

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

Chapter 1 : Virtue - Wikipedia

Modern moral philosophy, in contrast, treats virtues "if it treats them at all" as secondary to an ethics based on principles and rules. The attempt to secure an account of morality that is not as subject to variations as an ethics of virtue certainly contributed to this displacement of virtues.

These guiding principles should encompass your personal core values as well as family core values. They should also reflect your cultural and religious beliefs. It is important to note, our website respects your right to believe in any religious doctrine you choose. It is not our intention to promote our personal values or religious beliefs. Your religious beliefs are personal to you and need to be considered in defining your guiding principles and value system. The ideas presented here are based on virtues that transcend most cultures and are universally valued by all spiritual and religious beliefs. They merely serve as guidelines and food for thought to help define principles important to you, clarify personal core values and define your own family values.

Your Own Value System Suppose your child comes home from school and tells you their teacher was talking about core values and proceeds to ask you; What are your values? Would you be able to answer that? on the spot? To practice " Positive Parenting ," model good character and guide your children in making proper choices in life, you must be able to answer those questions. You must be conscious of your principles and values at all times. Thus in order to define values of importance to you, it helps to understand the difference between principles, values and virtues. At times, this may seem a little confusing as many people consider values and virtues to be one and the same. Here is a simple interpretation of their meaning: How Do We Define Principles? To define principles in the personal context, we perceive them to be rules or beliefs governing morally correct behaviour and attitudes. More specifically, your personal convictions and commitments to what is true to your heart, the personal code of ethics in which you put your faith in. Guiding principles root from the virtues you value most and will not abandon or compromise under any condition. Examples might be your conviction and adherence to: This is by far one of the most important principles you can promote in your children. If you abandon this principle, then you disregard the virtues of Justice, Respect, Fairness and many others such as Caring, Consideration, Kindness, Courtesy and Thoughtfulness. Another principle might be the biblical principle in the "Ten Commandments": Consequently, your principles stem from your core values. In order to define your personal core values and family values you need to clarify which "Virtues" shape those values. What is the difference between Values and Virtues? The definition of values can be categorized into either "Personal Preference Values" or "Principle Values. You will more than likely adjust these personal preference values as your life circumstances change. When we define virtue, we deem it as objective, an actual quality considered morally good or desirable in a person. Virtues are the foundation to your core value system, the very essence that make up good character. In addition to the above mentioned virtues, Patience, Consideration, Trustworthiness and Forgiveness are just a few more examples. Below is a more in-depth list of Virtues A List of Virtues and their Meanings To help you define principles and core values important to you, we have provided a list of virtues and their meanings.

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

Chapter 2 : 10 Major Cultural Differences Between China and the United States | Owlcation

Virtue (Latin: virtus, Ancient Greek: ἀρετή "arete") is moral excellence. A virtue is a trait or quality that is deemed to be morally good and thus is valued as a foundation of principle and good moral being.

References and Further Reading 1. Ancient Ethics and Modern Morality There are at least two main criteria that each moral theory must fulfil: However, many traditional moral theories are unable to meet the second criterion and simply fall short of the high demands of applied ethics to solve the complex moral problems of our times. Why is this the case? The main point is that the traditional moral theories are not sufficiently well equipped to deal with completely new problems such as issues concerning nuclear power, gene technology, and cloning and so forth. Therefore, there is constant interest in updating and enhancing a particular moral theory in order to make it compatible with the latest demands. This is a difficult and often very complex process. But, why is this the case? The challenging question is, according to Annas Even if one acknowledges the fact that happiness means a satisfactory and well-lived life according to the ethical virtues and not only a happy moment or so, it still does not sound like morality. Ancient ethics is about living a good and virtuous life according to the ethical virtues, that is, to become a virtuous person, while the modern notion of morality is primarily focused on the interests of other people and the idea of deontological constraints. Historically speaking, from a different perspective, there is no evidence which term is most legitimate. When Aristotle analyses the good life in the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the *Eudemian Ethics*, he therefore focuses on the central topic of good and bad character traits that is virtues and vices. In this original sense, ethics means an analysis about the character or character traits. The term *moralis* rather refers to the Greek *ethos* whose primary meaning is habits and customs. If the term *morality* refers to *mores*, then the term *morality* means the totality of all habits and customs of a given community. The term *moralis* became a *terminus technicus* in the Latin-shaped philosophy, which covers the present meaning of the term. *Morality*, however, is not simply a matter of mere convention but the latter often conflicts with *morality* for example, an immoral convention, hence, it seems inappropriate to shorten the term in this way Steinfath At present, there are, at least, four different possibilities to distinguish between ethics and morality: Ethics and morality as distinct spheres: The equation of ethics and morality for example Peter Singer. Morality as a special field in the ethical realm: Ethics is the generic term for ethical and moral issues in the above-mentioned sense. Morality is a special part of ethics for example, Bernard Williams. Morality as the object of ethics: Ethics is the philosophical theory of morality which is the systematic analysis of moral norms and values standard reading. The upshot is that it is always important to ask how the terms ethics and morality are used and how one uses them for oneself. It is certain that one makes a textual and not only a conceptual differentiation by claiming that the terms differ. Ancient Ethics It is impossible to give a complete depiction of the rich history of ethical reasoning and decision-making in Antiquity here, therefore the focus of this section concerns the main lines of ethical reasoning of the most important philosophical schools in the classic and Hellenistic period. This rather simplified overview is nonetheless sufficient for our purposes. One can roughly distinguish the classic and Hellenistic periods into four different but closely connected parts. All the philosophical schools "being at odds with each other" are still united by the fact that they are deeply concerned with the most important ethical questions of how to live a good life and how to achieve happiness. Their responses to these vital questions are, of course, diverse. The Most Prominent Philosophical Schools in Ancient Greece The following brief depiction focuses on the basic ethical assumptions of the philosophical schools of the Cynics and Cyrenaics, the peripatetic school, the Epicureans, and the Stoics. Plato himself did not provide any systematic ethics comparable to the other main ancient schools either, even though one can certainly reconstruct "at least to some extent" his ethical viewpoint in the dialogue *Politeia*. In addition, most ethical works of the classic and Hellenistic periods are lost in the dark of history; what remains is a collection of fragments, phrases, and parts of letters of various important philosophers and commentators standing in the tradition of

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

particular schools at that time. Many rival views on ethics are mediated through the works of Plato and Aristotle, in which they criticize their opponents. In addition, some of these rudiments and testimonials were also mediated by famous writers and politicians such as Xenophon fifth and fourth century BC and the important historian of philosophy Diogenes Laertios third century AD. Aristotle, however, is the only ancient philosopher whose two substantial and complete ethical contributions, that is, the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the *Eudemian Ethics* – leaving aside the *Magna Moralia* of which the authorship is unclear – have survived, even though all of his dialogues including those that are concerned with ethics and ethical issues are also lost.

