

Spring 2019

Integrity and Its Relationship to Morality

Hyun Jeong Kang

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kang, H. J.(2019). *Integrity and Its Relationship to Morality*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/5156>

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

INTEGRITY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO MORALITY

by

Hyun Jeong Kang

Bachelor of Arts
Chonnam National University, 2002

Master of Arts
Chonnam National University, 2005

Master of Arts
University of Missouri-Columbia, 2010

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in

Philosophy

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2019

Accepted by:

Christopher O. Tollefsen, Major Professor

Konstantin Pollok, Committee Member

Jennifer Frey, Committee Member

Thomas P. Crocker, Committee Member

Cheryl L. Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by Hyun Jeong Kang, 2019
All Rights Reserved.

ABSTRACT

Some scholars take it for granted that one's possession of integrity has nothing to do with one's moral quality whereas others believe that they are no doubt intertwined. Hume, for instance, holds that a person who ambitiously tries to gain a great achievement can still be a person of integrity even if he is dishonest with others. Plato's concept of integrity can be formulated in the way that a person with morally vicious commitments has disunity in his soul and fails to possess integrity. In order to decide which side is right, I suggest that we examine the most promising current views on integrity and see whether the most appropriate one can offer an answer to the relationship between integrity and morality.

The integrated-self view turns out to be the most appropriate one out of five promising theories. According to the integrated-self view, integrity is a unification of one's inner desires or volitions in the way that one does not fail to make up one's mind. According to my version of the view, however, the integration of oneself would not be complete if one does not take considerations of how others think of his actions or decisions. Especially when you try to decide on an action that you think that others would disagree with, you would ask

yourself 'Are you okay with the way that other people see you with this new decision?' Such decision-making is a certain compromise between the way that you reflect upon how other people would think of yourself and the way that you reflect upon yourself with the decision. My argument suggests that if a person possesses integrity, it usually means that he does not have the morally vicious commitments or principles that other people would obnoxiously disagree with.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	iii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The Need for a New Approach to the Moralized View of Integrity	5
1. The Nature of the Debate on the Moralized View of Integrity	6
2. Why is There No Easy Way Out from the Question?	17
3. What are the Unmoralized Views of Integrity?	23
4. Hume's Account of Integrity.....	27
5. Aristotle's Account of Integrity	46
6. Conclusion	58
Chapter 2: The Moralized View of Integrity	60
1. What are the Moralized Views of Integrity?	61
2. Plato's Account of Integrity	62
3. Kant's Account of Integrity	70
4. Lack of Motivational Thoughts Problem.....	77
5. Integrity and Virtue	87
6. Conclusion	95
Chapter 3: Accounts of What It is to Possess Integrity	96

1. Five Competing Views	100
2. Why Certain Views are not the Answers	104
3. Objections against the Integrated-self View	140
4. Conclusion	154
Chapter 4: Three Versions of the Integrated-self View	155
1. Frankfurt's Version of the Integrated-self View	157
2. Korsgaard's Version of the Integrated-self View	168
3. Unification of Your View and Other People's View of Yourself	181
4. Conclusion	204
Chapter 5: General Conclusion – An Answer to the 'Moral Nature' Question ...	205
Bibliography	229

INTRODUCTION

What is it to possess integrity? What is the correct way of explaining the relationship between integrity and morality? In fact, could a person committing to a vicious principle still be regarded as a person of integrity? For some scholars it is quite obvious that integrity is not restricted to any particular commitments. Rawls, for instance, thinks that the virtues of integrity “allo[w] for most any content.” On the other hand, people often seem to associate integrity with a person’s intact soul or character when they give a compliment or criticize someone’s personality.

Handling this issue is tricky since morality’s relevance to integrity has to do with how we define integrity and how we define integrity has to do with morality’s relevance to integrity. One good way to resolve the issue is that we look at each promising theory of integrity and see how well the view faces some challenges and how well it respects the relevance of the question in hand. If we can find good evidence that one theory is far better than the others, then we can examine the theory carefully in order to find an answer from the theory.

