

# Resolution and Conscience

Michinori Kobayashi (japanese philosopher)

Actions shall not be resolved simply according to norms, but rather shall be in forms suitable to the situation in which the action is taken. Though the action must ultimately be done based on one's conscience, its responsibility is judged by the result of the action thrown out into the situation. This is an ethics disquisition that intends to evaluate the ethical thoughts of the East and the West by contemplating actions within formation and formation within actions.

## 1. Situations and Actions

Actions within situations

The mutual linkage and the goodness and badness of the action

## 2. Obligation and Appropriateness

Normativism and Immanuel Kant's Deontology

The limit of Kant's Deontology

Confrontation between obligations

The moral law and situations

The appropriateness of actions

## 3. Profundity of the Conscience Theory

Conscience, Socrates and Luther

Wang Yangming's "*Chiryochi* (exerting intuitive knowledge)"  
theory

The conscience and decision

## 4. Responsibility of Actions

Responsibility of actions and the theory of motivation

Responsibility of actions and the theory of results

Responsibility ethics

## 1. Situations and Actions

### Actions within situations

We always execute our actions under certain circumstances. We choose our actions while reading in the situation we are placed in and balancing between our own desire and the values and norms we conform to. Moreover, situations never fixate and keep changing. Therefore, even if our desire or the values and norms stayed the same, we are often forced to re-choose another form of actions. Furthermore, our own desire and the value and norms are also often subject to changes depending on the changes in situations, making the form of our action even less uniform. The forms of actions are formed through the interaction between the ever-changing situation and the ever-changing self. There are no such things as the absolutely changeless situation or the absolutely changeless self, and therefore the forms of actions change infinitely.

If that is true, we must flexibly cope with the ever-changing situations by reading them in and choosing our own actions properly depending on the situation we are facing occasions by occasions. We must find the most suitable action within the linkage between the self and the situation. Since it is decided by the interaction between ever-changing self and ever-changing situation, it is impossible to generalize the most suitable action in such form so that it would be suitable for anybody, anytime and anywhere. We must always cope with ever-changing situations flexibly, in case-by-case basis.

There are various types of difference in the situation differences, including people, place and time. When a doer executed a certain action, the action would be judged appropriate or inappropriate according to the target, the place and the time of the action. Therefore, whatever the necessary action is, it must be executed while taking into account the personality and state of affairs of the person the action will be done to. The doer also must be aware of the place the action is executed, as well as the timing and occasions. In short, when an action is executed, it must be appropriate to the people, place and time.

Moreover, the situation formed by people, place and time is always changing, and has unpredictable uncertainty. When we try to execute a certain action, in many occasions, we predict the situation we may face and choose the action accordingly. However, we often face a new and different situation that is against our predictions. It is impossible to expect the same situation even if the action we execute was the same one.

Therefore, there is no such thing as an almighty principle that we can set in advance for our actions, which functions appropriately anytime and in any situations. If we fixated on such a fictional principle, we might fail to grasp the unexpected and new situation. What is essential is that we choose the appropriate action for the situation, on that place and on that time.

The reason why Aristotle advocated the “golden mean” as the way actions should be was, in a way because he was aware of this uncertainty of situations. All actions are executed under each different opportunity and situation, and therefore it is impossible to judge which action is the most appropriate uniformly. Thus, Aristotle reasoned that it

was the best to search for the appropriate action in the middle of the two extremes: exaltation and deficiency.

Nevertheless, the “golden mean” advocated by Aristotle does not symbolize the same thing the mathematical definition of a midpoint, as it is an ability to cope with uncertain situations flexibly. Rather, we must think of the “mean” as something that moves around freely according to various conditions, such as people, place and occasions. By advocating the mean that can change according to situations, Aristotle advocated the necessity for the choice of actions according to the changing situations.

In fact, even in Aristotle’s case, considerations on the complexity and uncertainty on situations was not sufficient. It can also be said that, rather than to deal with the issue directly, Aristotle had converted the difficulty of the situation issue into the issue of the mind’s ability he named as “mean”.

The mutual linkage and the goodness and badness of the action

Actions are evaluated in various ways according to the situation in which the action is executed, and not by the action itself. The evaluated result of the action could be completely opposite depending on the situation. It is fair to say that the value of an action is determined by the situation. Actions do not carry any meaning on their own, but have their meanings defined by their relation to the context. The same goes for the goodness and badness of the action. The goodness and badness of the action also is determined by the situation the action was executed, including the person the action is done to and the place and time the action was performed. Moreover, since the situation is always changing,

the goodness and badness of the action also fluctuate continuously.

Of course, people may judge the act of murder as bad action in any and all possible situations. However, even the act of murder, depending on the situation in which the action is executed, could be either good or bad.

When a society is comparatively orderly, with its law observed and a certain level of mutual trust premised, murder is considered as bad since it destroys this relationship. However, even in a situation where there is order and the law is established, there can be a chance where murder is not determined as bad circumstantially. For example, abortion for the sake of eugenic protection or evisceration from brain-dead patients are often accepted. Death penalty is also permitted in many cases. Executioners are not accused of murder for doing their job. Rather, in this case such action and system are necessary in terms of keeping law and order. Murder in self-defense is also equivalent to this situation. Moreover, in situations where law and order are collapsed or barely existent, in a state of war for example, killing is not also considered as murder. Murder took place openly in public during the Warring State period or state of anarchy. Conversely, if such act was necessary to rebuild law and order, it can be even appraised as a heroic action. And yet, when the filter of an universal religion that aims for the absolute peace was applied to such situation, killing in the state of war or in the anarchy could be defined as bad again. Even killing could switch between good and bad depending on the change in the situation.

Wittgenstein, who argued that “the meaning of the language shall be interrogated through its use,” had stated in his work titled *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus* that, “ethics propositions also cannot exist.”<sup>1</sup> Shin Ohara, who elaborated in detail on situational ethics, interpreted these

words of Wittgenstein as, “a certain proposition has an equal chance of becoming ethical or unethical when put in a specific circumstance.”<sup>2</sup>

Indeed, good and evil of a certain action is defined by concrete circumstance or the context. There is not a single proposition in existence that has its good or evil decided a priori. We tend to consider that good and evil, or right and wrong of things exist objectively, and that they are decided in the beginning. In fact, however, the good and evil is not so fixated. On the contrary, since the decision on good and evil of things relies on the circumstances, it requires highly complicated judgment.

In all things, the value of thing is not generated on its own, but is through various relationship it is placed within. Therefore, good and evil of actions fluctuate depending on circumstances. The goodness or the evilness of the action is not in the action itself, but is defined 病名 by the condition and circumstance it is placed in. Therefore, a good action in one circumstance could be evil in another, or an evil action in one could be good in another.