The Cynics and the Cyrenaics – The Extremes

The founder of the school of the Cynics, Antisthenes of Athens, taught that virtue in terms of practical wisdom is a good and also sufficient for eudaimonia, that is, happiness. Badness is an evil and everything else is indifferent. In accord with Socrates, Antisthenes claimed that virtue is teachable and he also accepted the doctrine of the unity of the virtues which is the general idea that if a person possesses one ethical virtue, then he or she thereby possesses all other ethical virtues as well for a recent contribution to this controversial doctrine, see Russell, The only good of human beings is that what is peculiar to them, that is, their ability to reason. Against the Cyrenaics he argues that pleasure is never a good. Things such as death, illness, servitude, poverty, disgrace, and hard labour are only supposed to be bad but are not real evils. They were also against the common cultural and religious rites and practices, a main feature which they shared with the Sophists. They took Socratic frugality to extremes and tried to be as independent of material goods as possible, like Diogenes of Sinope who lived in a barrel. Furthermore, one should abstain from bad things and seek apathy and tranquillity, which are important features the Stoics adopted from the Cynics as well. According to the Cynics, there are two groups of people: Aristippus of Cyrene was well known and highly regarded among philosophers in Antiquity and was the first Socratic disciple who took money in exchange for lessons. Thereby, the school of the Cyrenaics stands in striking contrast to the Cynics. Aristippus claims that knowledge is valuable only insofar as it is useful in practical matters a feature that the Cyrenaics share with the Cynics ; all actions should strive for the utmost pleasure since pleasure is the highest good. There are gradual qualitative differences of the goods. Unlike Aristotle the Hedonists believed that happiness understood as a long-term state is not the overall purpose in life but the bodily pleasure of the very moment, which is the goal of life. The past has gone by and the future is uncertain therefore only the here and now is decisive since the immediate feelings are the only guide to what is really genuinely valuable. Practical wisdom is the precondition of happiness in being instrumentally useful for achieving pleasure. Aristippus and the Cyrenaics were seeking maximum pleasure in each moment without being swamped by it. Aristippus – known for his cheerful nature and praiseworthy character as well as his distinguished restraint – famously claimed that one should be the master in each moment: Aristotle claims that happiness eudaimonia is the highest good – that is the final, perfect, and self-contained goal – to which all people strive at. For example, if the proper function of a pair of scissors is to cutting, then the proper function of a good pair of scissors is to cutting well likewise in all other cases. Since the proper function of human beings - according to Aristotle - is to reason, the goodness of human beings depends on the good performance of the proper human function that is to reason well. In fact, Aristotle claims that the goodness of human beings does not consist in the mere performance of the proper function but rather in their disposition. This claim is substantiated by his example of the good person and the bad person who cannot be distinguished from each other during their bedtime if one only refers to their active performance. The only possible way to distinguish them is to refer to their different dispositions. It is a matter of debate whether there is a particular human function as proposed by Aristotle. The different approaches are dealt with in order. The virtue of the good person EN II, 3, 4: Three criteria must be met, according to Aristotle, in order to ensure that an action is virtuous given that the agent is in a certain condition when he performs them: The action-oriented virtue ethics EN II, 6, 10 – Practical wisdom EN VI: He claims that a practically wise person has a special sensitivity or special perceptual skill with which to evaluate a situation in a morally correct or appropriate way. Here, the emphasis lies on the practical wisdom - as the capacity of ethical reasoning and decision-making - rather than

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

on adhering to single ethical virtues, even though Aristotle claims that it is impossible to be practically wise without having ethical virtues and vice versa. The intrinsic value of the virtues: Epicureanism and Stoicism

Epicurus – educated by the Platonist Pamphilus and highly influenced by the important teachings of Democritus – developed his philosophical school of the Epicureans in controversies with the Cyrenaics and the Stoics and meeting their objections and challenges. The lively exchange of arguments concerning the vital issue of how to live a good life put Epicurus in the position to successfully articulate a refined and sophisticated version of hedonism, which was regarded as superior to the rival philosophical school of the Cyrenaics. He claims that sensation is the only standard of measuring good and evil. Epicurus shares the view with the Cyrenaics that all living beings strive for pleasure and try to avoid pain. But, unlike the Cyrenaic school, he argues that happiness consists of not only the very moment of bodily pleasure but lasts a whole life and also contains mental pleasure, which is – according to him – preferable to bodily pleasure. In his Letter to Menoecus, Epicurus comments on flawed views of his ethical position and claims: Long and Sedley

The ultimate goal in life is not to strive for positive pleasure but to seek for absence of pain. Unlike Aristippus, Epicurus claims in support of the importance of mental states that bodily pleasure and pain is limited to the here and now, while the soul is also concerned with the pleasurable and painful states of the past and prospective pleasure and pain. Thus, sensations based on recollections, hope and fear in the context of mental states with regard to the past and future are much stronger than the bodily pleasure of the moment. Being virtuous is a precondition of tranquillity, that is, peace and freedom from fear, which is closely connected to happiness. Shortly after the rise of epicureanism, Zeno of Citium – the founder of stoicism – established a new school in Athens. The Stoics were influenced by teachings of the Cynics. Human beings, according to stoicism, are able to perceive the laws of nature through reason and to act accordingly. The best life is a life according to nature Zeller

For example, in the case of rational beings only what is in accord with reason is valuable; only virtue, which is necessary and sufficient for happiness, is a good. Following the Cynics, the Stoics argue that honour, property, health and life are not goods and that poverty, disgrace, illness, and death are not evils. Against the Cyrenaics and Epicureans, they hold the view that pleasure is not a good and certainly not the highest good; they agree with Aristotle that pleasure is the consequence of our actions – if they are of the right kind – but not the goal itself. Two main doctrines are of utmost importance in the teachings of stoicism, first, the significance of ataraxia and, secondly, the idea of doing what nature demands. First, happiness is ataraxia – the freedom from passions – and a self-contained life style. Following Socrates and Plato, the Stoics believed that virtue is ethical knowledge and that non-virtuous people simply lack ethical knowledge, since virtue consists in the reasonable condition of the soul, which leads to correct views. The Cynic idea of the sharp distinction between the existence of a very few wise people and many fools, that is all non-wise people, had become less sharp in the process of time. In addition, the Roman philosopher and politician Cicero – 43 BC is the first author whose work on the notion of duty survives, *De Officiis*, in which he examined the notion in great detail in the first century BC 44 BC. It should be noted, however, that the stoic philosopher Panaitios of Rhodes – BC had already published an important book on the notion of duty prior to Cicero. Stoicism outlived the other philosophical schools with regard to its ethics by being an attractive position for many people and leading philosophers and politicians such as Seneca first century AD and Marcus Aurelius second century AD in Ancient Rome. Both theories have been adopted and modified by many scholars in recent history in order to make them more compatible with the latest demands in ethical reasoning and decision-making, in particular, by meeting the objections raised by modern virtue ethics.

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

Chapter 3 : Justice, Wisdom, Courage, and Moderation: The Four Cardinal Virtues

Virtue ethics is currently one of three major approaches in normative ethics. It may, initially, be identified as the one that emphasizes the virtues, or moral character, in contrast to the approach that emphasizes duties or rules (deontology) or that emphasizes the consequences of actions (consequentialism).