The integrated-self view seems to be the most appropriate one out of the most promising theories. According to the integrated-self view, a person must integrate various parts of himself into one in order to possess integrity. The view holds that integrity is a unification of one's inner desires or volitions in the way that one does not fail to make up one's mind. According to my version of the view, however, the integration of oneself would be complete only when one takes considerations of how others think of his actions or decisions. Whenever you make a decision for your action, you would necessarily engage with the decision between the self that you see as yourself and the self that other people see as yourself. When you make a decision for an action, there is always a suggested self that is brought up by others in your mind. Especially when you try to decide on an action that you think that others would disagree with, you would ask yourself 'Are you okay with the way that other people see you with this new decision?' Such decision-making is a certain compromise in the sense that you are deciding between the way that you reflect upon how other people would think of yourself with the decision and the way that you reflect upon yourself with the decision.

My argument suggests a certain relationship between integrity and morality. The first does not guarantee the second. Even if a person possesses integrity it does not mean that he also possesses morally good characteristics or a

moral unification. Still, if a person possesses integrity, it usually means that he does not have the morally vicious commitments or principles that other people would obnoxiously disagree with. As a matter of fact, it would be highly unlikely that a morally vicious person has unified himself in the way that other people can also see. Thus, we can say that integrity implies morality in general and that they go hand in hand in most cases. The view that I propose reveals a certain fact about the social nature of persons. Recent research suggests that even as young as 15-month-old infants have the correct projections of how another person would behave based on their understanding of the person's belief. My view brings together the discussion of integrity with such social nature of persons. The tight relationship between integrity and morality is in line with the fact a human being is essentially a social creature who is very much attentive to other people's beliefs and desires. As such a being we attend to other people's minds even in our self-integration.

The order of chapters is as follows. In Chapter 1 I raise the question of the relationship between integrity and morality. In Chapter 2 I present the moralized view of integrity whilst I defend against the idea that integrity is a virtue. In Chapter 3 I discuss competing views on the conceptions of integrity. I criticize three different views and then conclude that the integrated-self view is the most appropriate one. In Chapter 4, I compare two versions of the integrated-self view

and consider the weaknesses of each view in order to find a better version between them. Finally, in Chapter 5, I derive a moralized view of integrity from the integrated-self view. The integrated-self view tells us why a person with a vicious commitment is unlikely to be counted as a person of integrity.

CHAPTER 1

THE NEED FOR A NEW APPROACH TO THE MORALIZED VIEW OF INTEGRITY

In this introductory chapter I present the problem of the relationship between integrity and morality. Since my main goal in other chapters is to defend the moralized view of integrity, I want to make clear the debate between the moralized view and the unmoralized view. To put it more precisely, I introduce the question of whether a person acknowledged possessing morally vicious commitments or principles could still be regarded as a person of integrity.

I will offer an explanation of why we need a new approach to the question. Along with this, I will consider the common people's understanding of the usage of the word 'integrity' as well as why disagreements on morality do not hinder our discussion. I will also consider some of the ideas that could be misread as the same question as mine. After this, I will see whether the question that I address here is a genuine one by examining some easy ways out from the question. Lastly, as a part of the explanation of the question in hand, I will elaborate some cases of my opponent's view of the unmoralized position by examining why

the philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle could be read as taking such a position.

1. The Nature of the Debate on the Moralized View of Integrity

For some people, Hitler who did anything in order to achieve what he wanted, could be considered as a person of integrity in that he showed the quality of sticking to what he believed in. For some scholars, it is obvious that integrity is not restricted to any particular commitments. John Rawls, for instance, thinks that the virtues of integrity “allo[w] for most any content” and “it is impossible to construct a moral view from these virtues alone.”¹

Past usages, on the other hand, suggest that integrity was often used to associate with a person’s intact soul, body, or character.² Although it could mean that integrity carried so much of a moral connotation in the past that it is anachronistic from our current perspective, it also means for some scholars that there is some truth in the usage. In order to defend the idea that morality and

¹ John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), p. 456. Agreeing with Rawls’s point, Schaubert goes even further that integrity is not a virtue worthwhile to pursue at all. Nancy Schaubert, “Integrity, Commitment and the Concept of a Person,” *American Philosophical Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (1996): 119-129.