For instance, in a common example given by Fletcher, willing to lend money to the poor is a good action. However, if the poor person was addicted to gambling or was an alcoholic, it could be an evil action<sup>3</sup>. Conversely, although lying is usually an evil action, it would be a good action if a doctor lied to his timorous cancer patient and did not tell him the true name of the disease in order to ease his mind.

Since things are interrelated with each other, an action thrown into a certain situation will not be judged its goodness/evilness based on itself, but from its interrelationship with relating phenomena. In the field of interrelationship between phenomena, an action usually regarded as

good does not necessarily function as good, nor an action regarded evil does as evil. Something done with a good intention might hit on others as bad, and another action done with a bad intention could often do good on others. Our actions are executed within the interrelationship between manifold, infinite phenomena both spatially and temporally. It is this interrelationship that defines the good and evil of an action.

Therefore, those actions usually regarded as evil could sometimes possess some kind of a significant meaning in the field of interrelationship. In fact, even an action of atrocity could conversely convey a proactive meaning, by which the society could even move towards the orderly. In the field of manifold and infinite interrelationship, no action shall be regarded unnecessary. There, all actions have some kind of unexpected impact, be it good or evil, through the field of interrelationship.

In *Zhuang-zi* also, a proverb that says, “Thin wine from Lu leads to the siege of Handan,” was quoted by a notorious thief named Baimei Shen<sup>4</sup>. It is an allegory of an event having impact in an unexpected thing. A long time ago, King Xuan of Chu acting out as if he was the champion, had forced all other lords to pay visit to his kingdom. Duke Gong of Lu was late and showed up after all other lords did, and to make the matter worse, the wine he brought as an offering was very thin and tasteless. King Xuan was furious and decided to conquer Lu. Concurrently, King Hui of Wei had the ambition to conquer Zhao, but did not have the chance because of the alliance between Lu and Zhao. However, Lu's defeat to Chu had put Zhao in a very dangerous position. Taking advantage of the situation and catching them off guard, King Hui of Wei easily put Handan, the capital of Zhao under siege and put it in danger of surrender. It was all because the wine from Lu was thin.

Thus, an action could have effect in unexpected places by going through the field of interrelationship, it is no wonder if a good action came out as evil and an evil action as good. That being the case, our actions, then, must be fundamentally defined as neither good nor evil. Good and evil are rather merely the reflective concepts that would be judged later on from the field of interrelationship. Moreover, the action itself is constantly interchangeable both spatially and temporally in the field of interrelationship. As Lao-tse once stated, the good and evil, the fortune and misfortune are always circulating, just as a rope being braided<sup>5</sup>.

## 2. Obligation and Appropriateness

### **Normativism and Immanuel Kant's Deontology**

Admittedly, there is a thing called social norms in our society, acting as the binding force that governs our actions. It protects the order of our society. Social norms include rules arranged by specific organization or group, laws established as system by nations, local conventions not written in the law but do exist historically in the society, and above all, moral law. Among these norms, there is a considerable amplitude from moral laws, which not only regulates the external actions but also goes into one's internal feelings to control, to laws and rules, which only regulate the external actions and stays out of one's internal feelings.

However, these norms, whether be it internal or external, do possess the binding force to regulate our actions. Therefore when we violate them whether morally or legally, sanctions will be imposed. Generally speaking, following these norms is considered as good, whereas deviating from them would be evil. When we execute some kind of action,



we set a certain goal, try to accomplish it and observe the situation we are put in. Concurrently, we decide which norm to follow, ethically or legally, and classify our own action into good or evil based on it before choosing what to actually execute. This norm we base our choice of actions is the “oughtness”, or as Nietzsche had put it, “Thou shalt do.” Oughtness provides proper directivity to our actions originated in emotions, volition or impulses. It is the will of our reason, which controls sensibility.

Oughtness is given in the form of moral law. In his *Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant maintained the “paradox of method” and argued that the concept of good and evil should be provided not prior to moral law but after and through it. The concept of good and evil is generated by obeying or denying moral law. Kant argued that moral law must be at the base of the concept of good and evil<sup>6</sup>. Obligation is the practical compulsion that forces action to suit moral law. Since human being is a contradictory existence that is both rational and sensible, the moral law given by the reason will always assume the form of obligation when forcing us. However, when obey our obligation while suppressing the sensibility existence, we will become able to live in the world of higher intelligence, - of the oughtness.

For Kant, obligation is a universal rule that is led a priori from practical reason, and the good is defined as our making own volition obey this rule. Just because obligation is obligation, an action that agrees with the obligation must be executed. Therefore, neither the action that is suiting moral law only externally nor an ethical action executed by the sensible tendency will be regarded as moral action. Kant sets a strict distinction between the action that agrees with obligation and action that derives from it. The action that agrees with obligation can also be executed

when volition is set by fondness. In such case, it is merely a matter of compliance with the law. On the other hand, the action that drives from obligation is executed because of the fact that obligation is obligation, and solely out of the pure respect for the law. Therefore, this action is the truly moral action<sup>7</sup>.

Obligation takes the form of imperatives. There are two forms of imperative; hypothetical imperative that is a conditional command, and categorical imperative that is unconditional command. Between those two, the truly moral imperative is the categorical imperative. In short, it employs an unconditional style such as, "Be honest." Moreover, Kant considered that since categorical imperative possesses a universality that suits all people, it is good. Kant took no notice of the essence and result of the action, but focused only on the formality and principle that cause the action.

### **The Limit of Kant's Deontology**

However, as it is often criticized, the ethics of Kant has fallen to the formalism, in which the morality of action is judged only by its formality. That is to say, it attempts to uniformly judge the morality of an action by whether the rules set forth by the action can be fit into the law's formality commanded unconditionally and be universalized or not. This does not necessarily function effectively in the actual scene of action. In fact, although the ethics of Kant does possess an unimpeachable logical consistency as a principle theory, from our daily lives' point of view, it has fallen into a mere puritanism with no significant effectiveness.

The ethics of Kant has a strong tendency to set a priori a transcendental

and universal principle, then deduce the entire ethical phenomena with it. However, in the actual scene of action, it is not so easy to put logical consistency on one's own action. Indeed – and this also is something that has been criticized since long time ago – if based on Kant's puritanism, if a good action is executed based on sensibility or emotion that raise from within, the action will not be regarded as a moral action. It suggests that a moral action must always be done reluctantly and against one's will, and for the sake of obligation.

Hegel is another to criticize Kant's standpoint of subjective morality as an empty formalism. Hegel pointed out that it did not acknowledge contradiction between obligations and focused only on formal uniformity, and for that reason it only stayed within abstract unspecified-ness<sup>8</sup>. However, in the actual scene of moral life, our consciousness often gets confused by numerous obligations.