May 31, Pocahontas in American Culture: However, the view of Americans towards her has varied throughout time, expressed through artistic creations such as paintings or poems. One of the most notable shifts in common view towards Pocahontas is the vanishing of European domination over Pocahontas and Native American culture. In the 17th and 18th century, wars between Native Americans and European settlers soaked the land with blood. During that period, under the white men view, Natives were uncivilized savages that supposed to be ruled and converted. In , a group of English colonists from Virginia Company sailed upstream to James River and landed beside a swamp on the north bank to avoid Spanish ships. After the setup, the colonists soon recognized that the land was deadly with malaria and poisonous water. Instead of working diligently to reap their own resources, they tried to gain resources by force, yet they failed. The initial conflicts led to a series of wars between Jamestown settlers and Powhatan tribe Taylor In one of those wars, Captain John Smith, one of the leaders of Jamestown settlers, was captured by the Chief Powhatan, and later was rescued by his daughter, Pocahontas. A few years later, she herself was captured by the colonists and was converted into Christianity. She married to an Englishman, moved to England, and had a child with him. She died of illness in in England. Since then, the image of Pocahontas had been remolded into many different forms of art, varied from paintings to poems. During the shift of time, the image appeared in the creations varied, according to the opinions of American towards Pocahontas and Native Americans. He described Pocahontas in the order of general to detail, with the overall beauty at the beginning and parts of her talent at the end. She was tall, beautiful, and graceful, all the things a woman wanted to possess. In the next part, the author added: Right after the verse about beauty, the author described Pocahontas as a talented warrior, excellent archer, and good leader. Her image overwhelmed and covered all other Native Americans. Apparently no, for since her captivation, she had been with the Englishmen and could not influence on her people. In fact, her influence was just strong enough for the Indians to keep the relationship between them and the settlers a healthy one for a short time. If no, then why did the author describe such an image? Furthermore, considered the life of Pocahontas, she was the first Native American who ever abandoned her culture and converted into Christianity and lived like a European. She was the model that Europeans at the time hoped other Natives would follow. Therefore, in general, there seemed to be a sense of inferior over Indians of the Americans at that time. In the painting, Christy reflected a very different Pocahontas from previous works. He depicted a white Pocahontas shone brightly with a series of warm color center and a boundary of cold color. The dark and stark surrounding truly promoted Pocahontas, who stood at center of the painting where all lights and lines converged, with gold like colors. The light source was at the front, casted illumination upon Pocahontas and left her surroundings in darkness. The shape of her body, with a reaching arm, a lightly released arm which was held by a white man, and a to-infinity-gaze directed three main axis of the painting, yet all converged back to the Princess. In addition, she wore a plain ivory dress with some brownish stains, and simple jewelries of Native American. The wampum necklace on her chest, the triangular shaped hanging on her belly, and the colorful belt on her waist reflected deep connection with Native American culture despite the white skin tone of Pocahontas. Converted to Christianity and married to John Rolfe, an eminent colonist, it was strange that she dressed simple, and Native American-like. Furthermore, the lack of crucifix, the most essential symbol of Christians, the community Pocahontas had been converted to, among her accessories indicated a certain separation from the Europeans in her image. The lines created by her long distance gaze, her far reaching arm, and her relaxed arm pulled the focus to another character of the painting, who seemed to be sinking into the obscurity surrounding him. His head lightly nod, which pushed half of his face in the

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

shadows. His shoulders vaguely arched in the front. His lower position to Pocahontas indicated that he might be on his knees. The half smile carved on his face gave a sense of slyness to his image. Her arm and gaze were reaching far way for something that she had been longing for a long time, according to the expression of her face. The man now seemed less but at the same time very important in the painting. Combining her appearance and neglect for the man, Pocahontas seemed to be drifting away from Europeans and their values and embracing her owns. She was running away from Western conversion for freedom. Just like the white man in the painting, the Europeans in the history restrained her from her desires and kept her for themselves. And true to idea of the Statue of Liberty, Pocahontas was thriving for her liberty, her independence from the Europeans. Through his Pocahontas, Christy perhaps showed us American society at his period: Comparing the poem and the painting, there was an eminent difference in the attitude of the author or the painter. That was the feeling for Europeans. It showed her desire for her Native culture and liberty. This difference somehow described viewpoints of Americans of Pocahontas and the Indians in the 20th century, when Americans were on their way to find the true American virtues. Works Cited Christy, Howard Chandler. American Illustrators Gallery, New York. A Very Short Introduction. Course Reader for AmCon

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

Chapter 4 : Virtue Ethics and an Ethics of Care | Alan Thomas - theinnatdunvilla.com

Character Strengths and Virtues is a groundbreaking handbook that was created built on reports from a prestigious group of researchers who have attempted to create a systematic classification and measurements of widely valued positive traits. The aim was to present a measure of humanist ideals of virtue in an empirical and scientific way.

While ancient Greek philosophers such as Plato , Aristotle , and their descendants opined that justice cannot be defined and that it was a divine mystery, Valluvar positively suggested that a divine origin is not required to define the concept of justice. In the words of V. Nedunchezhiyan , justice according to Valluvar "dwells in the minds of those who have knowledge of the standard of right and wrong; so too deceit dwells in the minds which breed fraud. Men should seek the sovereign good that Descartes, following Zeno , identifies with virtue, as this produces a solid blessedness or pleasure. The only aspect that makes a human truly virtuous is to behave in accordance with moral principles. Kant presents an example for more clarification; suppose that you come across a needy person in the street; if your sympathy leads you to help that person, your response does not illustrate your virtue. In this example, since you do not afford helping all needy ones, you have behaved unjustly, and it is out of the domain of principles and true virtue. Kant applies the approach of four temperaments to distinguish truly virtuous people. According to Kant, among all people with diverse temperaments, a person with melancholy frame of mind is the most virtuous whose thoughts, words and deeds are one of principles. Nietzsche promotes the virtues of those he calls "higher men", people like Goethe and Beethoven. According to Nietzsche these higher types are solitary, pursue a "unifying project", revere themselves and are healthy and life-affirming. Finally, a Higher type affirms life because he is willing to accept the eternal return of his life and affirm this forever and unconditionally. In the last section of Beyond Good and Evil , Nietzsche outlines his thoughts on the noble virtues and places solitude as one of the highest virtues: And to keep control over your four virtues: He had a checklist in a notebook to measure each day how he lived up to his virtues. Eat not to Dullness. Drink not to Elevation. Speak not but what may benefit others or yourself. Let all your Things have their Places. Let each Part of your Business have its Time. Resolve to perform what you ought. Perform without fail what you resolve. Make no Expense but to do good to others or yourself; i. Be always employed in something useful. Cut off all unnecessary Actions. Use no hurtful Deceit. Think innocently and justly; and, if you speak, speak accordingly. Wrong none, by doing Injuries or omitting the Benefits that are your Duty. Forbear resenting Injuries so much as you think they deserve. Tolerate no Uncleaness in Body, Clothes or Habitation. Be not disturbed at Trifles, or at Accidents common or unavoidable. Imitate Jesus and Socrates. Contemporary views[edit] Virtues as emotions[edit] Marc Jackson in his book Emotion and Psyche puts forward a new development of the virtues. He identifies the virtues as what he calls the good emotions "The first group consisting of love , kindness , joy , faith , awe and pity is good" [40] These virtues differ from older accounts of the virtues because they are not character traits expressed by action, but emotions that are to be felt and developed by feeling not acting. In Objectivism[edit] Ayn Rand held that her morality, the morality of reason , contained a single axiom: All values and virtues proceed from these. To live, man must hold three fundamental values that one develops and achieves in life: Reason, Purpose, and Self-Esteem. The first three represent the three primary virtues that correspond to the three fundamental values, whereas the final four are derived from the virtue of rationality. She claims that virtue is not an end in itself, that virtue is not its own reward nor sacrificial fodder for the reward of evil, that life is the reward of virtue and happiness is the goal and the reward of life. Man has a single basic choice: Moral perfection is an unbreached rationality, not the degree of your intelligence but the full and relentless use of your mind, not the extent of your knowledge but the acceptance of reason as an absolute. List of virtues The opposite of a virtue is a vice. Vice is a habitual, repeated practice of wrongdoing. One way of organizing the vices is as the corruption of the virtues. As Aristotle noted, however, the virtues can have several opposites. Virtues can be considered the mean between two extremes, as the Latin maxim dictates in medio stat virtus -

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

in the centre lies virtue. For instance, both cowardice and rashness are opposites of courage; contrary to prudence are both over-caution and insufficient caution; the opposites of pride a virtue are undue humility and excessive vanity. A more "modern" virtue, tolerance , can be considered the mean between the two extremes of narrow-mindedness on the one hand and over-acceptance on the other. Vices can therefore be identified as the opposites of virtues - but with the caveat that each virtue could have many different opposites, all distinct from each other.

