire. Because every desire is accompanied by emotion of pleasure, all actions also involve emotion.

Kant states that there is a fundamental difference between inclination and rational desire. He believes that in an action done from duty the feelings and desires are rational not empirical emotions and desires. Hence, moral action involves a rational desire. Kant does not accept that the foundation of morality involve sympathy or empirical emotion or desires. This emotion cannot give objective and universal principles.

Kant asserts that moral virtue involves not only the avoidance of emotion but also the control of what Kant calls 'affects.' An affect is a sudden access of feeling, as of fear, anger, or joy and people can control their emotional affects by rational power. Although Kant emphasizes reason concerning the moral law, he does not totally reject some emotions. He maintains that someone lacking certain kinds of emotions; respect, love of human beings, moral approval and disapproval, conscience – simply could not be a rational moral agent. In *Kantian Ethics*, Allen W. Wood states that,

In the Groundwork, the feeling of this kind that Kant emphasizes is respect, especially respect for the moral law. As we have already observed more than once, Kant distinguishes four distinct feelings that arise from pure reason: (a) moral feeling, (b) conscience, (c) love of human beings, and (d) respect.²⁶

It can be understood that Kant distinguishes four distinct feelings that arise from pure reason. These are moral feeling, conscience, love of human beings, and respect. The last two feelings correspond to the duties of love and duties of respect. Moral feeling consists in a feeling of pleasure or displeasure attached to actions, either performed or contemplated, and whether performed by another. Conscience is a feeling of pleasure or displeasure associated with oneself. In the former case, the feeling is one that may motivate one either to perform the action or to refrain from it. In the latter case, it is a feeling either of self-contentment or of moral remorse. Because of its motivational force,

Kant sometimes calls conscience as feeling or 'instinct,' meaning that it is capable of impelling people to action and not merely of judging actions. Conscience as a feeling is the outcome of a specific process of moral reflection.

From the above mentioned, Kant regards duties of love and duties of respect as two complementary classes of duties to others. The basis of Kant's ethics is the unlimited goodness of the goodwill. The good will is only the will that acts from duty. Moreover, Kant rejects empirical desires or emotion and they are unreliable guides to what is morally right. Kant does not accept sympathy as the basis of morality because it involves empirical feelings as they arise from social conditions. Although Kant emphasizes reason, he does not totally deny that some emotions arise from pure reason whenever there are moral feelings, conscience, duties of love and duties of respect. Therefore, reason and emotion play a vital role in Kant's ethics. For Kant, there are many good things under certain conditions. As it has been mentioned intelligence, wit, judgment, courage, resolution, perseverance, power, honor, wealth, health and even happiness. But these qualities can be truly good only if the will is good. Hence, the goodwill is the key to morality according to Kant.

It can be concluded that it is necessary to control individual emotions of human beings which come from personal feelings. Generally, it is undeniable fact that reasoning for morality can bring people to avoid immoral conducts and to do morally good conduct. However, there is no one can survive his/her life successfully lacking in emotion in the world. Therefore, reason plays a vital role in attempting to make people behave morally. On the contrary, emotion is primary or basic level of human mind so that it also plays a crucial role for changing one's moral behaviors from evil to good. It means that lacking the proper understanding of human emotions, it is impossible to change or control human behaviors by merely reasoning. Hence, even if reasoning has the potentiality to change

one's egoistic feeling to be altruistic by means of promoting one's sympathetic emotion for others, it is undeniable fact that personal emotion itself is primary factor of human mind. Thus, people are able to use their positive emotions as morally motivating factors along with their reasoning power.

It can be found that both rationalists and empiricists are unable to reject emotions like generosity, love, sympathy, passion, and charity though they maintain the role of reason in order to make people doing moral conduct. Kant does not accept that the foundation of morality involve sympathy or empirical emotion or desires because these emotions cannot give objective and universal principle. But he accepts four feelings such as moral feeling, conscience, love of human beings and respect in his moral thought. For that reason, it is obvious that both reason and emotion play a crucial role in morality of human beings. In the fourth chapter, the role of emotion and reason in Twentieth century ethics will be discussed.

CHAPTER IV

THE ROLE OF EMOTION AND REASON IN TWENTIETH CENTURY ETHICS

In the history of Western philosophy, many philosophers have tried to find some unchanging reality behind the changing world. But with the idea of evolution and the development of Twentieth Century science, philosophers put their emphasis on the study of practical human life and have become preoccupied with proposing philosophies which are akin to the actual situations of daily life. Pragmatism and existentialism are the two major philosophical movements which are more interested in man and his life. The pragmatists and the existentialists are those who try to solve the problem of irrationality and the rational or the problem of emotion and reason of the Twentieth Century. That is the reason why they have been chosen for discussion.

4.1. The Role of Emotion and Reason in the Ethical View of Pragmatists

Most philosophies of the early Twentieth Century are partly based on the refutation of Hegel's absolute idealism. Pragmatists are opposed to the idea of a single unified formal system of Hegel's philosophy. Hegel had tried to build an absolutely coherent system which must be real. But pragmatists are not interested in the search for reality like Hegel because for them such knowledge of reality does not have practical importance. They are interested in the kind of knowledge of the sciences because for them such knowledge can improve the quality of life. That is the reason why they are more interested in the conditional and relative human life as opposed to Hegel.¹

For pragmatists, knowledge needs to be practical. This is because pragmatists want the kind of knowledge which will enable man to mould and master his environment in order to live a better life. For them, the human world is to be moulded by using whatever is useful or practical.

Pragmatists emphasize the conceivable practical effects. So they are interested in the effects of phenomena. Their aim is to guide and control the human environment and the human being with a practical approach. Science and technology attempt to satisfy man by finding means to satisfy human desires through the increased capacity to mould the environment. But science and technology may not be able to gain ultimate satisfaction for all human desires. Sometimes the satisfaction of one desire leads to another new desire. So, instead of increasing satisfaction they may lead to dissatisfaction.

For the pragmatists, knowledge is practical and experimental. It is also necessary to mould the world according to one's needs and aspiration. Hence, the emphasis is on emotion and feelings which are directed to desire and aspiration. For the pragmatists, the function of philosophy is to settle metaphysical disputes by finding out whether they lead to any consequences in the practical life. They recognize that reason plays a role in the search for knowledge. This can be found in their views on experience. Experience is usually understood as a result of using the five senses. But the pragmatists, especially James and Dewey use the term experience as including five senses as well as reasoning. At the same time the pragmatists accept that experience also includes feelings and emotions. The point is obvious in James criteria for testing the truth or meaningfulness of sentences. Concerning moral and religious statements, the statements are decided as meaningful if these lead to some benefits in one's life like happiness, satisfaction and so forth.

4.1.1. Ethical View of Charles Sanders Peirce

During the second half of the nineteenth century, *The Origin of Species* (1859), a famous work of Charles Darwin, which is considered to be the foundation of evolutionary biology, appeared. This new finding of Darwin's biological philosophy made a profound impact on the philosophical studies of American and English intellectuals. Hence, its

intellectual authority also impacted greatly on the biologically oriented philosophy of C.S. Peirce who is the founder of Pragmatism.²

Peirce presented a pragmatic analysis for 'beliefs' in the intellectual life of a person. For him, a belief consists of a series of habitual expectations of practical consequences. When the actual consequences are different from the expected consequences, doubt arises concerning a certain belief. Doubt will lead to the search for new beliefs which are supposed to give satisfactory consequences. Hence, according to Peirce, belief has three properties. In his essay *How to Make Our Ideas Clear*, it runs as follows;

We have seen that it has just three properties. First, it is something that we are aware of; second, it appeases the irritation of doubt, and third, it involves the establishment in our nature of a rule of action, or say for short, a habit."³

For Peirce, people use to aware of something so that awareness irritates doubt and finally establishing an action. According to Peirce, belief is a rule for action. But belief involves further doubt and further thought so that it is also a new starting place for thought. Hence thought is essentially an action.

Peirce distinguishes four ways of attaining a fixed belief. These ways are called methods of settling opinion. First is the method of tenacity. Second is the method of authority. Third is the *apriori* method. According to Peirce, this method was used by Plato and Hegel whose philosophies are great metaphysical systems. The fourth is the method of science which Peirce maintains is distinctive. The method of science is the public method. Another feature is that the social impulse will not undermine opinion that is settled in the scientific way. One of the distinctive features of the scientific method is that this method attempts to make men's belief responsive to something which is independent of their thought.

The meaning of a belief lies in the consequences that follow from it. According to

Peirce, these consequences must be public and practical. They must be observable and verifiable by the scientific method. Peirce's conception of science rests on an assumption or hypothesis about some reality which is supposed to be independent of men's thinking about it. Peirce maintains that beliefs are habits which invariably lead to conduct in conjunction with desires that move to act.

J.K. Feibleman, the author of *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Charles S. Peirce* remarks that for Peirce, morality is a means to good life. It consists in the tradition of right conduct. Peirce explains a man's life by stating that a man is brought up to think what he ought to behave in certain ways. If he behaves otherwise, then he is uncomfortable. That is, his conscience makes him feel guilty. That is the traditional conception. If he violates it then he will become a victim of his passions.⁴

Peirce asserts that as ethics divides the actions into the right and the wrong, morality as the application of ethical principles to conduct must be an affair of approaching absolute limits although it may not attain absolute limits. Peirce defined the meaning of conduct as follows;

"The practice of meaning, so far as human action is concerned, may be summed up in the one word "conduct" and conduct may be described as the "phenomena of controlled action. There are three ways in which conduct appeals to a man as ideal: he thinks the conduct fine, he thinks it consistent with his other actions, and he desires its consequences."⁵

According to Peirce, there are only three ideals for controlled actions. After reflecting on these ideals a man takes actions. Man first forms a resolution of how he would act upon a certain occasion. This resolution is a mental diagram or formula. By a mental act, the resolution is converted to a determination. For Peirce, a peculiar feeling is involved in the first step of this process. When the determination is sufficiently formed man is aware of it as a need or desire. In all events and in all actions there is determination and after that there is relaxation of need.