Not only that, above all, in actual scenes, there is the confrontation and contradiction between nature (sensibility) and morality. Therefore, if taking a standpoint of morality, one must continue an endless hostile struggle against the sensibility. Moreover, morality will inevitably stay incomplete thence, and its completion will be pushed away far into infinity<sup>9</sup>. Kant's standpoint has such defect. Hegel's criticism on Kant sharply hits the mark in terms of criticizing the dualism of Kant.

Furthermore, other defects of Kant's ethics would include the question of whether his argument on obligation being a universal and valid moral law is truly universal and valid or not. Even the moral law of "thou shalt not kill" may not be a universal moral law that can be applied to all people at all time, when taking into account the situations such as capital punishment, legitimate self-defense or war. It does not take

much contemplation to see that Kant's arguments such as categorical imperative or deontology are not absolute either.

Kant's ethics is nothing more than a mere formalism. It does not take into account the reality of humans, who choose their own actions at the actual scene of practice, facing many contradictions and suffering each and every time. In that sense, Kant's ethics has a major defect in understanding of humanity.

### **Confrontation between obligations**

As it has been discussed for a long time, obligations confront and contradict with each other by nature. If, like Kant did, obligations were separated and considered in the abstract and conceptual, there would be no contradiction between obligations. However, concretely and realistically, our actions are always executed in complex circumstances and therefore we must perform multiple obligations concurrently. Thus, contradictions and conflicts between obligations are generated, which put us in distress. Obligations eliminates each other. No matter what action was chosen, if it accorded with one obligation, it will violate the other. Moreover, since only one action can be chosen, it is virtually impossible to find a universal obligation that can request binding force unconditionally. If that is the case, the attempt to base multiple obligations without ethical contradiction and in accord with the reality is bound to fail.

In *Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant divided multiple obligations that need to be executed into obligations for the self and for others, and further categorized them into perfect obligation and imperfect obligation. Whereas perfect obligation is the obligation that needs to be executed

without exceptions, imperfect obligation is a kind of obligation that is evaluated only as virtueless and not vice even if it was not executed. As examples of the perfect obligations for the self, Kant suggested denial of actions including suicide, sexual self-injury, falsehood, greed as well as servility. As for the examples of imperfect obligation for the self, he suggested development of various natural abilities (mentality, intellect and physical strength) of the self and ethical refinement of feelings. Moreover, as for the perfect obligation for others, Kant suggested the obligation of respect that denies actions such as arrogance, backbiting and insult, whereas for the imperfect obligation for others the obligation of love that includes kindness, compassion and gratitude<sup>10</sup>. In summary, those obligations defined by Kant suggest that, ultimately speaking, our obligation is to make effort in perfecting ourselves and to promote the happiness of others.

The deontology of Kant is seemingly agreeable for anyone, but in reality, there will be contradictions and conflicts between these obligations. In fact, there will be a contradiction between obligations for the self and others. For example, as in the case mentioned above, for a patient of the last stage cancer, it is often better not to inform the cancer, but to execute the obligation of love with compassion and kindness until the end comes. However, if told a different disease instead of informing cancer, it would be a telling of a lie and will be against the obligation for the self.

Kant considered that lying is a loss of human dignity and is prohibited in all possible situations, denying even the harmless “necessary lies.”<sup>11</sup> However, this is the major defect of Kant’s ethics. Although Kant assumed that it was impossible to see any conflicts between obligations, in the actual realistic scenes obligations do have contradictions and

conflicts against each other, and we are always forced to make decisions on which action to take. Rather, it is within these decision-making process where we find the true ethics.

As often discussed, the tragedy *Antigone* by Sophocles, which Hegel had interpreted in *the Phenomenology of Spirit* is a good example of a *tragedy caused by the contradiction and conflict of obligations*.

Antigone's brother Polynices was executed as a criminal, and his body was left unburied according to the order of the King Creon and the nation's law. However, Antigone could not help but giving his body a proper burial out of her deep love as a sister of the same blood. What is described here is the conflict between two obligations: the love for family and the compliance with the nation's law. By breaking the nation's law, Antigone decided to fulfill her love for family. However, since it was ultimately an act against the nation's law, she was later forced to be confined in a cave and left to die. Hegel interprets this tragedy of Antigone as the confrontation between the two morality principles: of family and of community<sup>12</sup>.

We always stand on the ethical antinomy, which is what tears us up. It definitely is not - despite Kant's argument - something that can be integrated by a formal, universal principle. We make decisions by choosing one action out of moral conflict. This decision is not something that can be deduced inevitably from the list of obligations set a priori or the general principle. Rather, it is a type of experiential intuition that can be found from the conflict between the situation the self is placed in and various obligations.

Originally, values humans carry is diverse and none of them are fixed a priori, but rather they change in mutual correlation. In what the value

lay emphasis on also changes along with the situation. As the situation changes, one type of value could get closer to another, transform slightly, or oppose and compete with each other. The conflict of obligations also occurs for the same reason. Another way to put it, only after when there are diverse types of value and when they contradict and conflict with each other often, we can manage to correspond with the ever-changing situations.

### **Moral laws and situations**

Whether an action is valid or invalid is not decided by just one principle. Rather, it depends on what type of action is decided on as a result of applying a principle was to individual situations. Moreover, the morality of an action must be questioned on this decision on the validity of an action. Ethical principle is always right as a principle, but it does not necessarily function as right depending on the situation it is put in. Whatever the action is, it is regulated by the situation. Furthermore, the situation is diverse and always changing, and there is never a situation completely identical to another. There never is the same opponent or location, and the opportunity is independent. Therefore, it is impossible to uniformly decide which action suits the principle the most in what situation. The only thing we can do is to make the most suitable decision each time according to the situation.

Indeed, there are numbers of norms set in various parts of the society we live in, in order for the society to function in an orderly manner. Those norms are fore sure something that must be kept. The action that puts special respect in keeping the norm thoroughly tries to obey the norm that seems to be universal and valid, no matter what situation it is put in.

Kant's pragmatism that emphasizes the universal validity of moral law is one of the things that base such norm-observing actions. Kant argues that moral law must be valid at any and all circumstances, and must not be affected by specific situations. Whether the action is valid or invalid shall be judged by whether it is based on a universally valid moral law or not, and the judgement must not be affected by the situation each individual faces or experiences and feelings they have. Although moral law is given to us in the form of obligation, Kant insists, this obligation shall be executed for the obligation sake itself, and no other condition shall be put into consideration.

However, such principle-based approach of Kant is not something that grasped the reality of our actions. This is because if the reality of actions is taken well into consideration, even if an action observed moral laws, norms and obligation, it could become an inappropriate action depending on what situation it is thrown into. Indeed, norms such as "be honest" and "thou shalt not lie" may be universal and valid. However, as long as there is a possibility of an honest speech or action that comprised with these norms turning out to be harmful to others, it is impossible for any ethical norm to be valid at any and all situations. Ethical norms is always limited within the situation the action is placed in. Straightening the crown to keep dignity is a valid etiquette, but if the action is done under a plum tree, it may not necessarily be an appropriate action.