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

Chapter 5 : Culture and Cognitive Science (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

The considerations one must take into account are impressive, as there is a big difference between Chinese and American culture. It is, however, important to understand and recognize other cultures and their way of doing things.

January 11, at 5: The main point of the article was the lack of critical thought or support given when this is done. As soon as you start name calling you lose your credibility. Hey, idiot, is the OP also committing virtue signalling? I am better than you. I understood the article. You clearly do not. January 9, at 4: Judge is not self-aware enough to see that his jeremiad is itself virtue signaling. Sadly, he fails to present any evidence whatsoever that rage was the primary motive for most of the New Left, much less that unreason prevailed among its members, and even less than that, for the alleged temper-tantrum irrationalism the the New Left fathers and mothers infecting their offspring now going on several generations away, by some sort of cultural epigenetics. I knew some of the most extreme members of the New Left, and my experience was that by and large they could, and did, justify their views far more cogently than Mr. Judge has justified his own. January 10, at 6: January 10, at It gives a name to a type of probably universal human behavior and assigns a judgement about that behavior, as though it were a clinical condition to be abetted. What basis is there for the judgmental tone of this article about not being accidentally judgmental? Without discernment and communication, society would surely crumble. January 11, at 2: I am positive that many people feel the same way I do – that politics and lawmaking and environmental issues are NOT about who is more virtuous. Is this article meant to be ironic? It basically follows the same logical fallacies as the examples it states. June 16, at 1: A healthy ego doesn't need to prove confidence to others. Overt expressions are usually over-compensations put on for show, aimed primarily at convincing others that one has this quality or that quality. This is pretty well known in psychology already. Most people lie and lay false claim to virtues. January 11, at 6: Seldom is fear reasonable. Just the fact they call the social security I have paid into since I was 16 an entitlement drives me nuts since I thought that was part of my investment in my future, not welfare of some kind the way they paint it. Liberals on the coast want to outlaw the studded tires I need to get to my house and refuse to consider that some of us live in places that cannot be accessed certain times of year without them. I do express some pretty strong opinions sometimes, most of it comes from a place of fear. After losing my job, and not being able to find a decent full time job to replace it. After discovering the government thinks we can afford to pay for collage for our kids, even though our basic cost of living with no extras, takes our entire income each month, I am afraid every time I turn on the news. They are secure, or so they think. I am clinging to lower middle class by the skin of my teeth. It feels like just one more tax, one more expense, one more medical bill will tip us over the edge. No one is willing to look at why the other side feels the way they do. I think fear explains a lot of the conflict. January 11, at 9: In your case, you are entitled to your SS because you earned it by paying for the care of the sick and elderly during your working life. January 13, at It is a word used to hide the fact that Washington has given up control over that spending. January 12, at 4: I told him the cow dies just the same. It would be more virtuous to be vegan or hunt, kill and slaughter the meat himself. He just responded, the cow it was raised humanely. To me he was just virtue-signaling. Interesting read, and although I am appreciative in the overall point of the article, as some of it is reflective of my own sentiments, I find myself somewhat in conflict and therefore apprehensive to support it in its entirety. But how can this be? It has become something of a trend to be recalcitrant, by way of seeking out a progressively virtuous cause that is opposed to the cultural norm. And if they cannot find one they sometimes go to the extreme of inventing one. In short, I too grow very weary of emotionally based out-bursts of indignation from people in their support or opposition for a given cause that express little understanding of their own. Instead simply regurgitate what they have been fed rather than synthesizing their own understanding of it in their own words. This is done in an equally annoying manner with both my conservative friends as well as my so called liberal friends. If I may conclude by saying, take pride of what you write and,

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

therefore, research it well. Understand what it is you are reading. Then and only then, carefully and thoughtfully construct your response, if you feel that one is required. Invest the time to understand as well as to be understood. The path to understanding leads to peace on your behalf as well as for others. In an age of information, connectivity, and digital communication; indeed, there is no excuse for doing otherwise. January 13, at 2: The issue is used as a lens to focus on their own view of themselves. The expressing of opinions that are perceived to be good by the target audience therefore attaches to the person expressing them. It gives them the approval of others. Surely this is uncontroversial? This would change over time and place. How can you read comments threads and deny this happens all the time? January 23, at 9: First, there has been no demonstrable reason that the continual hatred of homosexuality from the right has been justified. Some examples to back up my claim: Fox and Friends in May referring to Mr. Supporting it in a highly public fashion by exploiting outrage against those who oppose that ideal, that is virtue signaling.

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

Chapter 6 : Modern Morality and Ancient Ethics | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

Differences between people within any given nation or culture are much greater than differences between groups. Education, social standing, religion, personality, belief structure, past experience, affection shown in the home, and a myriad of other factors will affect human behavior and culture.

Gregorio Billikopf University of California To all who took the proxemics survey between December and June a warm thank you! We are in the process of analyzing the data. Helping Others Resolve Differences, which you may download free here. I was there to provide some technical assistance in the area of agricultural labor management. One of my interpreters, once I was there, explained that a gentleman will pour the limonad type of juice for the ladies and show other courtesies. Toward the end of my three week trip I was invited by my young Russian host and friend Nicolai Vasilevich and his lovely wife Yulya out to dinner. At the end of a wonderful meal Yulya asked if I would like a banana. I politely declined and thanked her, and explained I was most satisfied with the meal. But the whole while my mind was racing: Do I offer her a banana even though they are as close to her as they are to me? What is the polite thing to do? So all the while thinking about Russian politeness I picked the banana Yulya had pointed at and peeled it half way and handed it to her. After this experience I spent much time letting the world know that in Russia, the polite thing is to peel the bananas for the ladies. Sometime during my third trip I was politely disabused of my notion. And here I had been proudly telling everyone about this tidbit of cultural understanding. Certain lessons have to be learned the hard way. Some well meaning articles and presentations on cultural differences have a potential to do more harm than good and may not be as amusing. They present, like my bananas, too many generalizations or quite a distorted view. Some often-heard generalizations about the Hispanic culture include: Hispanics need less personal space, make less eye contact, touch each other more in normal conversation, and are less likely to participate in a meeting. Generalizations are often dangerous, and especially when accompanied by recommendations such as: Here is an attempt to sort out a couple of thoughts on cultural differences. My perspective is that of a foreign born-and-raised Hispanic who has now lived over two decades in the United States and has had much opportunity for international travel and exchange. Commonality of humankind Differences between people within any given nation or culture are much greater than differences between groups. Education, social standing, religion, personality, belief structure, past experience, affection shown in the home, and a myriad of other factors will affect human behavior and culture. Sure there are differences in approach as to what is considered polite and appropriate behavior both on and off the job. In some cultures "yes" means, "I hear you" more than "I agree. For instance, someone who walks into a group of persons eating would say provecho enjoy your meal. In Chile, women often greet both other women and men with a kiss on the cheek. In Russia women often walk arm in arm with their female friends. Paying attention to customs and cultural differences can give someone outside that culture a better chance of assimilation or acceptance. Ignoring these can get an unsuspecting person into trouble. Hence, we are comparing two bell curves and generalization cannot be avoided. True and true, but the danger comes when we act on some of these generalizations, especially when they are based on faulty observation. Acting on generalizations about such matters as eye contact, personal space, touch, and interest in participation can have serious negative consequences. Cross-cultural and status barriers Sometimes, observations about cultural differences are based on scientific observation see, for instance, Argyle, Michael, Bodily Communication, 2nd ed. Argyle cites several studies on non-verbal communications and culture see pp. According to the studies cited, Latin Americans make more eye contact, face each other more, and touch more p. Strong eye contact used by Hispanics goes along with my observations. If Hispanics face each other more, it is probably because of the need for eye contact. I do not believe that Hispanics touch more, with the exception of some very specific social contexts, one of them being between dating or married couples. One of the studies cited more contact among Latin American couples p. Another study showed that Latin Americans stand closer than North