In his discussion of the relationship between integrity and alienation, Flanagan agreeing with Rawls takes for granted that integrity allows any kind of content. Owen Flanagan, *Varieties of Moral Personality: Ethics and Psychological Realism* (Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1991), Chapter 4.

² *Oxford English Dictionary*, Second edition, 1989.

integrity should go hand in hand, some scholars emphasize rationality or morality or both as requirement(s) of possessing integrity.³

If integrity requires rationality, one cannot simply insist that a person acknowledged to be evil could also be a person of integrity. A person with a vicious commitment would be regarded as not having integrity once a theory provides a reason to believe that having a vicious commitment is not a rational one. Although it would require a sophisticated theory, it could give us a reason to doubt that any sort of the principles that a person follows would be rational. In the same vein, if morality is one important requirement to possessing integrity, an evil person is not a person of integrity. By definition, the meaning of integrity would include morality so that having a vicious commitment would simply tell that the person does not have integrity.

The question is how they successfully defend the idea that either rationality or morality is a requirement for integrity. Unless they offer a full story of the relationship among those things, it would be difficult to see whether morality is a requirement for integrity. This leads to a further question of what

³ Mark Halfon defends a rationality condition in his book, *Integrity: A Philosophical Inquiry* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989). Graham thinks that moral reasons should be a condition of possessing integrity. Jody L. Graham, "Does integrity require moral goodness?" *Ratio* XIV, no. 3 (2001): 234-251, p. 239. For different positions on this, see Greg Scherkoske, *Leading a Convincing Life: Integrity and the Virtues of Reason* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013a), pp. 4-9. Scherkoske's position itself is a sort of the emphasis of a rationality condition. Korsgaard thinks that both of them are essential for integrity. Christine M. Korsgaard, *Self-Constitution: Agency, Identity, and Integrity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).

exactly it is to possess integrity. This is because it is more likely to be the case that whether the concepts of integrity should include morality requirement or not depends on the explanation of what it is to possess integrity.

1.1 *The 'conception of integrity' question and the 'moral nature' question*

Although the question of what it is to possess integrity is important, I want to focus on the initial question that I started with: 'whether a person acknowledged to be evil can possess integrity?' Most theorists have discussed the question only as a part of their projects rather than dealing with the question itself. People who think that integrity does not necessarily go with morality do not feel that it is necessary to defend the idea, whereas the opponents do not think that it is a separate question to ask because it is a part of their position to accept it naturally.⁴

Furthermore, it is less discussed in connection with analytically distinct conceptions. While it is good that the nature of integrity is discussed on its own,

⁴ What I have in mind is such a position that is taken by virtue ethicists. Although Cox and La Caze and Levine criticize Blustein for his argument's 'elusiveness,' their argument is not better. According to them, "[i]t is *almost always* a mistake ... to attribute integrity to those who 'get things morally so wrong' by supposing that they are simply morally mistaken in the alleged principles... They incorrectly see courage and principle where they should see narcissistic envy, self-hatred, cowardice, self-deception, and ignorance. Giving one's life is neither necessary nor sufficient for courage or principled action." Damian Cox, Marguerite La Caze, and Michael P Levine, *Integrity and the Fragile Self* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 59; Jeffrey Blustein, *Care and commitment: taking the personal point of view* (New York; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 122-126. Christine M. Korsgaard could be regarded as an exception. She does take this question seriously in her book *Self-Constitution*, and I will deal with her position in detail later.

it is more illuminating to see why a certain view is closer to explain what integrity is and in what sense morality is a necessary condition for the conception of integrity. Once we discuss the question in hand with distinct conceptions of integrity, it would be clearer why it is better to understand integrity either with the connection with morality or not.

Thus, there are two different questions that are addressed in this project. The first, the main question of this project, is whether a person committing to morally questionable principles could be a person of integrity. I will call this question the 'moral nature' question. In order to address this question, we need to ask another question: what is it to possess integrity? I will call this second question the 'conception of integrity' question. The first question concerns a certain nature of integrity. It is about whether we should include moral aspect as a part of the account of what integrity is. The second question is about a general conception of what integrity is.