What I need to take into consideration if I were to take some kind of action here and now, would not be just ethical norms and obligations given to me. Add to them, I Must take into consideration various other conditions, before I execute the action; to whom the action is executed to, in what situation the opponent is put in, what type of character and in



what mental condition the opponent is, what type of relationship the situation I am in has with the opponent and so on. Unless done so, no matter how kind-hearted the action was, it could be disadvantageous to the opponent.

Unless there is an understanding for the situation in which an action is executed, no theory of obligation – no matter how magnificently systematized it is – would have validity of any sorts in the selection of an appropriate action. Obligations are relative to the situation, the same action are not necessarily required as the obligation in all and any case. If someone is just mechanically executing an action that suits the given obligation without considering about this issue in all situations, it is merely an action of a formalism and of a petty official, and not a right action.

In that sense, Kant's categorical imperative does not take into consideration the situation in which the action is executed, and therefore cannot tell if the action that obeyed it will be right or not. There are various ways of being for our actions, and it transforms depending on the always changing situations. It points out that the action that obeys the categorical imperative is not always right in any and all situations. The situation in which the action is placed in needs to be taken into consideration when judging whether the action is right or not. If the situation is not taken into consideration, it would mean that the ways of our actions must always be selected in hypothetical imperative manner. How an action shall be executed in a certain situation is something that must always be taken under consideration. This is because the rightness of an action is not decided only by the norm, but also by the context, syntax and the usage regulations of the action executed.

Situations our actions face are diverse, ever-moving, complex and uncertain. Therefore, in order to cope with them, our actions must change according to the fluid, changing situations. An elastic and flexible way of living is required. An declarative order of “thou shalt do” is not always absolute in all situations. Suffice it to say, there is no such thing as a universally valid norm of ethics that always holds true in any and all situations.

For example, Kant states that the norm of “thou shalt not lie” is a universal moral law that is valid in any and all situations. However, this is not necessarily true. According to Kant’s idea, if someone lied to a man who has no hesitation in committing a murder in order to protect the victim-to-be, the someone’s lie would still be an evil action. It is because for Kant, being honest is the absolute obligation and there is no exception to be allowed. Kant regards that if an exception were to be allowed, the universality of law itself would collapse<sup>13</sup>. However, this idea of Kant is too rigid of a principle-based approach and lacks flexibility. Realistically thinking, there are many situations when we have to be dishonest to moral laws. On the contrary, being dishonest is almost essential in keeping human relationships. Most of human relationships would not stand our disclosing all of true feelings.

### **Appropriateness of actions**

We must flexibly cope with diverse and ever-changing situations, according to each case. What becomes necessary is the appropriateness of the action executed to the given situation. The right and wrong of an action must be judged based on its appropriateness/inappropriateness to the situation (place, time and occasion) the action was executed. When evaluating an action also, in what situation the action was executed

needs to be taken into consideration. When doing so, the situation that needs to be taken into account will be diverse including the situation of others, situation of the self and the surrounding situation that is formed by them. Therefore, the appropriate action for the situation is not necessarily just one but could be many, and it is not something that can be decided uniformly. Sometimes even completely opposite courses of action can both be judged appropriate.

What is necessary, as Fletcher mentioned, is the appropriateness within the situation<sup>14</sup>. We need to decide what is appropriate within the situation according to each case. The behavior of a person in a situation must be judged not based on formal principles or norms but from the specific situation of the reality. Moreover, the rightness is the making of the appropriate judgment for the situation. The right and wrong is not preset without consideration about the situation, but must be judged based on the appropriateness within the designated situation.

In that sense, Kant's standpoint of ignoring the situation and setting the standards of right and wrong of action only on the universal moral law and on the will to obey it should be criticized. This is because Kant's categorical imperative of "thou shalt do" is not always valid when dealing with a real situation. We do not live our life observing all of the Kantian categorical imperative on a daily basis. We manage to live our civic life adjusting between requests of the self and others and taking under consideration various types of situation. If we were to judge it with a Kantian deontology, it would mean that most of us are living unethical life. However, it does not mean that our life is no good, but that Kant who holds sacred the moral law too abstract and universal is the one who is unrealistic.

Situation we face continuously changes and is filled with unpredictable uncertainty. In order to cope appropriately with such situation, we must admit that situational ethics that is capable of flexibly selecting the most appropriate action in each situation is superior to the Kantian Normativism.

Society changes incessantly. According to the change, people's course of action also changes, and so as the norms that regulate actions. It does not suggest the existence of a universal moral law that can be substantiated regardless of the situation that is formed with factors such as time, place and people. Action is executed under a certain situation by a certain subject, and is something concrete. Actions appropriateness cannot be judged ignoring the situation.

### **3. Profundity of the Conscience Theory**

Conscience

We usually refer to the ability to judge the ethical value of action as "conscience". Conscience is an ability to identify the right and wrong of actions, and is an ethical mind that perceive the right and wrong.

However, this is not a sufficient definition of the word "conscience."

Further contemplation would indicate that the concept of conscience is not necessarily a definite concept.

Conscience is the consciousness that functions on the action of the self over anything else. When someone has taken or about to take a wrong action, the voice that blames the action comes from deep within the mind of the self. That is what we call the voice of conscience. Therefore, conscience usually appears in the form of a sting in the heart or a guilty feeling. The voice of conscience is mainly heard as an accusing or prohibiting voice. It also warns and denounces the wrong. Conscience is

the voice of negation against the wrong. A person must face all alone against the voice of conscience that comes from deep within their own heart.

Kant searched for the basis of the voice of conscience in the pure and practical reasons and in the moral laws ordered by them. The voice of moral law that urges us from the root of our self must be the voice of conscience. Kant referred to the conscience as “the inner judge.<sup>15</sup>” The declaration of guilty and innocent on our actions is executed within the inner court of the ethical personality. This consciousness of the inner court of law is the conscience. “To be against consciousness” is to ignore the judgement of conscience. Therefore, to be a right person, one must listen and obey the voice of conscience. The authority of conscience that demands us to listen and obey the judgement would have to ultimately lead up to God as the highest authority of ethics. The practical philosophy of Kant was something that emphasized the genuineness of the sentiment that comes from inside the conscience.

However, the situation where this idea of Kant holds true is somewhere beyond the real situation in which the action is actually executed, and only when various moral laws are separately contemplated. When the real situation in which the actual action is executed is taken into account, such plain and simple conscience theory cannot hold true. It is because the real situation in which the action is executed is not only complicated and wide-ranging, but also has contradictive conflicts between obligations ordered by moral law.