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

Americans something that goes contrary to my observations but that there are regional variations among countries p. Argyle asserts that there are few genuine cross-cultural studies in the area of spatial behavior. Interestingly, yet another study p. Much of the differences in culture have to do with food preparation, music, and what each culture considers politeness. Food preparation, for instance, can be quite different in various cultures. One farmer could not understand why his workers did not attend a specially prepared end-of-season meal. The meal was being prepared by the farm owners. Instead, when the farm operators provide the beef, pork or other meat but delegate the actual preparation to the workers who can spice up their own way, such a celebration meal can be a great success. Similarly, a diary farmer found out that his Mexican employees were not too excited about getting ground beef as a perk. With world globalization, even tastes in food and music are rapidly changing, however. While I have not conquered this disagreeable human inclination, I feel I am beginning to see the way. Often, observations on cultural differences are based on our own weakness and reflect our inability to connect with that culture. I remember that on several occasions I felt my personal space was being invaded and wondered how Anglo-Saxon men could stand being so close to each other. After all these years, I still feel uncomfortable sitting as close to other men as often dictated by chair arrangements in the US. I am not the exception that proves the rule. Jill Heiken, an HRnet correspondent, explained her learning process this way: It is sort of funny because my wife now realizes that I need to have eye contact while we talk. They were all panicked because I kept looking at my mother as I drove. They felt I was not looking at the road enough and thought we would drive off the mountain. I have a very high need for eye contact. Besides being a native Chilean, I have met, taught, been taught, roomed with, studied with, worked for, worked with, been supervised by, supervised, and been friends with Hispanics from almost every Spanish-speaking country in the world. I have interviewed and done research among hundreds of Hispanic farm workers and have noticed no difficulties with poor eye contact or invasion of personal space. Nor have I ever had difficulties in these areas with people from other nations or cultures. Strong eye contact is partially a factor of shyness; partly a measure of how safe a person feels around another. If those who have written about poor eye contact on the part of Hispanics would walk down a mostly minority neighborhood at dusk, they may also find themselves looking at the ground and making less eye contact. Cross-cultural observations can easily be tainted and contaminated by other factors. Perceived status differences can create barriers between cultures and even within organizations. For instance, farm managers, instructors, and foreign volunteers through universities, peace corps, farmer-to-farmer programs, etc. A person with this status differential will have to show, by word and action, that she values the potential contributions of those she works with. Until this happens she will only obtain compliance but never commitment. At times, then, it may appear that some workers or students, especially when there are social or ethnic differences, do not participate as easily. This is not because they do not have ideas to contribute, but rather, because they may need a little convincing that their ideas would be valued. Once this floodgate of ideas is opened, it will be difficult to stop it. In some sub-cultures, once a person has given an opinion, others are unlikely to contradict it. That is why some organizations ask their least senior employees to give an opinion first, as few will want to contradict the more senior employees. Setting up the discussion from the beginning as one where one desires to hear all sort of different opinions, can be very fruitful both in the workplace and in the classroom. Americans have been historically welcome in most of Hispanic America. With a few exceptions they are looked up to, resulting in deferential treatment. This deferential and polite treatment should not be confused for weakness, lack of interest, and the like. Studies conducted some years ago showed African American children preferred White dolls. The Second Edition, Free Press, I believe Hispanics are also valuing their contributions more than in the past, and less subservient behaviors will be observed. Only through equality of respect between races and nations can we reach positive international relations in this global economy as well as peace at home. Cultural and ethnic stereotypes do little to foster this type of equality. Breaking through status barriers can take time and effort. The amount of exertion will depend on many factors, including the skill of the manager teacher, volunteer on the one hand, and how alienated and disenfranchised from the main stream the person he is trying

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

to reach feels. For example, in East Africa, a non-Black manager speaks to the Black African accountant and the accountant makes little eye contact and responds with submissive "Yes, Sirs" regardless of what he hears. When the manager exits, this same accountant makes plenty of eye contact and is full of ideas and creativity when dealing with those of his same and different race. In another example, an adult class of Hispanic farm workers says nothing to their Anglo-Saxon instructor over a three day period--even though they do not understand what is being taught. This same group of farm workers, when given a chance to be active participants in the learning process, become, in the words of a second Anglo-Saxon instructor at the same junior college, "the best class of students I have ever taught. He advises others not to expect much participation from Hispanics. The first perceives that the lack of participation is somewhat inherent in the Hispanic population; the latter assumes her gender is the cause. Meanwhile, other Hispanic instructors create so much enthusiasm and active participation from the Hispanic audiences they work with, that those who walk by wonder what is going--and why participants seem to be having so much fun. It is not a cultural difference if someone can totally involve a group into a discussion, within minutes, even when that group has had little experience with a more participatory method in the past. Conclusions Stereotyping can have intense negative effects, especially when educators or managers make fewer attempts to involve those of other cultures because they have been taught not to expect participation! Or do not realize there may be something wrong when a student or employee of a different ethnicity makes little eye contact with them. Faye Lee, a concerned Japanese-American wrote:

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

Chapter 7 : Values, Morals and Ethics

In conclusion, the mind and virtue orientations are constructed as two new interpretative themes in this review in which currently disjoint findings can be integrated, without them being perceived as discrete, homogenous and unchanging concepts (Ryan & Louie,).