Good reasoning and good morals are closely connected. Peirce asserts that in the conduct of daily life, one has to distinguish everyday affairs and great problems or confusions that must be solved or decided. In these great decisions individual reasoning is not reliable because it can be worse than it really is. Similarly, ethical goals which are ultimately sought are inherently logical for Peirce. Ethics recognizes the supreme importance of the good. Nothing in ethics can refute logical truth and consistency. Ethics, which is a normative study involves the hypothetical characteristic because the norm, when it is properly stated, "if.....then".⁶

Psychologically feeling has always been considered to be of two kinds such as pleasure and pain. Concerning this point, Feibleman discusses Peirce's view as follows;

Feeling overlaps with pleasure and pain but they are by no means the same. Pleasure and pain can only be recognized as such in a judgment.⁷

Peirce considers that a man may act for the sake of momentary satisfactions which may be the prompt satisfaction of instincts, future instincts, pleasure, from persuasion, or from dread of blame, or due to obedience to an instant command. One may act according to some general rules restricted to his own wishes, such as the pursuit of pleasure, or self-preservation, or good will toward an acquaintance, or attachment to home and surroundings, or conformity to the customs of his tribe, or reverence for a law. All motives are directed toward pleasure or self-satisfaction. Feibleman states that,

Right and wrong may be volitional, it is true; but for all that it is reasoning which educates the instinct, and even "reasoning essentially involves self-control".⁸

It means that right or wrong depends on active or passive volition. But when human beings encounter events in practical life, reasoning educates the instinct because self-control is an essential element of reasoning. According to Peirce, every man has certain ideals of conduct that befits a rational person in his particular place in life which is

in accordance with his nature and relations. Every man also has aesthetic taste and instinct. These ideals are gradually shaped to his personal nature. But when he becomes an adult he acts from impulse also.

For Peirce, individual reasoning is much more likely to make mistakes, because it is often influenced by various particulars. Peirce accepts that the criterion for what is good is ultimately not in individual reasoning. For him, man must have the aim to actualize social comprehension. One must place one's interest in community which includes all individuals and one must extend love beyond all bounds. He asserts that 'love' is the over-all requirement of ethics, and evil is a mere imperfect stage of that 'Love.'⁹ Hence, it can be said that not only reason but also emotion or positive volition plays a role in Peirce's moral thought.

4.1.2. Ethical View of William James

James accepted Peirce's criterion of meaning that consequences must be observable and verifiable. But he was not satisfied with a logical principle that merely helped to analyze the concepts of science. He wanted a device that would resolve the confusion of his age such as two world wars and economic which a man of his time had had to face both psychologically and economically.

For James, there are two criteria for testing the truth or meaningfulness of sentences. One of the criteria is that a sentence is meaningful if it leads to practical consequences which are observable in experience. This criterion is used in daily life and in the natural sciences. Another criterion is that a sentence is meaningful, if one's belief in it leads to consequences in one's behaviors. This criterion is used in dealing with moral and religious statements. For example, a statement 'God exists.' is meaningful if it leads to some benefits for its believer's life and guides one to do something. It can be said that

James tries to reconcile science and religion. For him, if one wants to know whether a theory of any kind is true, try to believe it and see whether satisfactory results ensue. That is James's attempt for the reconciliation of science and religion.

James holds that philosophical systems are reflections of the temperaments of those who devise them. James gives his famous distinction between the tender-minded and tough-minded philosophers giving an expression that pragmatism is a mediating philosophy in reconciliation of these two extremes. He holds that pragmatism can remain religious like rationalism while preserving the intimacy with facts like empiricism. In this way he thinks that his philosophy can mediate between philosophies that are religious, idealists or supernatural and philosophies that are scientific, secular and naturalistic. That is the reason why James is not satisfied with a logical principle that merely helps to analyze the concepts of science.¹⁰

James maintains that truths are a product of human interests. The philosophical reason for James's approach to truth is that he wants to tenderize the tough minded and vice versa. For him, pragmatism agrees with nominalism* because it always appeals to particulars. It agrees with utilitarianism in emphasizing practical aspects. Pragmatism agrees with positivism because it holds that a statement is true because it corresponds to the facts.

James's statements on truth stress certain important similarities between the notion of belief or scientific acceptability and that of ethics. James's argues that the true is that which ought to be believed. That which ought to be believed is what is best for human beings to believe. Therefore, the true is that which human beings ought to believe. Hence, in *Pragmatism*, James argues as follows;

*Nominalism is the doctrine that abstract concepts, general terms or universals have no independent existence but exist only as names. It is the theory that only individuals and no abstract entities (as essences, classes, or propositions) exist.

"What would be better for us to believe" This sounds very like a definition of truth. It comes very near to saying "what we ought to believe: and in that definition none of you would find any oddity. Ought we ever not to believe what is better for us to believe? And can we then keep the notion of what is better for us, and what is true for us, permanently apart?"¹¹

A belief is true when it works for men, when it satisfies their needs. James asserts that beliefs are rules for action. James's criterion for his philosophy is that the meaning of a belief lies in the consequences that follow from it. If something is true, then it must be observable and verifiable by the scientific method. For James, the truth is not a characteristic of reality. Truth is something which is significant for statements and beliefs. Truth must satisfy the purpose for which it is formulated. So, truth must be that which works. Truth changes due to different circumstances. Truth is relative.

For James, truths are not absolute. Truths are guidelines that may change as the universe and human knowledge evolves. For him, thoughts and feelings are affections or properties of human souls.

James identifies truth with what is better to believe. So it can be said that he makes truth a species of good. A belief must be consistent with previous beliefs so that it may be workable. According to him, beliefs may be adopted even when people are not sure of them. But when consequences are considered desirable, it is expected that they actually lead to desirable consequences.

James claims that moral questions cannot be answered as true or false by reasoning. Moral questions cannot be answered in such a way as consequences in science are verified by observation and experiment. Moral questions such as 'What is good?' or 'What would be good?' cannot be answered in the scientific way. Science can only determine the nature of what exists. Science cannot say anything about what does not exist. Whenever there are doubts in moral questions it cannot be shown either to be true or false by reasoning. Moral questions can be judged as true or false by personal

satisfaction.¹²

Moral judgments cannot be made by reason alone. With regard to moral judgment, Peirce and James accept the role of volition or free will. James accepts that moral beliefs are not intellectual. They are volitional. A fact cannot come into being if there is no existing faith for its coming. Similarly, valuations will become real if there are beliefs concerning them. There must be some conscious agent to determine the notion of good or bad. For something to be good it must be good to someone. The good is that which satisfies some demands. The ideal will be to satisfy all demands. Hence, it can be said that although he emphasizes the desired demand, the role of good volition is basically involved in his ethical conceptions.

There are three ethical questions; psychological, metaphysical and casuistic questions. James says that,

There are three questions in ethics which must be kept apart. Let them be called respectively the psychological question, the metaphysical question, and casuistic question. The psychological question asks after the historical origin of our moral ideas and judgments; the metaphysical question asks what the very meaning of the words "good", "ill", and "obligation" are, the casuistic question asks what is the measure of the various goods and ills which men recognize, so that the philosopher may settle the true order of human obligations.¹³

It means that the psychological question is concerned with the historical origin of moral ideas and judgments. The metaphysical question is concerned with what are the very meanings of the good, ill, and obligation. The casuistic question is concerned with what is the measure of the various goods and ills or the ways of solving moral problems. Hence the philosopher may settle the order of human obligations.

Moreover, James asserts that the feeling of the inward dignity of certain spiritual attitudes, as peace, serenity, simplicity, veracity and the feeling the vulgarity of others, as querulousness, anxiety, egoistic fussiness, etc. cannot be explained except by an innate

preference of the moral ideal for its own sake. Moral relations have their status, in that being's consciousness. So far as he feels anything to be good, he makes it good for him and being good for him, is absolutely good, because he is the sole creator of values in that universe. Outside of his opinion things have no moral character at all.

Morton White commented in *The Age of Analysis*, that James stressed the connection between beliefs and practical life. He emphasized the practical consequences of believing one thing or another. For James men's beliefs are shaped as much by their needs and interests as by the world. Those needs and interests are taken into account when they decide what to believe.¹⁴

For James, a true proposition is one which satisfies logical and emotional needs. A false proposition is one which leads to failure and frustrations. In this way, James modifies Peirce's more intellectualistic pragmatism. James's psychological description of reasoning, which is a form of problem-solving and adaptation of man to his environment leads to Dewey's instrumentalist theory of inquiry.

4.1.3. Ethical View of John Dewey

John Dewey was born in the year that Darwin published *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. He was impressed by Darwin's incorporation of human life into nature so that Dewey tried to work out its consequences for epistemology, metaphysics and ethics. Dewey was opposed to any philosophy that would pose an impossible gulf between the knower and what is known, between subject and object, experience and nature, action and good. For him, human beings are in the flux of natural processes.