In real-life circumstances, we can ultimately select only one action, taking into account various conditions. Given that, that action could be good to one person while bad to another. Moreover, it could be good when

viewed from one moral law, while bad from other moral laws. Even if the action was executed as being ordered by the inner moral law and according to conscience, it may not always be judged as good in the real-life circumstance. Conversely, deciding on an action based on conscience could mean deciding on doing bad in some form, in real-life circumstance.

For example, the issue of euthanasia that Mori Ougai had raised in his novel *Takasebune*, the same thing holds true. The main character, Kisuke, upon witnessing his younger brother suffering in pain from his unsuccessful suicide, makes up his mind and mercy-kills the younger brother. In this case, the action of Kisuke was an action executed out of his inner conscience. It was indeed an act of deep love for his younger brother and a good action. However, it was concurrently a violation against the moral law of “thou shalt not kill,” and a bad action. An action in accordance with conscience can be both good and bad, in the real-life circumstance. Things like this could happen not only in such extreme conditions, but also in our daily life to a greater or less extent, in the circumstance where selection of action takes place.

Therefore, when selecting an action, situational ethics avoids mechanically applying just rule and principle alone. Rather, it contemplates various issues in relation to the situation in the process of actually happening, and upon taken into account various conflicting values, consider what would be the best way to cope, and recommends deciding on one action with flexible judgement. In this case also, in selecting of action, it is necessary to ultimately make decision according to the conscience of the self and to be responsible for the decision. Situational ethics advocates the superiority of conscience to norms and require responsible decisions to individuals. The decision of action, situational ethics suggests, should be made by the voluntary judgement

and responsibility of each individual, and not simply by rule, principle or discipline.

However, in this case, even if the judgement was in accordance with conscience, it does not necessarily mean that the action was absolutely good and was the only choice. No matter what type of action was executed, all it has is only relative worth. In concrete situations, it is possible to say that we are always in between good and bad. Doing one good something based on conscience is concurrently doing bad to the other. Sometimes, we would have to go against the existing law or disobey it, in order to execute the action. There are conflict of good and bad, as well as tension. Ultimately, we have no other choice but to select the action based on our own conviction. The simple Kantian conscience theory would not be sufficient for overcoming such contradiction of reality.

Hegel had defined conscience as the entitlement of the right to “know what is the right and what is obligation, within and by ourselves”<sup>16</sup>. Since obligations given to us are diverse, conscience must select and decided on one out of them. What is to be selected should be decided based on the conviction of the self. Only by the conviction of the self, shall the action of the self be good. However, this judgement of action by conscience only has the choice between two alternatives, and therefore it would mean to select bad in some form<sup>17</sup>. When executing actions in real life, individuality, subjectivity and sin become practically inevitable. Hegel did not stay within the scope of the Kantian abstract universality, but observed the reality of actions in which various obligations conflict with each other very well.

## **Socrates and Luther**

Indeed, Socrates had chosen his own death according to the laws of Athens. That action was an action that came out of the conscience of Socrates. However, it did not simply mean Socrates had formally regarded the Athens' law as absolute. He judged on his own that dying in accordance with the law would be more 'right' than to break it and become a fugitive outside of the country. It was because he judged that obeying the law is the best way to express his loyalty to the community of Athens, in which he was born and raised, and that in order to fulfill his loyalty, he should not hesitate to choose death. Socrates displayed the act of obeying the law based on his own judgement, that is, his conscience.

Therefore, if, on the contrary, the conscience of Socrates had judged that he should express some kind of justice with his own action even if it meant breaking the law, he would have not hesitated to break both the law and prison. In the presence of the conscience-obeying action, superficial rules such as the law could only appear as something relative. We must say that conscience, in its root, exists beyond good and evil. Socrates referred to the mysterious voice of conscience in the place beyond good and evil as "the voice of daemon." The voice of daemon always had a control over the behavior of Socrates, and Socrates had always obeyed the signal of Daemon.

Socrates acquired self-awareness through the Delphic oracle on the fact that all human beings are ignorant about essence of matters and that only by returning to this ignorance can the true knowledge be acquired. He then understood that telling people this fact was his God-given mission and devoted himself to the people of Athens. This life-long



action of Socrates was also an act in accordance with the voice of Daemon and with conscience. However, living so faithfully to his own conscience was at the same time something regarded as dangerous by others, and often meant going against the democracy of Athens. Therefore, as a result, Socrates was sentenced to death by the procedure of the democracy of Athens. Nevertheless, the consistent action of Socrates that led him there was the action based on the conscience of Socrates himself.

The act based on conscience could appear as an act according to the law as well as against it. Conscience could order to obey the law in some cases, and to resist it in other. We must say that the very conscience that actions should obey exists somewhere beyond the ordinary rules and ethics.

Abiding by conscience indeed is truly knowing the self. Conscience is a self-conviction. It is to directly trust the action of the self that comes from the root of the self. Moreover, there is at the same time trust for something divine that is beyond the self. Such significance may have been included in the motto, "Know thyself," that was hoisted up at the Temple of Delphi where Socrates was given the oracle.

What had made Luther start the Reformation, announcing the Ninety-five Theses and going against the custom of the Catholic Church was also the order of his conscience. After harsh training as a monk, Luther became convinced that the only way a sinful man could be regarded as justice is through God's blessing and faith for it. Based on this conviction, he criticized harshly the way of the Church at the time. He continued to rebel against the authority of the Catholic Church, throwing the letter of excommunication from them into fire, and refusing their request to

withdraw his writings that was accused of being heretic. These actions of Luther were actions that accorded with his conscience that came from his firm faith. His conscience was with God and was being captured by the words of God.

However, those actions of Luther was against the custom and law of the Church at the time. Not only that, Luther's Reformation included some actions that were violating the moral at the time, such as allowing priests to get married and ensured the freedom to get divorced. The actions of Luther based on his conscience showed his determination to violate the ordinary norms and to take the social sanctions for doing so. In many cases, the action based of conscience is decided under the tension between the self-conviction and common sense. It can also be defined as the action that requires the determination to do some sort of bad. Such "conscientious action" requires, conversely, faith in something divine.

### **Wang Yangming's "*Chiryochi* (exerting intuitive knowledge)" theory**

As for the divine something that exists at the root of conscience, the Eastern action philosophy has contemplated deeper. Especially, the idea of "*Chiryochi* (exerting intuitive knowledge)," advocated by Wang Yangming is an extreme example that contemplated on the issue of the root of conscience through intense practice.

The "*ryochi* (intuitive knowledge)" of the *Chiryochi* comes from the words of Mencius that said, "the knowledge possessed by (men) without the exercise of thought is their intuitive knowledge.<sup>18</sup>" It is an inherent ability possessed by people that does not need any contemplation or learning to achieve, that is, the moral sense that is naturally given to people since the time of their birth. What Wang placed in the center of

his philosophy of action was the fostering of the intuitive knowledge that is based on the natural character of humanity and exhibit it, that is, “to exert intuitive knowledge.” Wang also stated that, “intuitive knowledge is exactly the mind of right and wrong, and right and wrong is exactly likes and dislikes<sup>19</sup>”. Intuitive knowledge is an ability provided to every human being that allows to know the right from wrong and good from bad, and it should affect the emotions of likes and dislikes. When executing actions, we shall conform to this intuitive knowledge.