The main goal of this project is to obtain the answer to the moral nature question. On the other hand, the conception of integrity question is necessary to be resolved in order to gain the answer to the first question. When we examine different accounts of the conception of integrity, we would also be able to tell what kind of answer the accounts of conception of integrity would give regarding the moral nature question. This is because defining integrity would

involve considering many different natures or aspects of integrity and the moral nature is a matter of one specific aspect of integrity. If we are able to tell which account of conception of integrity is the best, we would be able to focus on what the account has to say regarding the moral nature question.

Although I will discuss the relationship between these two questions in Chapter 3, a brief consideration between them already tells one particular characteristic of the main question that I deal with. In this project, my main assumption is that it is wrong to disregard the seriousness of the two questions. This means that an adequate theory on the conception of integrity question should give proper consideration of the fact that the moral nature question is a genuine question as well.

It may turn out to be, at the end of the day, that the most adequate account of the conception of integrity tells that there is a tight connection between morality and integrity so that a person who commits to morally questionable principles is not a person of integrity at all. Yet, an account of integrity that secures this result from the start by ruling out a certain type of person from people of integrity would seem implausible. If we assume that morality is the same as integrity and a person who has morally questionable principles is not counted as a person of integrity, we do not do justice to people's common intuition that the gist of integrity is sticking to one's own principles or

commitments. This is because people's puzzlement about the moral nature question starts from the very intuition that there is something positive about sticking to one's own principles or commitments and yet it appears not to be enough for the entire story about integrity.

1.2 The attitude towards the common or the average person's understanding

The common usages of integrity could suggest to some people that the word 'integrity' is used differently within contexts so that it does not have any distinct meaning. For instance, you often hear that people use 'integrity' to mean exactly the same as 'honesty.' Some people, on the other hand, would use it even to mean a physical or bodily intact.⁵ If there is this much of diversity among people's understandings of the word, it seems hard to grasp what it means.

Even if this is the case, it is still meaningful to find out what the concept of integrity is and what kind of person would be regarded as a person of integrity. If we accept any kind of person as a person of integrity, it would not be philosophically interesting why the person is called a person of integrity. More importantly, it would simply make the question in hand disappear from our philosophical domain. Therefore, it would be wrong to think that an adequate

⁵ For instance, Burrow argues that a woman's physical protection within this violent society is essential to her integrity since her fear of violence could restrict her choices or commitments. Sylvia Burrow, "Protecting One's Commitments: Integrity and Self-Defense," *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 26, no. 1 (2012): 49-66.

theory on the conception of integrity question should accommodate all the different usages that any average person would use.

An adequate theory, however, needs to accommodate some basic intuitions of what the average person thinks of integrity. This is because we cannot simply drop the relevance of our usage of the word. Even if it is the case that a philosophical discussion reveals some new aspects of integrity, we cannot accept a theory which does not even remotely reflect what integrity means to the average person.

It is, however, difficult to tell who the average person is and which usages of the word 'integrity' we should respect. Still, there are some basic usages to which we need to pay attention. I assume, for instance, that when we point out a person's possession or lack of integrity we mean it as an evaluative term. When a person says that someone does not have integrity, we could understand it simply as a descriptive term. The person could be using the word, without any judgment, to report a fact that another person has such and such characteristics. On the other hand, a person could use it to point out that another person's lack of integrity is undesirable so that the person has some faulty characteristics.

I will simply assume that someone's description of possessing or failing to possess integrity goes beyond the descriptive claim. Any plausible theory would

tell us why a certain type of person possesses integrity and why a certain other type does not. This may be enough for a *plausible* theory. An adequate theory, however, should not ignore the fact that most people in their daily life use the word as an evaluative term. When you use the word 'integrity,' you do not simply mean that the person has such and such quality. You often mean that there is something desirable or undesirable about the person because of his possession or lack of possession of integrity. Therefore, an adequate theory of the conception of integrity should not eliminate the very phenomenon that we use the word as an evaluative claim.