Dewey believes that all knowledge is hypothetical and revisable. For him, the same is true of one's values. Concerning values, no certainty is possible. Men can improve their

opinions about morals and values without attaining certainty.

For Dewey, there are no eternal and necessary truths. Dewey's ethics is guided by the same principle as that of his metaphysics because he holds that the task of morality is to guide human nature. All conduct is interaction of man and environment. So, conduct is an interaction of the natural and the social. There are two extremes in morals. One extreme is considering natural life to be immoral. The other extreme is considering moral life as conventional and as a hindrance to natural life. Dewey holds that both extremes separate moral life from natural life. For Dewey, both are the result of separating moral life from natural life. He accepts that all conduct is an interaction between elements of human nature and the environment, natural and social. Thus, it can be said that Dewey accepts human nature in which feelings and emotions cannot be isolated.

Dewey accepts that value is not dependent on desires and satisfaction. Only through man's intelligence can happiness come through and it is valuable. Thus, the main idea of Dewey's ethics is that an attempt should be made through man's intelligence to obtain happiness. It can be understood that Dewey does not deny the role of human nature which includes not only reason but also feelings and emotion. In *Human Nature and Conduct*, it is discussed as follows;

Although he recognizes the objectivity of custom, he treats sympathetic resentment and approbation as distinctive inner feelings or conscious states which give rise to acts. In his anxiety to displace an unreal rational source of morals he sets up an equally unreal emotional basis. In truth, feelings as well as reason spring up within action. Breach of custom or habit is the source of sympathetic resentment, while overt approbation goes out to fidelity to custom maintained under exceptional circumstances.¹⁵

It means that although Dewey recognizes the objectivity of custom, he treats anger and approval as distinctive inner feelings or conscious states. So emotion as well as reason could include within an action. Custom or habit is the source of the feelings of anger and approval. Dewey accepts that human conduct is social because actions which proceed

from man arouse reactions from the surroundings in the form of praise, blame, approval, disapproval, etc. Actions become habitual through interaction of the organism with the environment. Still wrongdoing is not merely the result of the evil will of individual or bad social conditions. So it is necessary to investigate moral problems. For Dewey, all knowledge is essential for valuation. Valuation is experimental. This experimental aspect of valuation destroys the subjective elements because the emphasis is on the objective environment.

Dewey holds that moral laws are not good in themselves. Their values lie in the consequences that follow from them. They are useful only as an instrument for guiding man in his relation to his environment. A man is free to choose the trend for adaptation to the environment. Such moral behavior is based on knowledge of facts and intelligence.

For Dewey, moral ideas are hypotheses because they have to be tested, confirmed or altered by valuation of the consequences which follow from them. They are tentative and hypothetical and is closest to human nature. Since it directly concerns human nature, everything that can be known of the human mind and body in physiology, medicine, anthropology, and psychology is relevant to moral inquiry.

Dewey maintains that philosophy must be a method concerning moral problems. For him, the world is in the making so that one must help in the process. Philosophy must help to say exactly what the cause of a certain moral problem is and to judge how something is likely to develop in the future. So such a philosophy must revise the theory of thinking, a new evolutionary logic which starts with an inquiry. Such a revised theory of thinking will construe validity, objectivity and truth.

Dewey sees that 'human will' instigates thinking, which is an instrument as a means of realizing human desires. It is an instrument of securing satisfaction, fulfillment

and happiness which lead to a state of harmony. Harmony is the end and test of thinking. According to Dewey, when the ideas, views, conceptions, hypotheses and beliefs are considered as true if they are verified in practical life successfully. Therefore, everyone keep on changing and transforming their ideas until they operate them practically. Accordingly, the effective operation of an idea is the evidence of its success and truth. At that point, Dewey seems to claim that successful operation is the attribution of a true idea.

Dewey holds that thinking serves human purpose. Thinking is useful. It removes collisions. It satisfies desire. Its utility is its truth. Dewey emphasized the biological character of knowledge. He believes that men exist in both the stable and precarious conditions. Man treasures security and certainty. So, they seek for security and certainty through thought and action. If an action offers only relative security then that action is looked down upon. Sometimes men think that they can escape from uncertainty by thinking alone without action. So, they emphasize pure knowledge without action putting permanence on the highest position. But according to Dewey, there is no such reality which is prior to knowledge because knowledge is invariably related to human purpose. According to Dewey, knowledge is an instrument which is used in life in order to act successfully.

Dewey wants philosophy to become a method of morals. Since the world is in the making one must help in the process. In thinking, Dewey finds an instrument which can remove the collision between what is given and what is wanted, a means of realizing human desire, satisfaction, fulfillment and happiness. The individual is not merely a knower. The individual is an emotional, impulsive, willing being.

For him reality is nothing but changing, developing and growing of things. Reality is not a fixed system which is completely given. Similarly, life is an experiment of the individual for successful adjustment. Physical objects are merely experiments of human

purposes. Hence, human purpose guides and directs operations for knowledge and thought is a plan for action.

Dewey asserts that rationality is not a force to evoke against impulse and habit. It is the attainment of a working harmony among diverse desires. Science is born not of reason but of impulses at first slight and flickering.¹⁶ To build morally good character, people need to have good emotion because he accepts that ethics is based on sympathy, pity, benevolence.¹⁷

Some scholars have remarked that Peirce is the pragmatic philosopher of science, James the philosopher of religion and Dewey the philosopher of morals as they apply to different problems. But what is vital to all of them is that their philosophy is a philosophy which seeks contact with science, morality and culture maintaining certain logical and analytical standards. From the above mentioned facts, it can be concluded that the three pragmatists Peirce, James and Dewey appreciate the balance between emotion and reason in their moral philosophies.

4.2. The Role of Emotion and Reason in the Ethical View of Existentialists

Existentialism was one of the outstanding intellectual movements of the twentieth century. Existentialist ideas are believed to have had its source in the philosophy of Søren Kierkegaard who maintained that philosophy is a matter of inner life, so that it is opposed to the Hegelian view. The existentialists emphasized the importance of the existent individual as against the abstract system and the absolute.

Existentialism asserts that one cannot doubt the existence of the individual self. The existence of the individual self or person is immediately accepted as undoubted fact. It is not an inferred fact. This is the reason why existentialists firmly state that existence precedes essence. The major interest of the existentialists is in the individual person and

man's individual existence.

As there are different situations and circumstances concerning different individuals, one's struggle for existence may not be the same as others. It can be said that man defines himself in his own subjectivity. Genuine subjectivity or existence is a proper description to produce feelings of sadness and sympathy. The existentialists study the human phenomenon more closely. Their interest is in the knowing of the subject more than the object known. Their emphasis is on the existence of the subject.

4.2.1. Ethical View of Søren Kierkegaard

Kierkegaard was the early nineteenth century philosopher who had a profound influence on existentialism of the twentieth century. He was greatly impressed by Christianity and the Christian view of the freedom and value of the human individual. His philosophy is an elaboration of the Christian conception of man as an individual with his basic choices, his commitments and his freedom.

There are three principal conceptions in Kierkegaard's philosophy. They are truth, choice and God. For Kierkegaard truth is about the actual, concrete individual. Like Socrates, truth is not introduced into the individual from without, but is within him all the time. He thinks that abstract thinking or speculation which explores the realm of possibilities by means of logical techniques only achieves hypothetical knowledge. For Kierkegaard, truth is a passionate inner commitment and the highest truth is attainable by an existing individual. Kierkegaard denies that truth is always objective. He regards truth as subjective in most important matters.

The central concept of Kierkegaard is choice. Kierkegaard interprets choice as a decision between two ways of life. The two ways of life are the esthetic life and the ethical way of life. For Kierkegaard, one cannot adequately describe the phenomenon of choice

because one has to experience it in order to understand choice.¹⁸

What Kierkegaard means by aesthetics is to sense, perceive or feel. So for him, a man who remains at this stage has sensual needs. That person devotes himself to worldly pleasure for momentary satisfaction. As a result he loses the meaning of his life. He tries to avoid responsibility trying to avoid choosing. The ethical life is the level at which men become aware to live ethically by making choices in with his life. The ethical level involves making a choice in accordance with a rule or a universal principle. One knows that he should not steal because there is a rule which forbids that one should not steal.

Kierkegaard drew the line between the ethical and religious level or way of life. For him it is necessary for a man to leap beyond the ethical level. He gives a biblical illustration that God came and told Abraham to sacrifice his son, Isaac. Abraham decided to sacrifice his son. It was not at all easy for him in making that decision. But Abraham believed in God so strongly that he could not turn away from his command. He had strong faith in God so that in fear and trembling Abraham was ready to kill his son. At that very movement, an angel of God appeared by telling him not to kill Isaac. The point is how it becomes necessary for Abraham to leap beyond the ethical stage to religious stage.¹⁹

The third conception is the knowledge of God. The individual in his inner experience of choice may achieve knowledge of the eternal God. Kierkegaard believes in the possibilities of the individual's union with God, when one can hold one's faith by preserving his individuality leaping from the ethical stage or level as in the case of Abraham.²⁰

For Kierkegaard, the task of ethics is not to analyze ethical concepts. The task of ethics is to guide to live ethically. For him ethical theory must be subjective. What he means by subjective is that an ethical proposition should not be merely stated but should be

lived. So, one can be ethical only when he can choose his life and in so doing, he moves beyond the aesthetic stage. For Kierkegaard, the individual man exists in the sense of having a unique way of thinking which is characterized by choice. On the nature and formation of character Kierkegaard teaches all about proper and improper emotions and actions. He stresses the role of choice when he illustrates emotions and actions.