Intuitive knowledge is naturally possessed by human, and is already complete and needs no adjustment – finished article. There is no exception no matter how uneducated a person is. Therefore, Wang states that “town full of people are all saints.<sup>20</sup>” Nevertheless, there is a possibility that this intuitive knowledge everybody possess could be hidden away by selfish desire, and that is why Wang claims that we must make effort in “exerting intuitive knowledge,” that is, “cherishing and fostering the intuitive knowledge correctly.”

The intuitive knowledge Wang defined is the activity of fundamental autonomy that everyone ought to possess naturally. The main point of Wang’s intuitive knowledge theory is that we all must act accordingly to the judgements made by the irresistible activity of this intuitive knowledge. Intuitive knowledge is the rules of heaven, the path and the true self. We must make effort to homogenize ourselves to this inner rules of heaven.

The intuitive knowledge Wang Yangming has defined is the work of fundamental life that functions within deep inside our mind. This work of mind we call intuitive knowledge seems to be existent within not only the minds of humans but all creations. “Humans’ intuitive knowledge is

nothing but the intuitive knowledge possessed by grass, trees, bricks and rocks,<sup>21</sup>” Wang states. The intuitive knowledge is so to speak the fundamental vitality immanent in the universe. In fact, Wang also stated that, “the intuitive knowledge is the Spirit of nature and universe. This Spirit has created heaven and earth, goblins, gods and the Lord of Heaven. Everything came out of here<sup>22</sup>.” The intuitive knowledge is not just a simple ethical principle, but is rather the fundamental work of all creations in the universe, and is the creative function. Wang called this function as “the concept of the unity of roots for all things.” It is the foundation on which all creations get united at their roots. The function of the universe that works within the mind of the self is exactly the function of the intuitive knowledge. Human’s mind, heaven and earth are one. For the intuitive knowledge to function vibrantly is for heaven and earth to throb actively. Therefore Wang acknowledges the natural manifestation of humanly emotion as the function of intuitive knowledge. The intuitive knowledge is the fundamental activity of the universe, fundamental life, and the function of creation that infinitely creates all things.

The intuitive knowledge as the fundamental function of the universe is already beyond the concept of good and bad. It was originally the ability to see right-and-wrong and good-and-bad that humans possess naturally, but upon searching for its root, we found that it reaches the cosmic intuitive knowledge that is beyond good and bad. Although the intuitive knowledge as the true form of the mind is the highest good, it is concurrently free from both good and bad<sup>23</sup>. The fundamental intuitive knowledge is something beyond the relative concept of good and bad, and we must think that, if anything, that might be where the good and bad derive from. Rather, we must start from the fundamental intuitive knowledge and get to distinguishing good from bad, and put our best

effort in exercising the intuitive knowledge. That is the true meaning of “exerting intuitive knowledge.

In his authored work titled *Instructions for Practical Living* (“Chuanxilu” in Chinese, “Denshuroku” in Japanese), Wang had mentioned that until the age of forty-five, he still had the mind that was bothered by the praise and censure from people around, but after passing that age, all he believed was what the intuitive knowledge truly approved and denied, and had lost all desire to hide or to make excuses for his actions. He even went so far as to say that his mind was at the state of a “madman,” who did not fear the overdoing<sup>24</sup>. Resigning himself to the ever-vigorous inner self-impulse of the intuitive knowledge, paying no attention to the reputation nor vacillating, not caring if the society called him a “madman,” and just acting in accord with the concept of "the unity of roots for all things" and challenge social evils; that is the action philosophy of Yangmingism (a.k.a., neo-Confucianism). This is also where the behaviorism of Yangmingism that focuses on emotion comes from.

Yangmingism’s judgements of value and action based on the intuitive knowledge are executed as the case-by-case response to each specific situation. The situation changes limitlessly, requiring the corresponding action to change flexibly with it. The intuitive knowledge is not a simple cognitive capability towards an immovable norm, but rather is a live foundation that produces forms of action quickly responding to the situation. There is no fixated form for an action that comes from the intuitive knowledge. In the constantly renewed situation, the intuitive knowledge functions as the foundation of mind, so that it can devise a way to cope the situation on case-by-case basis, rather than it to obey a single rule. The action based on the intuitive knowledge is a subjective

response to each different specific situation, and is one-time-only.

Immovable theorem cannot quickly response to the fluid and specific reality. The action based on the Yangmingism intuitive knowledge intends to abolish the immovable theorem and to respond to the imminent situation with full force. This action philosophy that is unique to the Orient reveals the most profound boundary of the situational ethics that tries to act conscientious according to the situation.

### **The conscience and decision**

As far as the possibility of actions in terms of what kind of action would be thrown in for the future goes, there are infinite choices. However, only one action will be actually executed. We choose one action out of countless possible actions. If we focus on that one action, we are always put in the position of choosing between whether do or don't do that action, and we are constantly forced to choose whether we should or should not execute that action. That choice is made by our decision.

However, in such case, an order based on an ethical law such as "thou shalt do" does not always become the absolute standard for the selection of the action. Rather, since there are also countless numbers of such ethical norms, even if we wanted to execute the action that obeys such norm, we still have to choose which norm we should obey when executing that action. When we execute an action according to one norm, it could be violating another. Again, it is up to our decision which norm to choose.

What type of action to select, or what norm to select needs to be decided

in the most suitable form according to each situation. If the decision was suitable to the situation, that action must be decided on even if it was violating a certain principle or norm. Situational ethics is the ethics of decision.

We must continue to create the most appropriate form of action according to the situation specifically and individually, while taking into account many norms but not being arrested up by them. That is why deliberation is necessary. Ethics is not about standardizing our actions according to a specific rule of action. We must choose the one-time-only and the best action in the situation we are put in. In that sense, the way of action is affected by the each specific situation and therefore action is something relative. There is no such thing as an absolutely right action. We are constantly thrown into the ever-changing situations, and at the same time throwing an action into that ever-changing situation. In a way, we are constantly exposed to the decision-making situation.

The decision of action should not be made simply based on a specific norm. When deciding what action to executing while considering the situation requires another force different from norms. Conscience and intuitive knowledge are such forces beyond norms.

For example, in the situation when the Nazism movement of Hitler was sweeping over Germany, the theologian and pastor Bonhoeffer decided that he must assassinate Hitler. He proceeded to scheme a plan for the action, but was detected before carrying out, resulting in his arrested and execution. Such a heroic action may be far different from our daily actions that does not require much strain. However, it does show the extreme example of what it takes to make a decision for an action.