*1.3 Questions the debate on the moralized view of integrity is **not** concerned with*

As I have elaborated, the question of this project is whether a person committing to morally questionable principles could be a person of integrity. Some people may take this question in different ways from my understanding and I want to make it clear what I am asking here.

Here is one possibility to understand it: whether a person of integrity is statistically more like a person who would not have morally questionable principles? It could be the case that a person who possesses integrity is likely to be the one with morally good principles. Suppose that scholars find out that a person of integrity statistically possesses such and such qualities and one of them

is the tendency to comply with the morally good principles. Would it be enough to say that integrity and morality should go hand in hand?

My concern here is not about any statistical possibility of the relationship. The question is not about whether there is a more statistical probability of one over the other. It may turn out to be the case that all the people of integrity tend to possess moral quality. Still, this empirical fact does not prove that a vicious person is not also a person of integrity. Regardless of whether there are more people of integrity with morally good commitments in the world, it is still a question to ask whether the concept of integrity has to do with morality.

One could also understand the question as the probability of obtainment of integrity within a person. It could be the case that integrity is related to other qualities that a person has and that whether a person possesses integrity or not could be diagnosed by checking those relevant qualities. Suppose that a person's obtainment of the quality of integrity is deeply related to the capacity of reasoning. If that is the case, then whether a person is a rational one or not would be a good indicator of whether the person has integrity or not. Then, in the case where a person has a great capacity of reasoning, should we now say that such a person is a person of integrity? The problem is that the original question is now rendered into another one such as this: 'whether a person committing to morally

questionable principles also possesses another quality that is potentially related to the quality of integrity?’

I do not deny that a person’s likelihood of the obtainment of integrity may be relevant to what integrity is. Nonetheless, the question is not about the likelihood of whether we figure out correctly which person would turn out to be a person of integrity. The question of this project has more to do with what should be the case considering the real meaning of integrity. The explanation of in what sense integrity is related to morality matters as well.

The relation between integrity and morality should be taken on its own, not by relating them to some other qualities. This is not simply because it would make things more complicated. On the contrary, considering the difficulty to decide which one of the questions between the moral nature question and the conception of integrity question should be examined first, it might make things easier. Nonetheless, the real meaning of integrity would not come to light if we turn the question into something else. And this seems to be exactly what is happening here if we start examining a third concept rather than considering the relationship between integrity and morality directly.

Thirdly, people could consider the task of the moralized view as the one with an unnecessarily high standard. Here is one way to read the moralized

view: if a person possesses integrity, the person has morally good commitments. However, this is not the only position that the moralized view can take. So far, I have been using it in a loose way, too. But technically, what the moralized view needs to prove is not that integrity and morality go hand in hand. The question that we are raising is more like this: even if someone has morally vicious commitments, would it still be regarded as a person of integrity? That is, even if we assume that most people with the possession of integrity turn out to be with morally good commitments, would it still be fine to call another group of people also as people of integrity?

As I indicated, there is one most straightforward way to offer a negative answer to the moral nature question. It is to find a way to show that the concept of integrity includes the concept of morality. This conceptual impossibility of the separation of integrity and morality is established if there is no case where a person of integrity could ever violate the morally right codes. I cannot go into detail here how this could be possible. Anyway, this line of the answer needs to offer an explanation of why these two things are inseparable from each other.

There seems to be, however, another way to prove that these two things go hand in hand. A person's impossibility to possess a vicious commitment could be a much weaker sense. For instance, a person who turns out to be a person of integrity could have some psychological difficulty to commit to

morally vicious commitments. In this case, the tightness of the relationship between these two concepts would be less. But there is still the sense in which integrity and morality go together. As it will turn out, what I defend is this weaker sense of the relationship.

2. Why is There No Easy Way Out from the Question?

Some people may wonder what I mean by 'morally vicious commitments.' Since this project asks the relevance of morality to the concept of integrity, one would think that it is hard to gain the answer if there is not much agreement on the concept of morality. If one agrees even further that there is no real agreement on the concept of morality, the question of this project would sound nonsensical. Therefore, the question that I have presented would be a simple mistake for such a person.