It persisted as the dominant approach in Western moral philosophy until at least the Enlightenment, suffered a momentary eclipse during the nineteenth century, but re-emerged in Anglo-American philosophy in the late s. Neither of them, at that time, paid attention to a number of topics that had always figured in the virtue ethics tradition—virtues and vices, motives and moral character, moral education, moral wisdom or discernment, friendship and family relationships, a deep concept of happiness, the role of the emotions in our moral life and the fundamentally important questions of what sorts of persons we should be and how we should live. Its re-emergence had an invigorating effect on the other two approaches, many of whose proponents then began to address these topics in the terms of their favoured theory. It has also generated virtue ethical readings of philosophers other than Plato and Aristotle, such as Martineau, Hume and Nietzsche, and thereby different forms of virtue ethics have developed Slote ; Swanton , a. See Annas for a short, clear, and authoritative account of all three. We discuss the first two in the remainder of this section. Eudaimonia is discussed in connection with eudaimonist versions of virtue ethics in the next. It is a disposition, well entrenched in its possessor—something that, as we say, goes all the way down, unlike a habit such as being a tea-drinker—to notice, expect, value, feel, desire, choose, act, and react in certain characteristic ways. To possess a virtue is to be a certain sort of person with a certain complex mindset. A significant aspect of this mindset is the wholehearted acceptance of a distinctive range of considerations as reasons for action. An honest person cannot be identified simply as one who, for example, practices honest dealing and does not cheat. An honest person cannot be identified simply as one who, for example, tells the truth because it is the truth, for one can have the virtue of honesty without being tactless or indiscreet. Valuing honesty as she does, she chooses, where possible to work with honest people, to have honest friends, to bring up her children to be honest. She disapproves of, dislikes, deplors dishonesty, is not amused by certain tales of chicanery, despises or pities those who succeed through deception rather than thinking they have been clever, is unsurprised, or pleased as appropriate when honesty triumphs, is shocked or distressed when those near and dear to her do what is dishonest and so on. Possessing a virtue is a matter of degree. To possess such a disposition fully is to possess full or perfect virtue, which is rare, and there are a number of ways of falling short of this ideal Athanassoulis Most people who can truly be described as fairly virtuous, and certainly markedly better than those who can truly be described as dishonest, self-centred and greedy, still have their blind spots—little areas where they do not act for the reasons one would expect. So someone honest or kind in most situations, and notably so in demanding ones, may nevertheless be trivially tainted by snobbery, inclined to be disingenuous about their forebears and less than kind to strangers with the wrong accent. I may be honest enough to recognise that I must own up to a mistake because it would be dishonest not to do so without my acceptance being so wholehearted that I can own up easily, with no inner conflict. The fully virtuous do what they should without a struggle against contrary desires; the continent have to control a desire or temptation to do otherwise. If it is the circumstances in which the agent acts—say that she is very poor when she sees someone drop a full purse or that she is in deep grief when someone visits seeking help—then indeed it is particularly admirable of her to restore the purse or give the help when it is hard for her to do so. But if what makes it hard is an imperfection in her character—the temptation to keep what is not hers, or a callous indifference to the suffering of others—then it is not. The concept of a virtue is the concept of something that makes its possessor good: These are commonly accepted truisms. But it is equally common, in relation to particular putative examples of virtues to give these truisms up. It is also said that courage, in a desperado, enables him to do far more wicked things than he would have been able to do if he were timid. So it would appear that

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

generosity, honesty, compassion and courage despite being virtues, are sometimes faults. Someone who is generous, honest, compassionate, and courageous might not be a morally good person—or, if it is still held to be a truism that they are, then morally good people may be led by what makes them morally good to act wrongly! How have we arrived at such an odd conclusion? The answer lies in too ready an acceptance of ordinary usage, which permits a fairly wide-ranging application of many of the virtue terms, combined, perhaps, with a modern readiness to suppose that the virtuous agent is motivated by emotion or inclination, not by rational choice. Aristotle makes a number of specific remarks about phronesis that are the subject of much scholarly debate, but the related modern concept is best understood by thinking of what the virtuous mature adult has that nice children, including nice adolescents, lack. Both the virtuous adult and the nice child have good intentions, but the child is much more prone to mess things up because he is ignorant of what he needs to know in order to do what he intends. A virtuous adult is not, of course, infallible and may also, on occasion, fail to do what she intended to do through lack of knowledge, but only on those occasions on which the lack of knowledge is not culpable. So, for example, children and adolescents often harm those they intend to benefit either because they do not know how to set about securing the benefit or because their understanding of what is beneficial and harmful is limited and often mistaken. Such ignorance in small children is rarely, if ever culpable. Adults, on the other hand, are culpable if they mess things up by being thoughtless, insensitive, reckless, impulsive, shortsighted, and by assuming that what suits them will suit everyone instead of taking a more objective viewpoint. They are also culpable if their understanding of what is beneficial and harmful is mistaken. It is part of practical wisdom to know how to secure real benefits effectively; those who have practical wisdom will not make the mistake of concealing the hurtful truth from the person who really needs to know it in the belief that they are benefiting him. The detailed specification of what is involved in such knowledge or understanding has not yet appeared in the literature, but some aspects of it are becoming well known. Even many deontologists now stress the point that their action-guiding rules cannot, reliably, be applied without practical wisdom, because correct application requires situational appreciation—the capacity to recognise, in any particular situation, those features of it that are morally salient. This brings out two aspects of practical wisdom. One is that it characteristically comes only with experience of life. Amongst the morally relevant features of a situation may be the likely consequences, for the people involved, of a certain action, and this is something that adolescents are notoriously clueless about precisely because they are inexperienced. It is part of practical wisdom to be wise about human beings and human life. It should go without saying that the virtuous are mindful of the consequences of possible actions. How could they fail to be reckless, thoughtless and short-sighted if they were not? The wise do not see things in the same way as the nice adolescents who, with their under-developed virtues, still tend to see the personally disadvantageous nature of a certain action as competing in importance with its honesty or benevolence or justice. These aspects coalesce in the description of the practically wise as those who understand what is truly worthwhile, truly important, and thereby truly advantageous in life, who know, in short, how to live well.

Forms of Virtue Ethics While all forms of virtue ethics agree that virtue is central and practical wisdom required, they differ in how they combine these and other concepts to illuminate what we should do in particular contexts and how we should live our lives as a whole. In what follows we sketch four distinct forms taken by contemporary virtue ethics, namely, a eudaimonist virtue ethics, b agent-based and exemplarist virtue ethics, c target-centered virtue ethics, and d Platonistic virtue ethics. A virtue is a trait that contributes to or is a constituent of eudaimonia and we ought to develop virtues, the eudaimonist claims, precisely because they contribute to eudaimonia. It is for me, not for you, to pronounce on whether I am happy. If I think I am happy then I am—it is not something I can be wrong about barring advanced cases of self-deception. Contrast my being healthy or flourishing. Here we have no difficulty in recognizing that I might think I was healthy, either physically or psychologically, or think that I was flourishing but be wrong. Most versions of virtue ethics agree that living a life in accordance with virtue is necessary for eudaimonia. This supreme good is not conceived of as an independently defined state made up of, say, a list of non-moral