The decision made by Bonhoeffer was against the norm of “thou shalt not kill,” which has been ever since Moses, and was not a decision that accorded with an ordinary moral law. According to him, the time they were living was when the evil has made its appearance disguised as the light, the good, the truth or the reform, and was not the time that could be comprehended by existing concepts. When in such situation, the only necessary things are the simplicity and wisdom. The simple would only look at God and not pander to the times, and is capable of looking at the reality freely and without prejudice. Therefore the simplicity could turn into wisdom<sup>25</sup>. By simply following his own belief that God is on His way to execute it, Bonhoeffer decided to assassinate Hitler. That was a decision made based on a sole conscience. Even though the result came out unfavorable and his losing life, it was a decision based on the conscience, deep contemplation and profound discerning of the situation of the times.

It does not take the example of the decision made in such a critical situation to see that we must decide our actions on our own within the tense relations between the current situation and various values. Conversely, the decision made by ourselves is what our freedom stands upon. If anything, it is free because it is the decision made by our own will. Moreover, it is free because it is the type of decision that the responsibility of its result assignable to ourselves.

#### 4. Responsibility of Actions

Responsibility of actions and the theory of motivation

Generally speaking, what is customarily referred to as ‘actions’ is not just a simple physical human body movement or physiological function. Actions generally are accompanied by will. Where we desire and intend,



our actions begin. Moreover, this will of ours possesses freedom, because by the will both doing and not doing will be possible. Free will intends, plans, decides and acts.

Commonly, the responsibility of an action is called on the person who had intended, planned and made the decision with his free will. That is why when, in a criminal act, if the crime were intentional, planned and executed based on the self-decision of the criminal himself, the punishment would become more severe.

In *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle also classifies the types of our action into voluntary and involuntary. He states that the voluntary actions are the only action that should be given praise or criticism, and that if an action is executed involuntarily, rather sympathy or sometimes even compassion will be given<sup>26</sup>. If that is the case, the source of the action's responsibility is in whether the action was intended, planned and decided by the doer's free will or not.

The theory of motivation, which pursues the responsibility of actions in the interiority of the subject, especially in the motivation of the action, focuses greatly on this aspect. It is because our actions are usually accompanied by the subjective will and is executed by the subjective will. Unless there was a fact to prove that the action was started by the will of the doer himself, the responsibility of the action cannot be put on him.

Moreover, to be eligible for the responsibility, the action must be executed by the free will of the doer himself. Behind the concept of responsibility is the premise of the freedom of will. The possibility for the imputation of responsibility for actions lies in the freedom of will to choose whether do or don't. Only when the action is executed by the

decision made by free will, can we hold it responsible, criticize it, praise it, regret it or feel guilty about it. Conversely, if the action was executed forcibly or by mental aberration, the doer would not be held responsible. When the action is executed with free will, it will be the action of the doer, and the doer will be held responsible, because the responsibility of the choice is on the self. Moreover, by taking responsibility for the action, the self becomes an independent personality.

### Responsibility of actions and the theory of results

However, Inclining too much towards the theory of motivation, it may become so that, as long as the motivation is right the result tends not to be cared for. The situation into which the action is thrown into and the result thereof should be taken into consideration more.

We often throw one action into a complex situation in which issues correlate with each other. To throw in an action into such circumstance is to surrender the self to the real situation and its rules. It is rather adventurous and there is no telling what result may come out. It may not always be the result willed, intended and planned.

The field in which the action is thrown into is the field of interrelations, and unpredictable accidents could sneak in. Accidents have the power to create any type of results. Therefore, the result of the action will be nondeterministic. That is why there is a chance the willed, intended and planned result may not be achieved.

An action executed out of good will could bring bad result, and so could an action of bad will bring good result. In that sense, no matter how good of will the action was done upon, it is always exposed to the danger

of making a mistake. Nevertheless, we must not blame the result of our action onto the situation and regard it as outside of the scope of our own responsibility. Even if we did not will it or intend it, we must take responsibility for the result of our action.

Hegel also stated in his *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, that for us to execute an action is to surrender ourselves to various rules of reality, and that is when inevitability turns into contingency. Accidental factor always follows the result of action, and it rolls away the action into various unrelated results far away. The reason why Hegel prized the old saying, “the stone becomes the possession of the devil once it is thrown from a hand,” is because he was concerned about this aspect<sup>27</sup>.

Lasson, who compiled the complete works of Hegel, quoted in response to this depiction by Hegel that, in the play titled *The Death of Wallenstein*, Scene Four of Act One, Schiller had had Wallenstein narrate as follows:

While they were within my heart, my actions were my own possession. Once it is presented to the world of strangers out of their native land, from the safe hideout of the mind, they belong to the various spiteful forces that no skill of human could throw off reserve<sup>28</sup>.

Nonetheless, Hegel considers that the result of action must not be neglected, and the doer must take responsibility for the action in its entire scope.

Responsibility ethics

No matter how good of intention the action is executed on, if the

situation the action was thrown into was bad, it does not always bring about a good result. Even so, responsibility ethics takes the stand on taking responsibility to that result. The standpoint of responsibility ethics is based on the result theory, which evaluates the good and bad of action based on its result. It does not consider factors such as the emotion, motive, will or intention of the doer of the action that generated the action as important when judging the good and bad of the action itself.

An action is always executed in a specific situation and within the mesh of social intercorrelation. Therefore, a person in the standpoint of responsibility ethics is assumed to be responsible for the result of an action executed under a such specific situation. When we throw in some kind of an action into the society, we must be prepared to take responsibility to the result generated by the action, even if it turned out disaccording with our intention.

Society is a complicated system that continuously changes based on the intercorrelation of numerous factors. Therefore, what kind of result would be brought about by the action thrown into it is unpredictable to the doer of the action, or to anyone at all. Nevertheless, responsibility ethics humbly takes on the result of the action as the responsibility of the self. We try to act in the most appropriate way, observing the current situation and considering the various effects of the action thrown in there. However, even in such case, it is still impossible to predict beforehand whether the result would turn out to be the most appropriate or not. Still, the standpoint of responsibility ethics dose not blame the result on the situation but takes it as the responsibility of the self. To take responsibility means to be responsible for the self, and to be responsible for the self is equal to being responsible for others. In the

circumstance within the intercorrelation of real-life society, personality will be established when being responsible for the self.

Therefore, from the standpoint of responsibility ethics, there could be a case in which one must take responsibility for an action that was not intended, regarding it as the action of the self. An example of such case is known as the negligence of liability. If you stepped on somebody's foot on an overcrowded train, even it was done without your intention, even it was caused simply by some external physical impact, you still apologize to the person. It is done in accordance with the idea of responsibility ethics, in which we attribute the responsibility of the action to ourselves, even if the action was not done intendedly, acknowledging the action as our own action. For an action to be an action, it does not necessarily always have to be accompanied by will or intention. Even if it was a simple physical motion of your body, it still could be an action.

