

Title	Conceptions of objectivity and truth in ethics : a survey of recent developments
Sub Title	
Author	Ertl, Wolfgang
Publisher	慶應義塾大学
Publication year	2022
Jtitle	学事振興資金研究成果実績報告書 (2021.)
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	<p>I enquired further into the problem of the domain specificity of truth and the claim, brought forward by Parfit and Scanlon, that in ethics truth does not involve correspondence so that there are no ethical objects such as values, while ethical judgements can nonetheless be true. One can call this approach "objectivism without realism", although the terminology is rather fluid, and some would still be prepared to call Scanlon's and Parfaits approach "realist". As far as terminology is concerned, perhaps Ronald Dworkin is the most important voice who dismisses realism in ethics, which -- in line with John Mickie's claims -- would in his opinion imply the existence of ontologically weird objects.</p> <p>In the course of this year, I considered a number of criticisms of "objectivism without realism". The most challenging one has been developed by Charles Larmore who -- and this is of course of special interest for me -- combines this criticism of this type of contemporary objectivists with a criticism of Kant. The discussion of objectivity in ethics, and of normativity in general, is conducted with reference to reasons and their status, and according to Larmore Kant rejects the idea that rationality consists in responding rightly to independently existing reasons. Rather, Larmore sees Kant's famous conception of autonomy as an attempt to construct rationality independently of such an idea of a response to something. In Larmore's opinion, Kant thinks that reason must be the author of its principles. This is where I disagree with Larmore. In my opinion, Kant's claim that rational nature has absolute worth is a point of reference which can be read in a realist way.</p>
Notes	
Genre	Research Paper
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=2021000003-20210212

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the Keio Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

研究代表者	所属	文学部	職名	教授	補助額	200 (B) 千円
	氏名	エアトル ヴォルフガング	氏名 (英語)	Ertl, Wolfgang		
研究課題 (日本語)						
Conceptions of Objectivity and Truth in Ethics: A Survey of Recent Developments						
研究課題 (英訳)						
Conceptions of Objectivity and Truth in Ethics: A Survey of Recent Developments						
1. 研究成果実績の概要						
<p>I enquired further into the problem of the domain specificity of truth and the claim, brought forward by Parfit and Scanlon, that in ethics truth does not involve correspondence so that there are no ethical objects such as values, while ethical judgements can nonetheless be true. One can call this approach "objectivism without realism", although the terminology is rather fluid, and some would still be prepared to call Scanlon's and Parfaits approach "realist". As far as terminology is concerned, perhaps Ronald Dworkin is the most important voice who dismisses realism in ethics, which -- in line with John Mickie's claims -- would in his opinion imply the existence of ontologically weird objects.</p> <p>In the course of this year, I considered a number of criticisms of "objectivism without realism". The most challenging one has been developed by Charles Larmore who -- and this is of course of special interest for me -- combines this criticism of this type of contemporary objectivists with a criticism of Kant. The discussion of objectivity in ethics, and of normativity in general, is conducted with reference to reasons and their status, and according to Larmore Kant rejects the idea that rationality consists in responding rightly to independently existing reasons. Rather, Larmore sees Kant's famous conception of autonomy as an attempt to construct rationality independently of such an idea of a response to something. In Larmore's opinion, Kant thinks that reason must be the author of its principles. This is where I disagree with Larmore. In my opinion, Kant's claim that rational nature has absolute worth is a point of reference which can be read in a realist way.</p>						
2. 研究成果実績の概要 (英訳)						
<p>I enquired further into the problem of the domain specificity of truth and the claim, brought forward by Parfit and Scanlon, that in ethics truth does not involve correspondence so that there are no ethical objects such as values, while ethical judgements can nonetheless be true. One can call this approach "objectivism without realism", although the terminology is rather fluid, and some would still be prepared to call Scanlon's and Parfaits approach "realist". As far as terminology is concerned, perhaps Ronald Dworkin is the most important voice who dismisses realism in ethics, which -- in line with John Mickie's claims -- would in his opinion imply the existence of ontologically weird objects.</p> <p>In the course of this year, I considered a number of criticisms of "objectivism without realism". The most challenging one has been developed by Charles Larmore who -- and this is of course of special interest for me -- combines this criticism of this type of contemporary objectivists with a criticism of Kant. The discussion of objectivity in ethics, and of normativity in general, is conducted with reference to reasons and their status, and according to Larmore Kant rejects the idea that rationality consists in responding rightly to independently existing reasons. Rather, Larmore sees Kant's famous conception of autonomy as an attempt to construct rationality independently of such an idea of a response to something. In Larmore's opinion, Kant thinks that reason must be the author of its principles. This is where I disagree with Larmore. In my opinion, Kant's claim that rational nature has absolute worth is a point of reference which can be read in a realist way.</p>						
3. 本研究課題に関する発表						
発表者氏名 (著者・講演者)	発表課題名 (著書名・演題)	発表学術誌名 (著書発行所・講演学会)	学術誌発行年月 (著書発行年月・講演年月)			