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

goods that does not include virtuous activity which exercise of the virtues might be thought to promote. It is, within virtue ethics, already conceived of as something of which virtuous activity is at least partially constitutive. Kraut. Thereby virtue ethicists claim that a human life devoted to physical pleasure or the acquisition of wealth is not eudaimon, but a wasted life. But although all standard versions of virtue ethics insist on that conceptual link between virtue and eudaimonia, further links are matters of dispute and generate different versions. For Aristotle, virtue is necessary but not sufficient—what is also needed are external goods which are a matter of luck. For Plato and the Stoics, virtue is both necessary and sufficient for eudaimonia. Annas. According to eudaimonist virtue ethics, the good life is the eudaimon life, and the virtues are what enable a human being to be eudaimon because the virtues just are those character traits that benefit their possessor in that way, barring bad luck. So there is a link between eudaimonia and what confers virtue status on a character trait. For a discussion of the differences between eudaimonists see Baril. It is unclear how many other forms of normativity must be explained in terms of the qualities of agents in order for a theory to count as agent-based. The two best-known agent-based theorists, Michael Slote and Linda Zagzebski, trace a wide range of normative qualities back to the qualities of agents. Similarly, he explains the goodness of an action, the value of eudaimonia, the justice of a law or social institution, and the normativity of practical rationality in terms of the motivational and dispositional qualities of agents. Zagzebski likewise defines right and wrong actions by reference to the emotions, motives, and dispositions of virtuous and vicious agents. Her definitions of duties, good and bad ends, and good and bad states of affairs are similarly grounded in the motivational and dispositional states of exemplary agents. However, there could also be less ambitious agent-based approaches to virtue ethics see Slote. At the very least, an agent-based approach must be committed to explaining what one should do by reference to the motivational and dispositional states of agents. But this is not yet a sufficient condition for counting as an agent-based approach, since the same condition will be met by every virtue ethical account. For a theory to count as an agent-based form of virtue ethics it must also be the case that the normative properties of motivations and dispositions cannot be explained in terms of the normative properties of something else such as eudaimonia or states of affairs which is taken to be more fundamental. Beyond this basic commitment, there is room for agent-based theories to be developed in a number of different directions. The most important distinguishing factor has to do with how motivations and dispositions are taken to matter for the purposes of explaining other normative qualities. If those motives are good then the action is good, if not then not. Another point on which agent-based forms of virtue ethics might differ concerns how one identifies virtuous motivations and dispositions. As we observe the people around us, we find ourselves wanting to be like some of them in at least some respects and not wanting to be like others. The former provide us with positive exemplars and the latter with negative ones. Our understanding of better and worse motivations and virtuous and vicious dispositions is grounded in these primitive responses to exemplars. This is not to say that every time we act we stop and ask ourselves what one of our exemplars would do in this situations. Our moral concepts become more refined over time as we encounter a wider variety of exemplars and begin to draw systematic connections between them, noting what they have in common, how they differ, and which of these commonalities and differences matter, morally speaking. Recognizable motivational profiles emerge and come to be labeled as virtues or vices, and these, in turn, shape our understanding of the obligations we have and the ends we should pursue. However, even though the systematising of moral thought can travel a long way from our starting point, according to the exemplarist it never reaches a stage where reference to exemplars is replaced by the recognition of something more fundamental. At the end of the day, according to the exemplarist, our moral system still rests on our basic propensity to take a liking or disliking to exemplars. The target-centered view developed by Christine Swanton, by contrast, begins with our existing conceptions of the virtues. We already have a passable idea of which traits are virtues and what they involve. Of course, this untutored understanding can be clarified and improved, and it is one of the tasks of the virtue ethicist to help us do precisely that. But rather than stripping things back to something as basic as the motivations we want to imitate or building it up to something as

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

elaborate as an entire flourishing life, the target-centered view begins where most ethics students find themselves, namely, with the idea that generosity, courage, self-discipline, compassion, and the like get a tick of approval. It then examines what these traits involve. A complete account of virtue will map out 1 its field, 2 its mode of responsiveness, 3 its basis of moral acknowledgment, and 4 its target. Different virtues are concerned with different fields. Courage, for example, is concerned with what might harm us, whereas generosity is concerned with the sharing of time, talent, and property. Courage aims to control fear and handle danger, while generosity aims to share time, talents, or possessions with others in ways that benefit them. A virtuous act is an act that hits the target of a virtue, which is to say that it succeeds in responding to items in its field in the specified way. Providing a target-centered definition of a right action requires us to move beyond the analysis of a single virtue and the actions that follow from it. This is because a single action context may involve a number of different, overlapping fields. Determination might lead me to persist in trying to complete a difficult task even if doing so requires a singleness of purpose.

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

Chapter 8 : Cultural Differences Between the USA and Japan | Owlcation

Ethics and Virtue ; Manuel Velasquez, Claire Andre, Thomas Shanks, S.J., and Michael J. Meyer We also apply them when we ask what they require of us as.

Rand originally expressed her philosophical ideas in her novels, most notably, *The Fountainhead* and *Atlas Shrugged*. An axiom is a proposition that defeats its opponents by the fact that they have to accept it and use it in the process of any attempt to deny it. It is proof that they are axioms, that they are at the base of knowledge and thus inescapable. The axiom of existence is grasped in differentiating something from nothing, while the law of identity is grasped in differentiating one thing from another, i. As Rand wrote, "A leaf Any other approach Rand termed "the primacy of consciousness", including any variant of metaphysical subjectivism or theism. The way entities act is caused by the specific nature or "identity" of those entities; if they were different they would act differently. For example, a belief in dragons, however sincere, does not mean reality contains any dragons. A process of proof identifying the basis in reality of a claimed item of knowledge is necessary to establish its truth. This is understood to be a direct consequence of the metaphysical principle that "existence is identity. The distinguishing characteristic of logic the art of non-contradictory identification indicates the nature of the actions actions of consciousness required to achieve a correct identification and their goal knowledge "while omitting the length, complexity or specific steps of the process of logical inference, as well as the nature of the particular cognitive problem involved in any given instance of using logic. An item of knowledge cannot be "disqualified" by being arrived at by a specific process in a particular form. Thus, for Rand, the fact that consciousness must itself possess identity implies the rejection of both universal skepticism based on the "limits" of consciousness, as well as any claim to revelation, emotion or faith based belief. Objectivist epistemology maintains that all knowledge is ultimately based on perception. For example, optical illusions are errors in the conceptual identification of what is seen, not errors in sight itself. Perceptual error, therefore, is not possible. The form in which an organism perceives is determined by the physiology of its sensory systems. Whatever form the organism perceives it in, what it perceives"the object of perception" is reality. An "unprocessed" knowledge would be a knowledge acquired without means of cognition. She argued that concepts are formed by a process of measurement omission. Peikoff described her view as follows: The integration is completed and retained by the selection of a perceptual symbol a word to designate it. That measurements must exist is an essential part of the process. Rand acknowledged the importance of emotion for human beings, but she maintained that emotions are a consequence of the conscious or subconscious ideas that a person already accepts, not a means of achieving awareness of reality. Faith, for Rand, is not a "short-cut" to knowledge, but a "short-circuit" destroying it. Rand argued that neither is possible because the senses provide the material of knowledge while conceptual processing is also needed to establish knowable propositions. Criticisms on epistemology[edit] The philosopher John Hospers , who was influenced by Rand and shared her moral and political views, disagreed with her over issues of epistemology. Campbell says the relationship between Objectivist epistemology and cognitive science remains unclear because Rand made claims about human cognition and its development which belong to psychology, yet Rand also argued that philosophy is logically prior to psychology and in no way dependent on it. The existence of inanimate matter is unconditional, the existence of life is not: It is only a living organism that faces a constant alternative: In any hour and issue of his life, man is free to think or to evade that effort. Thinking requires a state of full, focused awareness. Man can focus his mind to a full, active, purposefully directed awareness of reality"or he can unfocus it and let himself drift in a semiconscious daze, merely reacting to any chance stimulus of the immediate moment, at the mercy of his undirected sensory-perceptual mechanism and of any random, associational connections it might happen to make. Life is given to him, survival is not. His body is given to him, its sustenance is not. His mind is given to him, its content is not. To remain alive he must act and before he can act he must know the nature and purpose of his action. He cannot obtain his food without