Kierkegaard uses such words as subjectivity, existence, character, passion, inwardness and personality. Among them existence, virtue and emotion which he often uses as passion are classical themes in his philosophy. According to Kierkegaard, existence, inwardness, subjectivity, being an individual and character are closely related.

Kierkegaard asserts that to exist as a genuine, fully flourishing human being, it is necessary to dispose of emotions such as fear, anger, hope, confidence, grief and pity in a proper way. These are the ways that are proper both to being human and to the particular situations in which one finds oneself. Emotions and actions are somehow intermediate between extremes. For Kierkegaard, educating the emotions is essential to the inward transformation of the whole mind.²¹

Kierkegaard uses the word 'character' as something like ethical enthusiasm or interest or commitment. A person with character offers something stable, whereas a person without character is an unstable emptiness which Kierkegaard means the lack of essential emotion. Due to the lack of essential emotion, he or she feels uncomfortable lacking specific quality.

Kierkegaard sometimes stresses inwardness. Inwardness is used as a metaphor for centrality to the self. The self is concerned with enthusiasms, interests, passions and from these emotions, intentions, decisions and actions flow. If the essential passion is taken away, then everything becomes meaningless externality. Everything will also be devoid of

character, and the ideal will be lost. Proper passion or emotion gives the character of the self. For Kierkegaard, passions are not unruly because unruly affections are not passions for him. Passions for the good and the true are ethical and religious since these produce propriety and are produced by propriety. Hence, propriety is one's own intention which comes from feelings and emotion.

Kierkegaard focuses on the connection between emotion and reflection. It is the heart of his conception of the well-formed and fully functioning person. He believes that the mature self is a proper synthesis of emotion and reflection. In *The Cambridge Companion to Kierkegaard*, Alastair Hannay and Gordon D. Marino make the comment on view of Kierkegaard as follows;

"Passion without reflection is immature, unformed, chaotic, and childish "immediacy", and reflection without passion is the kind of personal emptiness."²²

Moral virtue is a state of character concerned with choice and choice is deliberate desire. The origin of action is choice, and the origin of choice is desire and reasoning. That is the reason why choice cannot exist either without reason and intellect or without a moral state.

For Kierkegaard, good action cannot exist without a combination of intellect and character. Hannay and Marino give a remark that a person whose interest and enthusiasms were disconnected from reflection would be childish and someone whose reflection was merely unpractical would be idle thinking.²³

Kierkegaard holds that the ideal individual is one whose passion is directed by reflection and whose reflection is given ethical and religious substance by passion. According to Hannay and Marino, Kierkegaard expresses the relation between passion and reflection in terms of a temporal sequence. But it is not necessary for the mature individual

that every decision is preceded by immediate, spontaneous inspiration and then is followed by prudence. It may be rather that the individual's enthusiasm is shaped by a certain understanding of himself and the world, in terms of which he reflects.²⁴

What Kierkegaard means by 'concern' is passion, interest, enthusiasm, attachment and involvement. They can give rise to any or all emotions. Emotions are particular states based on one concern or another, mental states such as joy, hopefulness, anxiety, grief, gratitude, anger, pride, guilt, shame, a feeling of sadness mixed with pleasure and affection and so on. These mental states vary with the circumstances. They vary with how one views the circumstances.

So if an individual is to find value and truth he must live as a free man making real choices which may involve conflicts. Hence freedom is born in painful anxiety. Kierkegaard distinguishes between anxiety and fear. Anxiety can turn into despair. Anxiety and despair are caused by something internal.

In Kierkegaard's view, a person's moral identity cannot be absolutely identified with his or her character because the world is merely a world of temporal existence. Kierkegaard's point is that there are no easy smooth solutions for life. No one can use a rational or logical system to figure out life. He can come to exist only through an existential leap into faith. That is the reason why Kierkegaard opposes all attempts to rationalize or systematize life.

The concept of emotion is central in Kierkegaard's ethics about subjectivity, inwardness, existence, and character. For Kierkegaard, character is constituted largely in the temperaments of emotion. Good character or virtues are temperaments of proper emotions, and bad character or vices are temperaments of improper ones. In this respect, he seems to accept that human emotion includes one's thought, interest or concern.

Thus, to exist well is to incorporate right thinking into a life which is full of feeling and sympathy. That is the reason why ethical virtue has the emotions or passions for its material, and reason for its form.

4.2.2. Ethical View of Martin Heidegger

From Kierkegaard, the German existentialists derived much of their inspiration. Kierkegaard and later existentialists including Heidegger assert that the individual man exists in the sense of being characterized by choice. Kierkegaard's concept of existence became the central concept in Heidegger and Jaspers. Existentialism, as a philosophical system was elaborated by Heidegger in his *Being and Time*, 1927. The central problem of his philosophy is the problem of being. Heidegger attempts to analyze and clarify the meaning and structure of being. His analysis is through the analysis of a human being because he believes that man is the key to the nature of reality. So, he analyses man thoroughly and hopes that that will lead to the understanding of "being" itself.

To understand 'being', Heidegger uses the phenomenological method. This method is a disciplined attempt to see and to let something be seen as it is. So while one is using this method, he has to be cleared from all preconceived ideas and assumptions.

Most of the Western philosophers conceived the world as a material substance in which there are human beings and other things. Heidegger holds that Western tradition has a tendency toward objectification because they consider the world to be made up of substances, things and objects and even the soul or self or mind has been considered as substance. So their crucial problem is epistemological, asking whether the subject can know the object. There is difference or separation between subject and object. For Heidegger, there is no such difference because the world is a field of human concern as there is no world without human beings. Human beings and the world are intimately

related and this relationship is of existential participation and engagement.

Heidegger maintains that if one is going to understand reality, one must not do it on the basis of things. What he means by things is objective properties that stand outside of human beings. For him, a human being has being and insight into his subjectivity. If one wants to understand reality, he has to look inside his subjectivity.

The existence of the individual is finite and temporal. It is man's sense of finitude and fleeting human life that make him aware of his existence and his peculiar character. He holds that anguish or anxiety from the inevitability of death permeates in the whole of individual existence. Hence, the individual is confronted with absolute nothingness. For Heidegger, it is a nothingness which is not the mere absence of existence. Nothingness is a basic reality. Concerning the idea that death is associated with nothingness, Heidegger's point is that death has a status beyond the mere non-existence of the individual. Hence, man's existence is a being for death.²⁵

Like Kierkegaard, Heidegger emphasizes the element of risk in all human decisions, action, and commitment. The relation between the individual and the world is not a subject-object relation. It is a direct relation which is called by Heidegger an active participation.²⁶

Most scholars claim that Heidegger's philosophy is ontological. Heidegger's local point of discussion is on the nature of human life. But his philosophy is ethical when he discusses man's life, the authenticity of being, making choices and responsibility.

In Heidegger's ethics there are themes such as responsibility, evil, autonomy. But he is opposed to the version that rules of human conduct can be specified in abstraction. His ethics is concerned not just with human beings but with human beings in relation to otherness. That is his point of analyzing '*Dasein*'. For him, humanbeing is essentially

relational and not just in relation to itself and to other human beings but in relation to both known and unknown otherness.

Heidegger asserts that because of the development of technology, human beings have to face more ethical issues in social relationship. As a result, ethics is cut loose from abstract universal moral standards. Hence, Heidegger emphasizes the predominance of technical relations, because technical relations lead to the ethical problems of human existence. Heidegger accepts that moral theory becomes impossible if being is not taken into consideration because if so constructing theories of truth, of identity, of individuation and responsibility as a condition for moral judgment will not be possible.

For Heidegger, morality can be understood as the concern with good and evil. Theories of morality attempt to provide judgments of good and evil which are derived from some set of principles. So, formal ethics claims that such universal principles which are concerned with all human beings seeking to establish universal judgment. But his aim is not to demonstrate the possibility of universal judgment which does not between practice and pure reflection.

According to Heidegger, metaphysics and ethics become indistinguishable in asking the question 'What is it to be human?' For him, human beings cannot construct an ethics where there is no way of asking such questions in a technological age in which there may be a breakdown of ethics. So the question 'What is it to be human?' is not a traditional problem. Traditionally, ethics is a general, not a specific form of enquiry, and is concerned not with particular kinds of human beings, but with human being in general. This generality disconnects ethics from actual existence. In order to live in the contemporary world, where the technical relations are predominant human beings have to follow the dictates of technical relations.²⁷ Hence, Heidegger urges that the form of thinking must respond to being, because it is necessary to free oneself from any technical interpretation of

thinking. Heidegger tries to develop another kind of thinking which is supposed to lie outside the philosophical tradition.

For Heidegger, ethics ceases to be a set of questions about what ethics takes for human beings to flourish, an issue for individuals to confront within whatever specific context of existence. Ethics becomes a set of issues for which there is offered a global, indeed a final, solution in all its fear.²⁸ Heidegger does not deny the existence of good and evil. Heidegger only claims that the analysis of '*Dasein*' takes place at a level before, or beyond, the distinction between good and evil. Heidegger believes that a human being has potentiality that is limited by his birth. So in his life, man has inherited intelligence, his upbringing and his social and political environment. All these provide all the ontological conditions for *Dasein*'s ability to exist factically. These are the existential conditions for the possibility of the 'morally' good, 'morally' evil, for morality in general and for all the possible forms which this may take factically.