In *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle focused on involuntary actions and gave some examples as the following; an accidental murder caused by the misrecognition that the tip of a spear was covered by a pad, and accidentally killing a sick patient by giving him medicine with intention to help him<sup>29</sup>. Such actions are not based on voluntary will but on blunders. However, we still have to take on the negligence liability to these actions.

The tragedy of *Oedipus Rex* by Sophocles was also caused by a sin committed unintentionally. Upon being given an oracle from Apollo predicting that his son will eventually kill father, the King Laius of Thebes decided to abandon his son Oedipus, who was born to his wife Jocasta, in the mountains. Oedipus was brought up by the king and

queen of Corinth to attain manhood. After being reviled at one of his friends that his was not a true son of his parents, Oedipus went to Apollo for the Delphic Oracle, which told him his true destiny. He set off on a journey in an attempt to avoid his prophecy to be fulfilled. However, on his way, he encountered an old man and his servant on a narrow road. As a result of a quarrel, he killed the old man without knowing that it was his true father. Oedipus continued on his journey and arrived at Thebes, where he delivered the nation from danger by solving the riddle of the Sphinx and became king. He then married the wife of the former king without knowing that she was his true mother. Then the nation was attacked with the epidemic, and Oedipus asked the cause of it to Apollo, who gave him the advice to get rid of the murderer of the former king. As he searched on, he eventually found out that he was the murderer, and gave in to despair. He then gauged out his eyes and went into a vagrant life.

If this tragedy of Oedipus was to be interpreted from the standpoint of the theory of motivation, Oedipus had no need to feel remorse for his action, because neither killing of his own father nor marrying his true mother were willed or intended by Oedipus himself. Since those actions did not come out of Oedipus' bad will, but are so to speak mistakes, and therefore there is no necessity that he has to feel guilty or take responsibility about them at all.

However, even so, those actions were executed, after all, within the circumstance of a community, where the law of human morality is in effect. Therefore, even though not willed, Oedipus blamed himself and tried to take the responsibility to the result.

When one action is executed, it means that the action is thrown into the

circumstance of intercorrelation of actions inherited from the past to present and from the present to future, regardless of the will and intention of the action. No matter how insignificant the action may be, it must be called a destined action. When taking on the destiny as the one's own, feeling of guilt will be generated. Self is not living on itself alone, but is with the destiny. The tragedy of Oedipus tells the story of a deep source of destiny for himself. That may be where the more profound basis of what we call responsibility lies.

Indeed, when passing judgement for a criminal act, if the action was deliberate the crime will be considered serious, and extenuating circumstances may be pleaded if it were indeliberate and uncontrollable. Taking this fact under consideration, we must not ignore calling to account the responsibility of the action from the aspect of its motivation. This is because in many cases, actions are decided and executed by free will. However, considering that we must take responsibility to the results of actions done by mistakes, the theory of motivation is not sufficient to settle the discussion of responsibility.

Max Weber referred to the ethics that takes responsibility to results as responsibility ethics. The responsibility ethics was originally formulated as the professional ethics mainly for politicians. This is because politicians must take responsibility to the result itself, even though their belief and motivation were good, if the result of the action done based on them came out bad. However, responsibility ethics can be applied not only to the ethics of politics but also to our actions in general. On the contrary, Weber referred to the ethics that valued the purity of feelings as ethics of conviction. Ethics of conviction is mainly formulated as religious ethics. Nevertheless, Weber thought that bringing in such ethics into the field of politics will result in irresponsible actions<sup>30</sup>.

Generally speaking, we tend to be more irresponsible to the results of the action, if focused only on the inner motivation, feelings and conviction. No matter how pure the motivation, feelings and conviction the action was based on, if the result of the action brought about bad influence, we cannot escape from the responsibility of the result. No matter how much value we put in the motivation, feelings and convictions, we must act with sufficient consideration for the result the action may cause, and must take responsibility to the result of the action. It is because action is always executed under complicated circumstances in which things intercorrelate with each other.

#### Notes

- 1 Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, Routledge-Kegan Paul, 1958, 6 • 42 p. 183.
- 2 Ohara, *Jokyo-rinri no kanousei* [The Potential of Situation Ethics], Chuo-koron, 1971, p. 243.
- 3 Fletcher *Jokyo-rinri* (Situation Ethics), Shinkyō-shuppansha, 1971, p. 91.
- 4 *Zhuangzi "Ransacking Coffers."*
- 5 *Tao Te Ching, Chapter 58.*
- 6 Kant, *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft, Werke* (Hersg. Cassirer) V, Bruno Cassirer, 1922, S.70f. (A 110-112).
- 7 *ibid.*, S. 89f. (A144).
- 8 Hegel, *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*, (Ph.B.) Felix Meiner, 1955, §135 S.120f.
- 9 Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes, Gesammelte Werke* Bd. IX, Felix Meiner, 1980, S. 324- S.332.
- 1 0 Kant, *Die Metaphysik der Sitten, Werke* (Hersg. Cassirer) VII, Bruno Cassirer, 1922, S. 225ff.
- 1 1 *ibid.*, S.240-S.243.



- 1 2 Hegel, op. cit., S. 241-S. 251.
- 1 3 Kant, *Über ein vermeintes Recht Menschen liebe zu lügen, Gesammelte Schriften* (Hersg.Akademie) VIII, G. Reimer, 1923, S.423-S.430.
- 1 4 Fletcher, Ibid., p. 41.
- 1 5 Kant, *Die Metaphysik der Sitten*, S.211.
- 1 6 Hegel, *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*, §137 S.121-S.123.
- 1 7 Ibid., §139 S.124f.
- 1 8 Mencius, *Jin Xin I*.
- 1 9 Wang Yangming, *Chuanxiliu II*.
- 2 0 Ibid., p. 559-560.
- 2 1 Ibid., p. 540.
- 2 2 Ibid., p. 533.
- 2 3 Ibid., p. 556.
- 2 4 Ibid., p. 558.
- 2 5 Bonhoeffer, *Gendai Kirisuto-kyo Rinri* (Modern Christian Ethics), Shinkyō-shuppansha, 1962,  
p. 16-21.
- 2 6 Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea*, 1109b.
- 2 7 Hegel, op.cit., §117-§119 S.107-S.109, §132 S.117.
- 2 8 Schiller, Wallenstein II Wallensteins Tod, Reclam, 1982, Bd. II, S.10f.
- 2 9 Aristoteles, op.cit., 1111a.
- 3 0 Weber, *Politik als Beruf, Gesammelte Politische Schriften*, J. C. B. Mohr, 1988, S.551-S.560.