Elements of Moral Cognition

Rawls' Linguistic Analogy and the Cognitive Science of Moral and Legal Judgment

JOHN MIKHAIL
Georgetown University

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Contents

List of Tables and Figures *page* xi
Preface xv

PART ONE: THEORY

1 The Question Presented 3
2 A New Framework for the Theory of Moral Cognition 13
2.1 Nine Comparisons between Linguistics and Moral Theory 14
2.1.1 The Main Questions 14
2.1.2 The General Answers 15
2.1.3 The Fundamental Arguments 17
2.1.4 The Competence–Performance Distinction 17
2.1.5 The Distinction between Operative and Express Principles 19
2.1.6 Levels of Empirical Adequacy 21
2.1.7 Two Additional Questions 23
2.1.8 Commonsense and Technical Concepts of Language and Morality 24
2.1.9 Theoretical Goals 26
2.2 Preliminary Clarifications about Rawls' Linguistic Analogy 27
2.3 Outline of Remaining Chapters 33
3 The Basic Elements of Rawls' Linguistic Analogy 42
3.1 Eight Features of Rawls' Conception of Moral Theory 43
3.1.1 The Argument for Moral Grammar 43
3.1.2 The Problem of Descriptive Adequacy 48
3.1.3 The Distinction between Descriptive and Observational Adequacy 49

3.1.4 The Distinction between Operative and Express Principles 50
3.1.5 The Distinction between Descriptive and Explanatory Adequacy 51
3.1.6 The Competence–Performance Distinction 51
3.1.7 The Theory-Dependence of the Competence–Performance Distinction 55
3.1.8 The Importance of Idealization 56
3.2 Further Clarifications about Terminology 57
3.3 Moral Theory as a Theory of I-Morality 63
3.4 Some Further Remarks about the Linguistic Analogy 67
3.5 The Contrast with Particularism 71

PART TWO: EMPIRICAL ADEQUACY

4 The Problem of Descriptive Adequacy 77
4.1 The Trolley Problems 78
4.2 The Properties of Moral Judgment 82
4.3 Framing the Problem of Descriptive Adequacy 85
4.4 Locating the Problem within the Framework of Cognitive Science 87
4.4.1 Perceptual and Acquisition Models 88
4.4.2 The Hypothetico-Deductive Method 91
4.5 Objections and Replies 94

5 The Moral Grammar Hypothesis 101
5.1 Some Initial Evidence 104
5.2 Simplifying the Problem of Descriptive Adequacy 106
5.2.1 Twelve New Trolley Problems 106
5.2.2 Twelve Considered Judgments 110
5.3 The Poverty of the Perceptual Stimulus 111
5.3.1 Labeling the Stimulus 111
5.3.2 Expanded Perceptual Model 111
5.4 Outline of a Solution 117
5.4.1 Deontic Rules 117
5.4.2 Structural Descriptions 118
5.4.3 Conversion Rules 120
5.5 Intuitive Legal Appraisal 121

6 Moral Grammar and Intuitive Jurisprudence: A Formal Model 123
6.1 Three Simplifying Assumptions 124
6.2 Structural Descriptions I: Acts, Circumstances, and Intentions 125
6.2.1 Acts and Circumstances 125
6.2.2 K-Generation and I-Generation 130
6.3 Deontic Rules 132

6.3.1 The Principle of Natural Liberty 132
6.3.2 The Prohibition of Battery and Homicide 133
6.3.3 The Self-Preservation Principle 136
6.3.4 The Moral Calculus of Risk 137
6.3.5 The Rescue Principle 144
6.3.6 The Principle of Double Effect 148
6.4 Structural Descriptions II: A Periodic Table of Moral Elements 153
6.5 Conversion Rules 162
6.5.1 Temporal Structure 171
6.5.2 Causal Structure 172
6.5.3 Moral Structure 172
6.5.4 Intentional Structure 172
6.5.5 Deontic Structure 173
6.6 A Brief Note on Enlightenment Rationalism 174
6.7 Further Clarifications about Act Trees 175
6.8 Concluding Remarks 178

PART THREE: OBJECTIONS AND REPLIES

7 R. M. Hare, Peter Singer, and the Distinction between Empirical and Normative Adequacy 183
7.1 Hare's and Singer's Criticisms of Rawls' Linguistic Analogy 183
7.2 Empirical and Normative Adequacy in *Grounds* 191
7.3 Empirical and Normative Adequacy in *Outline* 195
7.4 Empirical and Normative Adequacy in *A Theory of Justice:* Reflective Equilibrium 197
7.4.1 The Main Contractual Argument of *A Theory of Justice* 198
7.4.2 The Concept of Reflective Equilibrium 202
7.5 Empirical and Normative Adequacy in *Independence* 213
7.6 Some Clarifications about Metaethics 217
7.7 Objections and Replies 221
7.8 Summary 227
8 Thomas Nagel and the Competence–Performance Distinction 228
8.1 Nagel's Criticisms of Rawls' Linguistic Analogy 228
8.2 Analysis of Nagel's Arguments 231
8.2.1 The Intuitions of Native Speakers Are Decisive in Linguistics 232
8.2.2 The Moral Intuitions of Ordinary Persons Are Not Decisive in Moral Theory 236
8.2.3 Whatever Native Speakers Agree on Is English 238
8.2.4 Whatever Ordinary Individuals Agree in Condemning Is Not Necessarily Wrong 240

8.2.5 The Plausibility of an Ethical Theory Can Change Our Moral Intuitions, but the Plausibility of a Linguistic Theory Cannot Change Our Linguistic Intuitions 248
8.2.6 In Linguistics, Unlike Ethics, the Final Test of a Theory Is Its Ability to Explain the Data 257
8.3 Objections and Replies 258
8.4 Summary 264

9 Ronald Dworkin and the Distinction between I-Morality and E-Morality 266
9.1 Dworkin's Analysis of Rawls' Linguistic Analogy 268
9.1.1 The Natural Model versus the Constructive Model 269
9.1.2 The Natural Model and Reflective Equilibrium Are Incompatible 271
9.2 Problems with Dworkin's Analysis 274
9.3 Dworkin's Misinterpretations of Rawls 276
9.3.1 Subject Matter 277
9.3.2 Goal 280
9.3.3 Evidence 282
9.3.4 Method 287
9.4 Objections and Replies 291
9.5 Brief Remarks about Moral Grammar and Human Rights 295
9.6 Summary 303

PART FOUR: CONCLUSION

10 Toward a Universal Moral Grammar 307

Appendix: Six Trolley Problem Experiments 319
Bibliography 361
Index 393