4.2.3. Ethical View of Jean-Paul Sartre

Jean-Paul Sartre, the leading figure of the existentialist movement in France came under the influence of German existentialist, Heidegger. He developed existentialism in his book *Being and Nothingness*. Like Heidegger, his version of existentialism is secular and atheistic. For him, existentialism is nothing but an attempt to draw all the consequences from a consistent atheistic position. According to him, the very notion of God is self-contradictory. Sartre believes that the theistic position infers the existence of God and the world from the nature or essence of God. But for Sartre, human existence is prior to his essence.²⁹

Since he holds that existence precedes essence, he rejects rationalism in favor of irrationalism and anti-intellectualism. If God does not exist, then there is one being in

whom existence precedes essence, a being which exists before he can be defined by any concept.

Sartre's interpretation of 'man' is derived from his ontology. The notions of conscious subjectivity, freedom, nothingness have their ontological basis in existential reality. For Sartre, being is the totality of all phenomena. There are two types of being, 'being-in-itself' and 'being-for-itself'. 'Being-in-itself' is the uncreated, fixed and lifeless physical world. Otherwise, 'Being-for-itself' is not fixed which is human consciousness and is living and free.

The existentialists believe that neither reasoning nor experience is the adequate means of acquiring knowledge of the individual or reality. They believe that by phenomenologically analyzing self, one can know reality which is called Being. For Sartre the central problem is that of Being. For him a person exists as a conscious being.

Descartes asserted that he could prove his existence through reasoning. He knows himself as a thinking being. From this he draws the conclusion that I think, therefore I am. For Sartre people do not have to prove that they exist because they are already involved in the misery and absurdity of life that they know very well. People find themselves thrown into the world full of miseries and unhappiness. But people often lose sight of their existence as being-for-itself. So, when they interact with other human beings they often treat themselves as objects losing self-confidence. They lose confidence that they are free and of worth as being-for-itself.

For Sartre, to be free is to choose. As he is an atheist, Sartre contends that people have no standards to guide them. Sartre asserts that life is full of absurdity. There is nothing out of himself upon which they can depend. So, people must turn within and find strength in themselves. It is through human or human consciousness that 'nothingness'

comes into the world. In this sense, Sartre's philosophy is nihilism, an existentialist's discovery of nothingness. Then, 'What is the reason why human being has to face nothingness?' Hazel E. Barnes in the translator's introduction of the book *Being and Nothingness* remarks that with Sartre, the concept of nothingness is a denial of everything, and it becomes important and heavy with consequences.³⁰

For Sartre, 'nothingness' is not an abstract idea but a reality. Nothingness is an actual reality just like being itself. Freedom is the reason or the cause of nothingness. According to Sartre, freedom is the very nature of man. He even asserts that the being of man is identical with his being free. So, man cannot be separated from his freedom. Freedom is the very being of the 'for-itself' which is condemned to be free. To be free does not mean to obtain what one has wished. Sartre explains freedom as follows;

The formula "to be free" does not mean "to obtain what one has wished" but rather "by oneself to determine oneself to wish (in the broad sense of choosing).³¹

The point is that one must determine oneself to choose, which the broad sense of choosing is. Hence, success is not important to freedom. For Sartre, freedom is the first condition of action. Sartre asserts that while the philosophers are endlessly arguing about determinism and freewill, they never attempt first to make explicit the nature of the very idea of action. Traditionally, the concept of freedom is equivalent to the ability to obtain the ends chosen. But for Sartre, choice is identical with action. That is the reason why Sartre distinguishes choice from the dream and the wish.

Freedom, for Sartre, is the very nature of man. The being of man is identical with his being free. For him, man gets the consciousness of this freedom in anxiety. So freedom has come into being in anxiety.

Anguish is the reflective apprehension of the self as freedom. Hence, anguish is the

realization which comes when one feels that nothing can relieve him from the necessity of continuous choosing of oneself and nothing can guarantee the validity of the values when one chooses. For Sartre, a human being is the one who can take negative attitudes with respect to himself.

Sartre holds that freedom and anxiety provide the conditions for bad faith. Nothingness is related in man most freely in anguish. People try to free themselves of this anguish, this nothingness by means of bad faith. Through bad faith a person seeks to escape the responsible freedom of being-for-itself.

Sartre's existentialism is connected with the living person and his concrete emotions of anguish, despair and nausea. Like the other existentialists the existence of the individual is the basic reality for Sartre. But the personal life of an individual cannot be predicted rationally, because it is full of changes including psychological changes in man's life. So, one cannot understand man's life by the usual means of perception and reasoning.

In Twentieth Century ethics, Peirce believes that beliefs are rules for actions and right actions depend on good volition. For James, beliefs are rule for action and a belief is true when it works for people, when it satisfies their needs. Dewey accepts that ethics based on the emotions of sympathy, pity and benevolence. Kierkegaard believes that when an individual makes a choice at the ethical level, he has to make a choice in accordance with reason. For Heidegger, man's being in the world includes his relationship with an environment. Man is also related to community with other human beings. For Sartre, man must forever choose himself, and that freedom is the very nature of man. Whenever chooses to do something he must have reason for his choice. Thus, Kierkegaard, Heidegger and Sartre do not eradicate the role of reason in their moral thoughts. For that reason, pragmatists and existentialists accept the role of reason and emotion in their moral thought. It can be concluded that their philosophies are the attempts to proper balance

between reason and emotion.

When people are in a situation of solving moral problems, they try to examine the situation by asking, which is wrong, which is missing and also tries to find out the ways and means that can make the situation right. This happens in the everyday lives of human beings especially in their moral lives. Thus, it is obvious that the role of emotion and reason is very important for morality of everyone.

CONCLUSION

Generally, human actions deal with knowledge, justification, and purpose because human beings are rational. In this respect, it is unquestionable that human conduct is generally based on reason. In contrast, when people make choices for their moral conduct such as good or evil and right or wrong, most of their decisions are naturally based on their personal feelings or emotional response or free will. In this respect, human beings are often influenced by personal emotions in their everyday life in nature. If their decisions merely depend on personal emotions without reason, they turn out to be the wrong or evil deeds. From this point, it can be said that managing personal emotions may be considered as a way to morally good character.

In this dissertation, the main theme of discussion focuses on why emotion and reason play a role in Western ethics. It shows that living a good and happy life depends on people's ethical knowledge. It can be said that some emotions like sympathy, love, generosity, joy at another's success can mostly motivate people to conduct themselves to benefit not only the agents but also the other members of their society. In this dissertation, it is highlighted the fact that people are required to cultivate good emotions in order to do good and this reap good consequences which can be shared by all members of society, and to eliminate bad emotions with the help of reason so as to achieve peace and tranquility as well as common good of people.

Human beings usually make moral choices after they have rationally considered them. So it is believed that the moral agent must be able to justify his actions rationally. In order to find agreement between human beings, there has to be a rational basis. So at the stage of reflective morality, reason and morals are closely related. Even at the stage of customary morality, individual actions are chosen by some people on rational grounds. At this stage actions are considered to be moral so far as they are based on thoughts and

experience of the race. In morals, the issues 'Why is it right?' and 'Why is it good?' are to be answered by giving reasons. So, moral valuations are not arbitrary.

Sometimes moral actions are judged on the basis of the acceptance of the social group. Sometimes universal human acceptance is necessary. Universality is important. If there is disagreement then both sides have a duty to reason. Sometimes the rightness and wrongness of a certain action depends on whether it is universally accepted or not. Moral objectivists maintain both the universality of moral judgment and the idea that the same action cannot be both right and wrong at the same time. It has been found that in the evolution of conduct and morality, customary conduct is controlled by social feelings and emotions. There is reason only when there is reflective morality.

In the West, emotions are sometimes called passions and sometimes the words sentiments or feelings stand for emotions. Whenever emotions are defined they are defined as anger, fear, love, joy and sorrow and most of the times as the feeling of pleasure and pain. Sometimes the word 'emotion' is used as affection, appetite and hope. The term 'emotion' is concerned not only with psychology and physiology but also with ethics. The chief concern with the emotions is the moral concern starting from the ancient and the medieval until modern times.

Throughout the history, moral philosophers hold that there is in man a fundamental conflict between reason and passions. The conflict is between man's rationality and his irrationality. When emotions are regarded as the animal aspect or bodily aspect, these are bad so that emotions must be eliminated from human life. But when emotions are regarded as nature or being part of human nature, they are either good or bad in accordance with the way these are controlled or used in the moral life.

The aim of moral thought or ethics is to guide people ethically and to make them

understand what is good or bad, and right or wrong, and to give them reasons of why they should follow or observe moral principles. Moreover, it can be said that Western philosophers do accept the relationship between emotion and reason. Specifically, the dissertation deals with philosophical analysis and literature review or survey, focusing on the role of emotion and reason in Greek ethics, the role of emotion and reason in Medieval ethics, the role of emotion and reason in Modern ethics and the role of emotion and reason in Twentieth Century ethics.