knowledge of food and of the way to obtain it. He cannot dig a ditch" or build a cyclotron" without a knowledge of his aim and the means to achieve it. To remain alive, he must think. If [man] chooses to live, a rational ethics will tell him what principles of action are required to implement his choice. If he does not choose to live, nature will take its course. The only alternative would be that they live without orientation to reality. Rand also rejected subjectivism. A "whim-worshiper" or "hedonist," according to Rand, is not motivated by a desire to live his own human life, but by a wish to live on a sub-human level. Instead of using "that which promotes my human life" as his standard of value, he mistakes "that which I mindlessly happen to value" for a standard of value, in contradiction of the fact that, existentially, he is a human and therefore rational organism. The "I value" in whim-worship or hedonism can be replaced with "we value," "he values," "they value," or "God values," and still it would remain dissociated from reality. Rand repudiated the equation of rational selfishness with hedonistic or whim-worshipping "selfishness-without-a-self. He argues that her attempt to defend the morality of selfishness is, therefore, an instance of begging the question. In response, the philosophers Douglas B. Persuasion is the method of reason. By its nature, the overtly irrational cannot rely on the use of persuasion and must ultimately resort to force to prevail. Peikoff, explaining the basis of rights, stated, "In content, as the founding fathers recognized, there is one fundamental right, which has several major derivatives. The fundamental right is the right to life. Its major derivatives are the right to liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness. Objectivism maintains that only societies seeking to establish freedom or free nations have a right to self-determination. Furthermore, the value of a commercial product comes in part from the necessary work of its inventors. However, Rand viewed limits on patents and copyrights as important and held that if they were granted in perpetuity, it would necessarily lead to de facto collectivism. Rand opposed racism and any legal application of racism. She considered affirmative action to be an example of legal racism. She therefore said she opposed capital punishment "on epistemological, not moral, grounds. Friedman , Roy Childs , Norman P. Barry , and Chandran Kukathas , have argued that Objectivist ethics are consistent with anarcho-capitalism instead of minarchism. Art, according to Objectivism, serves a human cognitive need: In this respect Objectivism regards art as a way of presenting abstractions concretely, in perceptual form. A concept is already a sort of mental shorthand standing for a large number of concretes, allowing a human being to think indirectly or implicitly of many more such concretes than can be held explicitly in mind. But a human being cannot hold indefinitely many concepts explicitly in mind either" and yet, on the Objectivist view, needs a comprehensive conceptual framework to provide guidance in life. Objectivism regards art as an effective way to communicate a moral or ethical ideal. Moreover, art need not be, and usually is not, the outcome of a full-blown, explicit philosophy. The Fountainhead is the best example of this effort. This higher symbolism should be represented in all art; artistic expression should be an extension of the greatness in humanity. Rand held that Romanticism was the highest school of literary art, noting that Romanticism was "based on the recognition of the principle that man possesses the faculty of volition," absent which, Rand believed, literature is robbed of dramatic power, adding: What the Romanticists brought to art was the primacy of values Values are the source of emotions: Historically, many romantic artists were philosophically subjectivist. Most Objectivists who are also artists subscribe to what they call romantic realism , which is how Rand labeled her own work. The Russian Radical Some scholars have focused on applying Objectivism in more specific areas. In the field of ethics, Kelley has argued in works such as Unrugged Individualism and The Contested Legacy of Ayn Rand that Objectivists should pay more attention to the virtue of benevolence and place less emphasis on issues of moral sanction. Induction in Physics A Treatise on Economics , George Reisman attempts to integrate Objectivist methodology and insights with both Classical and Austrian economics. In psychology, Professor Edwin A. Her outspoken defense of capitalism in works like Capitalism:

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

Chapter 9 : Are You Guilty of "Virtue-Signaling"?

A person is all the more admirable if they are a "self-made man" or "makes up their own mind" or show initiative or work well independently. Collectivist cultures expect people to identify with and work well in groups which protect them in exchange for loyalty and compliance.

Compared to the United States, there are certainly a lot of similarities. But Japan and the U. Though no people can be generalized as a whole, and, like America, culture can vary from region to region, here are some things that stick out to American expatriates living in Japan. Japanese attitudes toward religion: The vast majority of Japanese people identify as Shintoist or Buddhist, or both at the same time. Therefore, issues that are based in typical debate in the Abrahamic faiths, such as gay marriage or teaching creationism in schools, lack a religious foundation in Japan. Japanese people tend to be more formal. This one is a generalization that depends on which region of Japan we are referring to, but overall Japan, especially Tokyo, is known for being "colder" than most areas of the United States. People stand a relatively far distance apart when speaking, and last names with honorifics are used. An example can be seen in different approaches to customer service. In America, ideal customer service is usually warm and friendly. In Japan, it is formal and unobtrusive. Physically touching is also more sparse in Japan than it is in America. Japanese people are nationalistic but overall not very political. Politicians in Japan have a shockingly low approval rate. Politicians are quick to resign after making mistakes, causing Japan to switch Prime Ministers almost once a year since In fact, Japanese people have a notoriously low voting rate. On the other hand, Japanese people tend to have a lot of love for their country, and celebrate their unique history, language and culture in a way not dissimilar to Americans. Though America is made up of people from many different countries, Japan is overwhelmingly Japanese. This can affect society in the sense that because Japanese people view their culture as homogeneous, it is expected that everyone understands the traditions and rules of society. Though well known that many Asian countries bow instead of shaking hands, Japanese people bow in more situations than just greetings. Bowing can be done in apologizing and thanking as well. Though in business people might bow deeply to a 45 degree angle, most bows are a casual bob of the head and slight incline of the back. However, Japanese people are well aware that foreigners usually shake hands and might readily offer their hands in greeting instead. Japanese people will often live with their parents until they get married. There is much less social stigma about an unmarried person living with Mom and Dad after college. No tipping in Japan! Tipping is not done or rare at best. If you leave a few bills on the table after eating out, prepare to have the waiter run after you with your "forgotten" item. In America, tips are, in philosophy, meant to show appreciation for good service. Considering that many jobs such as waiters that are usually tipped get paid minimum wage or less, tipping has become a necessity. Space in Japan is more precious. Because Japan is an island country and only about the size of California, and much of the land it has is mountainous terrain, what land there is is precious and often expensive. Sizes of apartments and houses are usually much smaller, and yards are often tiny if they exist at all. Still, Japanese people have learned to adapt in ways to maximize space, but it can nonetheless be shocking for an American who might take space for granted. Americans tend to be more direct and blunt, whereas Japanese people are more subtle. Being too direct in Japan can be considered rude. This can be seen in body language, too. People in the U. Japanese people also tend to be more reserved than Americans, and share less personal or sensitive information, often even with close friends. Gender roles are strict. There are very few female politicians and CEOs. When women join companies, they are often expected to quit when they get married to become housewives and stay-at-home mothers. The concept of masculinity can also be very strict, though among youth culture - typically university age or younger - there is some gender androgyny celebrated in fashion, appearances and roles. In Japan, social hierarchy is important. Japan is a collectivist culture, whereas the United States is more individualistic. Japanese culture is focused on groups and communities. Satisfaction and pride is meant to be found within the group you belong to. In the United States, people tend to

DOWNLOAD PDF VIRTUE OF THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THEM AND THE RESEARCHERS OWN CULTURE,

find satisfaction in their own accomplishments, and focus on their own aspirations. An example of this is that in Japanese business culture, employees tend to work for one company for their entire lives. Company loyalty is valued, and promotions are often given on a seniority basis. In America, people focus on their careers independent from the companies they work for, and will often change companies a number of times throughout their professional lives. Promotions are supposed to be given on a basis of merit. In Japan, this can also influence a mindset of how people live in society. People tend to follow rules more seriously, from something as simple as trying not to litter - which makes big cities like Tokyo surprisingly clean. Traditional Japanese wedding procession Questions must be on-topic, written with proper grammar usage, and understandable to a wide audience.