In Greek ethics, Socrates was interested in the problems related to living a good life. So, his philosophy deals with the meaning of right and wrong so that his attempt is to find out the basic principle of right and wrong, which is a measure to apply beyond the beliefs of any individual. The measure he finds is that 'knowledge is the highest good.' For him, inquiring into what is good is the best. Some radical philosophers look upon the ethical ideas and practices as mere conventions. That leads some to hold that might makes right. The conservatives regard ethical ideas as self-evident. Hence for them rules of conduct need not be reasoned but are commands to be obeyed. Socrates tries not only to understand the meaning of morality but also to discover a rational principle of morality, which is a principle of distinguishing right from wrong. Socrates firmly believes that it is a criterion by which one can decide moral issues. This belief leads Socrates to examine such questions as 'How shall I order my life?', 'What is the rational way of living?' and 'How ought a rational being to act?' These questions lead to the answer that knowledge is virtue and rules of conduct are the dictates of reason. But with Socrates knowledge of right and wrong is not a theoretical opinion but a firm practical conviction. Therefore, moral issues are not only matters of reason or intellect but also matters of will. That is the reason why it can be said that although Socrates accepts reason as a source of genuine knowledge of moral concepts he also accepts emotions. He asserts that the greatest need is love can help

people to be moral.

Plato accepts that man has three parts such as reason passion and desire. Out of the three parts, the appetites are concerned with the functions of body and desires. The will is the spiritual part of man which is concerned with actions, courage and bravery. Reason is concerned with the highest and the best for Plato. A man is living a good life when reason rules the will and the appetites. Consequently, that man is wise, brave and temperate. For Plato, the life of that man will be a happy life. For Plato, goodness and happiness go together. But pleasure should not be treated as the end of life. A good life is a life in which reason rules the will and the appetites and that the life of reason is the highest good for man. But Plato accepts the connection between love and wisdom in his moral thought.

Aristotle believes that every action of man has some ends. Because the ends happen to be an endless chain there must be something which is the highest good and which is the aim of everything. That highest good is self-realization which fully realizes the talents and abilities. Aristotle accepts that reason is the feature which distinguishes man from other beings. Man alone has the ability to reason. The highest good of man is his realization of his reason which brings happiness.

Like Plato, Aristotle recognizes reason as a part of man who also has feelings, desires and appetites. A good life is one in which reason and emotions are realized in perfect harmony. Concerning the rational attitude, Aristotle holds the golden mean which avoids the extremes by balancing one extreme over against another. The best life is to seeking knowledge about what is right and what is good. Thus, reason is crucial in morality of human beings for them. But these three philosophers do not deny that emotions influence human behavior. Socrates accepts that music can make one gentle. Moreover, he said that the greatest love enable a human being to live well. Plato holds that the connection between love and wisdom. Aristotle accepts the right relation between

reason and emotion. Nevertheless, it cannot deny that emotion can help human beings to be moral in some degree.

In this dissertation, the representation of God's will, love of God and love of neighbor which is regarded as essential emotions in Medieval ethics is highlighted in the discussion. However, some medieval philosophers lay more emphasis on good will, and accept that good or evil emerges from human will. And they argue that human beings should live in accordance with reason and God's will. In Augustine's thought, good or evil emerges from human will. He states that there are personal desires and God's will. People should not live in accordance with personal desires. To build good moral character, people ought to live in accordance with God's will. Aquinas holds that all choices are made under the lead of human intention and that God's will play a fundamental role in moral behavior. Aquinas argues that human beings should live in accordance with reason and God's will. In Ockham's thought, the agent's will is the fundamental role and it freely chooses moral law. Therefore, good or evil depends on the agent's good will. God's will is a way to reach the place of limitless good.

Medieval philosophers maintain that there is a connection between morality and religious faith. Religious faith motivates and guides people to behave in a morally good way. The moral rules of right or wrong come from the commands of God. Besides religious emotions of virtues such as faith, hope and charity dispose people to be morally good. They also believe that the rightness or wrongness of an action depends on God's commands. An act is right if it conforms to God's will but an act is wrong if it goes against God's will. Most philosophers in the Western Medieval age have generally agreed that emotion can lead people to do good or evil action. In fact, positive emotions can promote moral behavior and negative emotion can cause harmful effect on others. Augustine, Aquinas and William of Ockham do not totally ignore the role of

reason. Augustine accepts that morally upright person is perfectly under the rule of reason. For Aquinas, moral actions include four aspects such as good activity, good object, good end and good circumstance. People can choose these conditions by reason. William of Ockham accepts that a person can perform good in conformity with right reason. Thus, it can be said that the role of reason does not deny even Medieval philosophers who emphasize religious belief. Nevertheless, people cannot follow reason when they are overwhelmed by negative emotions. So it can be said that people who believe in God's will and emphasize good emotion can understand the importance of reason in ethics. This dissertation it is hoped will be able to contribute towards this view.

In this dissertation, it is attempted to show how two trends of modern philosophy rationalism and empiricism come to meet in ethics. Traditionally, these two trends are considered vastly different especially in epistemology although most rationalists and empiricists dare not deny the existence of God. Their stand points in relation to God are also related with their epistemological views. Nevertheless, it is clear that, Kant, one of the Modern philosophers accept that only by using reason, can an individual work out what one's duty was. Practical reason is better suited to the development and guidance of a good will. In Modern ethics, even though rationalists emphasize the role of reason, they recognize the necessity of emotion such as generosity, love, and charity in relation to morality. In fact, rationality may not always be associated with virtue and virtue may not always be associated with rationality because 'knowledge through reason' or reasoning may not always be associated with the welfare or happiness of humankind. However, it is an undeniable fact that knowledge through reason is necessary to enhance virtuous action which has constructive influence on the wellbeing of human beings.

The empiricists emphasize the relationship between morality and the will of God. Specifically, they emphasize the emotions of love and sympathy. These are necessary

moral virtues. However, it is not easy to motivate people to be morally good conduct against their personal emotions. For that reason, even though they are empiricists, they cannot reject the role of reason in order to control negative emotions of human being in their moral thoughts.

Therefore, it can be said that moral thoughts of both empiricists and rationalists have similar ideas; they accept the role of reason and emotion in order to promote the moral lives of human beings.

In the ethics of Kant, actions are morally right in virtue of their motives, which must derive more from duty than from inclination. So duty is necessary to act out of reverence for the law. It is found in Kant's ethics that good will alone is good, regardless of good consequence or bad consequence of an action. It is to be noted that moral judgment depends on whether one wills the good or bad. If one does his action through good will, it is not necessary to examine whether such action produces good or bad results. Human nature possesses subjective impulses, desires and inclinations. Kant accepts that the only good thing is good will. So, it is also shown that good will as well as good emotions and reason should be considered when people try to build a moral society in which an individual is able to synthesize emotion and reason. In Modern ethics, both rationalists and empiricists are unable to reject emotions like generosity, love, sympathy, passion, and charity though they maintain the role of reason in order to make people doing moral conduct. Among them, Hume argues that morality cannot be based on reason alone. Although he accepts emotions as the fundamental factor to motivate the human moral behavior, he accepts rationality as a range. In contrast to Hume, Kant accepts the reason as the primary factor to be morally good. Kant does not accept that the foundation of morality involve sympathy or empirical emotion or desires because these emotions cannot give objective and universal principle. But Kant accepts four feelings such as moral

feeling, conscience, love of human beings and respect in his moral thought. For that reason, both reason and emotion play in crucial role in morality of human beings.

In Twentieth Century ethics, Peirce points out that human belief are really rules for actions. But when people encounter social problems, reasoning educates the instinct. And he accepts that right or wrong depends on active or passive volition. James asserts that beliefs are rule for action. A belief is true when it works for human beings, when it satisfies their needs. Peirce and James accept the view that moral judgment cannot be made by reason alone and they accept the role of emotion or human will.

There are two tendencies in Modern thought concerning the nature of values. One tendency is that the origin of value is in something above or beyond nature. For examples, the view that value originates in God and Kant's view that it originates in pure reason. The other tendency is that value is identified with purely subjective satisfaction such as pleasure. For Dewey, values are not dependent on desires and satisfactions prior to actions. Values or what is valuable is the happiness which comes through intelligence. Hence, enjoyment without thinking or intelligent operation is not valuable. Hence for him, valuation is experimental. Dewey uses the terms intelligence, thoughtful planning and intelligent operation instead of reason.

Dewey emphasizes the change of the objective environment. He wants to account for values in a naturalistic way. Dewey does not identify goodness with the arbitrary preference of the individual. He treats values as a scientist treats hypotheses without claiming certainty. Daniel Goleman, in his book *Emotional Intelligence* remarks on Dewey's view of moral education as follows:

And philosopher John Dewey saw that a moral education is most potent when lessons are taught to children in the course of real events, not just as abstract lessons – the mode of emotional literacy.¹

Dewey believes that if character development is a foundation of societies, it is necessary to consider some of the ways in which emotional intelligence can support this foundation. For him, character education takes 'will' to keep emotion under the control of reason. It is found that moulding an individual and society is determined by human emotion. Thus, it can be concluded that without reason, what is practical and useful cannot be determined, and at the same time man's nature cannot be free from emotion and feeling. On the other hand, he accepts that ethics based on sympathy, pity, benevolence.

In the West there was a general tendency to emphasize the rational since the time of Plato. In the late nineteenth century, Hegel also greatly emphasized the rational as he even said that what is rational is real and what is real is rational. In the twentieth century, science has gained great success. Almost all are interested in this success so that most of them forget the fact that man's psychological life or inner life is also important. It happens that material success gains more attention than man's personal happiness. It can be said that the man of this century is more interested in the success of science so that one's inner life seems to be unimportant. But the theories of modern science indicate that man cannot rely on reasoning all the time and people came to accept that every kind of knowledge including science is not certain. The major interest of the existentialists is in the individual person and his individual existence. There are many areas in nature and human phenomena in which only reason without emotion. The existentialists are among those who come to accept that there are irrational parts in everybody. So, they recognize that not only reason but also emotion are present in man and his activities.

Kierkegaard believes that when an individual makes a choice at the ethical level, he has to make a choice in accordance with a universal principle or a rule. For Kierkegaard, an ethical rule is useful because it helps a person to make decisions. But life is too complex to be covered by rules. No rule can be applied in each and every case at

theethical level. So, one has to decide for himself as an individual. So he has to leap beyond universal moral rules. That is the reason of how and why Kierkegaard drew the line between the ethical and religious stage of life, showing how can one leap beyond universal moral rules. There are real possibilities for man and he must choose among them. If a man wants to live an authentic life, he must constantly make choices for in deciding either this or that man is making his own life instead of leaving it to be made for him.

Heidegger emphasizes choice, responsibility and relationship concerning human beings in general. Sartre argues that a human being is responsible for whatever he thinks, feels and chooses. Moreover, they accept that since feelings are not divorced from reason in decision making, reasoning is important. Thus, it can be said that the existentialist ethical view acknowledges the role of both emotion and reason. Although the statement "existence precedes essence" seems to mean that existence is primary and essence is secondary, existentialism does not deny the necessity of ethical value or essence.

The individual has to face life's uncertainties including 'death'. Since, there are many uncertainties of human life man comes to feel that life is nothing and that life is meaningless. Human life and existence is also full of uncertainties, absurdity, inconsistencies and irrationality. Hence, there are many things that cannot be understood through reasoning. So nobody can rely on reasoning alone. To understand an individual fully, one has to understand a wholly subjective inner feeling.

It is the aim of this dissertation to make people understand that emotion should not be neglected whenever ethical theories or principles are laid down. Human nature includes not only reason but also emotion. It is important to understand how to balance between emotion and reason in order that the aim of ethics can be achieved.

There are moments in one's life when feeling overwhelm rationality. Man is a rational animal. But at the same time he has emotions. So, human beings have to learn and understand emotions which can undermine one's best intentions. As there are destructive emotional impulses one has to be careful to shape one's emotions into good habits and avoid those that are bad.

When Aristotle philosophically enquired into virtue, character and the good life, he realized the challenge of managing the emotional life with intelligence.² Almost all the moral philosophers with the exception of three Medieval philosophers acknowledge that our passions must be well exercised under the dictates of reason. As Aristotle says, men's passions after they have been under the dictates of reason have wisdom so that at the stage of wisdom, passions guide men's thinking, values and the ways and means for survival.

Goleman makes a discussion on the ability, which he called emotional intelligence, in his work *Emotional Intelligence*. According to him, emotional intelligence includes self, control, zeal and persistence, and the ability to motivate oneself. Emotional Intelligence is the ability to choose the right feeling and it empathizes with other's feelings. Emotional intelligence plays an important role in the ethical decision making.³ The awareness of inner state is called self-awareness by Goleman. When Aristotle uses the term 'character' it is a characteristic which is required in moral conduct. Self – discipline is the basis of character. Hence philosophers since Aristotle have an understanding that the basis of the virtuous life is self-control. A certain person who has good character is able to motivate and guide himself so that one can control his or her emotions. The emotional skill that urges one to control appetites and passions was called 'will' at one time in the West. Hence, the skill of controlling, managing or directing the emotions is necessary because it can open up the way to empathy.

It can be said that all the moral philosophers try to take a balance between emotion

and reason. In most of the Western views, emotions and passions are regarded as natural in human life. So it is not necessary to get rid of emotions. It is necessary to keep them in their place in human life and make them to serve reason by directing the ability, effort and enthusiasm of emotions to make good things in the course of moral life.

Sometimes there is a conflict between a man's reason and his passions. Man is an animal. So, in his nature, there is both rationality and irrationality, both reason and emotion. But the conflict must not be resolved by means of eliminating the emotions. Emotions may play a part in human life. The good life is one in which emotions are under control by rational thought. A rational life is a life in which emotions are moderated or disciplined by rational principles.

Emotions have some role in moral life. This view is recognized by Aristotle in his theory of the moral virtues. Whenever he talks about reason and passion, passion is for him emotion. Aristotle holds that moral virtues are good emotional habits. Fear is neither good nor bad. But when fear is fearing the wrong things, at the wrong time and place there is the problem of good or bad. A man can control his feeling of fear when he fears the right things at the right time to the right amount in the right way.⁴ Aristotle's point is that if so, the person is emotionally controlled. So a courageous person is a man who has fear under control. On the contrary, cowardice means fearing the wrong things or fearing too much.

For Aristotle, temperance is another basic virtue. Temperance is moderation between appetite and lust or desire. When emotions are not extremes or excessive it can be judged that these emotions are not out of control. Consequently those kinds of emotions are not vices.

If everyone has a will and is able to neglect self-centered emotions, and impulses then the society he or she is engaging will have social benefits. Such actions will open up

the way to compassionate, empathetic and altruistic society. Hence in some Western moral thoughts especially Aristotle, advice is given to keep extreme emotion under the control of reason.

To conclude, Greek ethics holds that without good will or good emotion, one cannot achieve one's goal, but that good will or good emotion alone without reason cannot guarantee ethical achievement. In Medieval ethics, mostly the representation of God's will as well as good emotion, gives a room for reason, and does not exclude either reason or emotion but to keep a proper balance between these two. Modern ethics does not accept that morality relies on reason alone and Twentieth Century ethics does not deny the proper role of emotion and reason. This dissertation asserts that although Western philosophers whether they are rationalists or empiricists, pragmatists or existentialists, theist or atheist, and, in general, consequentialists or non-consequentialists, it is found through philosophical analysis that they acknowledge the role played by reason and emotion in ethics and morality. They accept the idea that moral conflicts cannot be resolved by reason alone but also awareness that such conflicts are more or less a struggle between emotion and reason. The role of emotions must therefore be acknowledged and only a seemingly balance between the two can achieve morality.

As the contribution of the dissertation it can be expected to have proper understanding about the significant role of both emotion and reason, in moral lives of the people. In other words, by being able to balance between emotion and reason, not totally relying on either, people are more likely to conduct themselves with and get happiness due to right choice and lead a good and happy life. Since human nature is emotion driven those emotions can be developed and controlled by reason for the benefit of good human relations, and that emotion in turn will be able to make people understand through empathy and good will that one should do unto other as they would do unto you which in the final analysis is the fundamental principle of morality and ethics.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicholas D. Smith. (2004). *Routledge Philosophy Guide Book to Plato and the Trial of Socrates*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group. p.128.
2. Ibid., p.134.
3. Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicholas D. Smith. (2010). *Socratic Moral Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p.56.
4. Sara Ahbel-Rappe and Rachana Kamtekar. (2006). *A Companion to Socrates*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. p.188.
5. Allan Bloom. (1968). *The Republic of Plato*. Second Edition. New York: A Division of Harper Collins Publishers. p.358.
6. Hugh H. Benson. (2006). *A Companion to Plato*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. p.278.
7. Ibid., p.310.
8. Normal Melchert. (2002). *The Great Conversation: A Historical Introduction to Philosophy*. Fourth Edition. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. p.142.
9. Ibid., p.188.
10. Aristotle. (Roger Crisp (trans.)). (2004). *Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p.3.
11. Ibid., p.20.
12. Ibid., p.31.
13. Aristotle. (George Henry Lewes (trans.)). (1910). *Nicomachean Ethics*. London: George Routledge & Sons, Limited. p.34.
14. Georgios Anagnostopoulos. (2009). *A Companion to Aristotle*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. p.501.
15. Bryan Magee. (1998). *The Story of Philosophy*. London: Dorling Kindersley Limited. p.38.

CHAPTER II

1. Jorge J. E. Gracia & Timothy B. Noone. (2002). *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. p.157.
2. Saint Augustine (Rev. Marcus Dods (trans.)). (1681). *The City of God*. Volume II. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co. p.10.
3. Ibid., p.47.
4. Ibid., p.15.
5. T.C. Denise, N.P. White & S.P. Peterfreund. (2002). *Great Traditions in Ethics*. CA, Belmont: Wadsworth. p.69.
6. Saint Thomas Aquinas. (Thomas Gilby (trans.)). (1951). *Philosophical Texts*. New York: Oxford University Press. p.264.
7. Ibid., pp.265-266.
8. T.C. Denise, N.P. White & S.P. Peterfreund. (2002). *Great Traditions in Ethics*. p.85.
9. James Fieser. (2001). *Moral Philosophy Through the Ages*. London: Mayfield Publishing Company. p.57.
10. Saint Thomas Aquinas. (Thomas Gilby (trans.)). (1951). *Philosophical Texts*. p.282.
11. Ibid., pp.285-286.
12. Ibid., p.301.
13. Saint Thomas Aquinas. (Thomas Gilby (Trans.)). (1951). *Philosophical Texts*. p.337.
14. Ibid., p.300.
15. Ibid., p.327.
16. Martin Pickave & Lisa Shapiro. (2012). *Emotion and Cognitive Life in Medieval and Early Modern Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p.75.
17. Paul Vincent Spade. (2006). *The Cambridge Companion to Ockham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p.227.

18. Ibid., p.237.
19. Frank Thilly. (1976). *A History of Philosophy*. Allahabad: Central Book Depot. p.178.

CHAPTER III

1. Rene Descartes. (Michael Moriarty (trans.)). (2008). *Meditations on First Philosophy with Selection from the Objections and Replies*. New York: Oxford University Press.p.86
2. Rene Descartes. (Jonathan Bennett (trans.)). (2010). *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting one's Reason and Seeking Truth in the Science*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.p.13.
3. Rene Descartes. (Jonathan Bennett (trans.)). (2010). *The Passions of the Soul*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.p.44.
4. Benedict de Spinoza. (R.H.M. Elwes (trans.)). (2000). *The Ethics*. Pennsylvania State University: The Electronic Classics Series.p.6.
5. Ibid., p.21.
6. Ibid., p.20.
7. Ibid., p.12.
8. Ibid., p.22.
9. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. (Ernest Rhys (trans.)). (1934). *Philosophical Writings*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons LTD.p.26.
10. David Blumenfeld. (2006). *The Cambridge Companion to Leibniz*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p.399.
11. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. (Ernest Rhys (trans.)). (1716). *Philosophical Writings*.p.29.
12. John Locke. (1690). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Pennsylvania State University: The Electronic Classics Series.p.336.
13. Frank Thilly. (1976). *A History of Philosophy*. Allahabad: Central Book Depot. p.347.
14. Ibid., p.214.
15. Ibid., p.215.
16. George Berkeley. (Jonathan Bennett (trans.)). (2010). *Alciphron*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company. p.30.
17. Ibid., p.124.
18. Ibid., p.44.
19. Ibid., p.46.
20. David Hume. (1896). *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. p.240.
21. Ibid., p.239.
22. Ibid., p.294.
23. Immanuel Kant. (Thomas Kingsmill Abbott (trans.)). (2010). *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.p.10.
24. Ibid., p.53.
25. Ibid., p.30.
26. Allen W. Wood. (2008). *Kantian Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press. p.183.

CHAPTER IV

1. Morton White. (1964). *The Age of Analysis*. New York: The New American Library. p.15.
2. Ibid., p.137.
3. Charles S. Peirce. (1878). *How to Make Our Ideas Clear*. Indian University: Indian University Press. p.291.
4. James. K. Feibleman. (1970). *An Introduction to The Philosophy of Charles S. Peirce*. Cambridge: M.I.T Press. p.378.
5. Ibid., p.380.
6. Ibid., p.367.
7. Ibid., p.223.

8. Ibid., p.369.
9. Ibid., p.387.
10. Morton White. (1976). *The Age of Analysis*. p.136.
11. William James. (1995). *Pragmatism*. New York: Dover Publication. p.30.
12. William James. (1897). *The Will to Believe and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co. pp.10-11.
13. William James. (1949). *Essays on Faith and Morals*. London: Longmans, Green and Co. p.185.
14. Morton White. (1976). *The Age of Analysis*. p.136.
15. John Dewey. (1922). *Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology*. New York: Henry Holt and Company. p.76.
16. Ibid., p.196.
17. Ibid., p.132.
18. Thomas Ellis Katen. (1973). *Doing Philosophy*. London: Prentice-Hall International, INC. p.278.
19. Ibid., p.279.
20. Frank Thilly. (1976). *A History of Philosophy*. Allahabad: Central Book Depot. p.179.
21. Ibid., p.179.
22. Alastair Hannay & Gordon D. Marino. (1998). *The Cambridge Companion to Kierkegaard*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p.182.
23. Ibid., p.182.
24. Ibid., p.183.
25. Frank Thilly. (1976). *A History of Philosophy*. p.586.
26. Ibid., p.587.
27. Joanna Hodge. (1995). *Heidegger and Ethics*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group. p.27.
28. Ibid., p.27.
29. Frank Thilly. (1976). *A History of Philosophy*. p.591.
30. Jean-Paul Sartre. (1956). *Being and Nothingness*. New York: Philosophical Library. p.XXV.
31. Ibid., p.483.

CONCLUSION

1. Daniel Goleman. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books. p.285.
2. Ibid., p.XIV.
3. Ibid., p.XII.
4. Ibid., p.XIII.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

1. Aquinas, Saint Thomas. (Thomas Gilby (trans.)). (1951). *Philosophical Texts*. New York: Oxford University Press.
2. Aristotle. (George Henry Lewes (trans.)). (1910). *Nicomachean Ethics*. London: George Routledge & Sons, Limited.
3. Aristotle. (Roger Crisp (trans.)). (2004). *Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Augustine, Saint. (Rev. Marcus Dods (trans.)). (1681) *The City of God*. Volume II. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co.
5. Berkeley, George. (Jonathan Bennett (trans.)). (2010). *Alciphron*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
6. Descartes, René. (Michael Moriarty (trans.)). (2008). *Meditations on First Philosophy with Selection from the Objections and Replies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Descartes, René. (Jonathan Bennett (trans.)). (2010). *The Passions of the Soul*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
8. Descartes, René. (Jonathan Bennett (trans.)). (2010). *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting one's Reason and Seeking Truth in the Science*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
9. Dewey, John. (1922). *Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
10. Hume, David. (1986). *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
11. Kant, Immanuel. (Thomas Kingsmill Abbott (trans.)). (2010). *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
12. Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. (Ernest Rhys (trans.)). (1934). *Philosophical Writings*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons LTD.
13. Locke, John. (1690). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Pennsylvania State University: The Electronic Classics Series.
14. James, William. (1897). *The Will to Believe and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co.
15. James, William. (1949). *Essays on Faith and Morals*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
16. William James. (1995). *Pragmatism*. New York: Dover Publication.
17. Peirce, Charles S. (1878). *How to Make Our Ideas Clear*. Indian University: Indian University Press.
18. Sartre, Jean-Paul. (Hazel E. Barnes (trans.)). (1956). *Being and Nothingness*. New York: Philosophical Library.
19. Spinoza, Benedict de. (R.H.M. Elwes (trans.)). (2000). *The Ethics*. Pennsylvania State University: The Electronic Classics Series.

Secondary Sources

1. Adler, Mortimer Jerome. (Max Weismann (edt.)). (2000). *How to Think about The Great Ideas: Form The Great Books of Western Civilization*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company.

2. Ahbel-Rappe, Sara and Rachana Kamtekar. (2006). *A Companion to Socrates*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
3. Anagnostopoulos, Georgios. (2009). *A Companion to Aristotle*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
4. Bagnoli, Carla. (2011). *Morality and the Emotions*. Oxford New York: Oxford University Press.
5. Baillie, James. (2000). *Routledge Philosophy Guide Book to Hume on Morality*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
6. Benson, Hugh H. (2006). *A Companion to Plato*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
7. Allan Bloom. (1968). *The Republic of Plato*. New York: A Division of Harper Collins Publishers.
8. Blumenfeld, David. (2006). *The Cambridge Companion to Leibniz*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Brickhouse, Thomas C. and Nicholas D. Smith.(2004). *Routledge Philosophy Guide Book to Plato and the Trial of Socrates*. New York:Taylor & Francis Group.
10. Brickhouse, Thomas C. and Nicholas D. Smith. (2010). *Socratic Moral Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Carr, David & Jan Steutel. (1999). *Virtue Ethics and Moral Education*. London: Taylor & Francis Group.
12. Cahn, Steven M. (1977). *Classics of Western Philosophy*. New York: Hackett Publishing Company.
13. Copp, David. (2006). *The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
14. Cottingham, John. (1992). *The Cambridge Companion to Descartes*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
15. Denise, T.C., N.P. White & S.P. Peterfreund. (2002). *Great Traditions in Ethics*. CA, Belmont:Wadsworth.
16. Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Mark A. Wrathall. (2005). *A Companion to Heidegger*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
17. Evans, Dylan. (2011). *Emotions: The Science of Sentiment*. New York: Oxford University Press.
18. Fieser, James. (2001). *Moral Philosophy Through the Ages*. Landon: Mayfield Publishing Company.
19. Feibleman, James. k. (1970). *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Charles S. Peirce*. Cambridge: M.I.T Press.
20. Gracia, Jorge J. E. & Timothy B. Noone. (2002). *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
21. Goleman, Daniel. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
22. Hannary, Alastair and Gordon D. Marino. (1998). *The Cambridge Companion to Kierkegaard*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Express.
23. Hodge, Joanna. (1995). *Heidegger and Ethics*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
24. Katen, Thomas Ellis. (1973). *Doing Philosophy*. London: Prentice-Hall International, INC.
25. Klima, Gyula. (2007). *Medieval Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
26. Magee, Bryan. (1998). *The Story of Philosophy*. London: Dorling Kindersley limited.
27. Melchert, Normal. (2002). *The Great Conversation: A Historical Introduction to Philosophy*. Fourth Edition. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
28. Newman, Lex. (2007). *The Cambridge Companion to Locke's "Essay Concerning Human Understanding"*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
29. Pakaluk, Michael & Giles Pearson. (2011). *Moral Psychology and Human Action in Aristotle*. New York: Oxford University Press.
30. Pickave, Martin & Lisa Shapiro. (2012). *Emotion and Cognitive Life in Medieval and Early Modern Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
31. Spade, Paul Vincent. (2006). *The Cambridge Companion to Ockham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
32. Thilly, Frank. (1976). *A History of Philosophy*. Allahabad: Central Book Depot.

33. Warnock, Mary. (1967). *Existentialist Ethics*. New York: St Martin's Press.
34. White, Morton. (1964). *The Age of Analysis*. New York: The New American Library.
35. Wood, Allen W. (2008). *Kantian Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
36. Youpa, Andrew. (2010). *The Cambridge Companion to Spinoza's Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.