However, I do not think that the disagreement presents as much issue to our discussion. First, even if there is a various amount of disagreement of what would be the morally right action or actions in a certain circumstance, there is also a considerable amount of agreement on what should be regarded as morally vicious commitments. If we assume at least that there is a decent amount of agreement on this matter, this would be enough for our discussion. For this

reason, I will assume that morality refers normatively to “a code of conduct that ... would be put forward by all rational persons.”⁶

The question of this project is not really about what kind of action would belong to a person of integrity as well as to a morally good person. Although a certain type of action or actions may be relevant to our discussion, the question has more to do with the characteristics of people of integrity. In other words, the question is whether a certain type of person, who is obviously regarded as committing to morally vicious principles, would still be considered as one of the people of integrity. For this reason, if a person’s action brings serious debate regarding whether it is morally right, such a marginal case would be better off to remain in a separate discussion. Thus, the real issue is not whether a certain type of action would be regarded as a morally good action. The more relevant issue is whether the gist of integrity would be explained in terms of morality in general.

Although I said that clarifying the boundary of morality is not this project’s concern, there is undoubtedly one thing that will be the outcome of this discussion in terms of the nature of morality. As I explained above, one of our

⁶ Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (entry: The Definition of Morality) <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/morality-definition/>

“the term “morality” can be used either

1. descriptively to refer to certain codes of conduct put forward by a society or a group (such as a religion), or accepted by an individual for her own behavior, or
2. normatively to refer to a code of conduct that, given specified conditions, would be put forward by all rational persons.”

primary jobs is to find an adequate theory of the conception of integrity. After this, we should figure out what implication that specific theory would bring to the moral nature question. The adequate theory will offer an explanation of how the essence of integrity is relevant to the concept of morality and the explanation will shed some light on the nature of morality. Therefore, it would be part of this project to show how we should understand a certain aspect of morality.

Some people may also wonder what kind of implication this discussion will bring to the people who do not believe in any sort of morality. I must confess that an amoralist is not the target reader of this project. For those people who do not believe in any sort of morality, it could be meaningless to show the relationship between integrity and morality. Nonetheless, it would give them some insights on how to understand morality if there *were* any sort of morality.

There is another mistake to think that the question of this project could be resolved easily. One may think that once we figure out which moral theory is better, it would tell us how to think of integrity and its relationship to morality. It could appear to some people that once we figure out which moral theory is better, it will give us some insights to the question of this project. For instance, a moral theory such as virtue ethics could seem to be closer to the idea that integrity and morality should go hand in hand whereas consequentialism and Kantian moral theory appear hostile to the idea. Therefore, one would think that

if we decide which side of the moral theories is better we could resolve this project's problem.

Nonetheless, the problem is not resolved in this way. Even among theories that should be categorized in the same moral theories, there are real disputes about the relationship between integrity and morality. In response to Bernard Williams's attack on consequentialism,⁷ for instance, there are different versions of consequentialism which offer different explanations on what should be taken as his point regarding integrity and consequentialism. Since there are so many ways to interpret William's understanding of what integrity means in his criticism,⁸ there are also different ways for theorists to think about what would be the real implications on consequentialism.⁹ This means that there are also different ways for us to think whether a certain version of consequentialism would say that there is a tight relationship between integrity and morality. One version of consequentialism could say that they should go hand in hand whereas a different version could say an entirely different thing. Then, it does not help for our project which moral theory would be counted as the best one.

⁷ Bernard Williams, "Integrity," in J.J.C. Smart and B. Williams, *Utilitarianism: For and Against* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

⁸ For instance, see Lisa Rivera, "Sacrifices, Aspirations and Morality: Williams Reconsidered," *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 10 (2007): 69-87, pp. 71-72.

⁹ See, for instance, Paul Hurley, *Beyond Consequentialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), Chapter 4. For an example to defend consequentialism against Williams's criticism, see Peter Railton, "Alienation, Consequentialism, and the Demands of Morality" in S. Scheffler (ed), *Consequentialism and Its Critics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

Finally, there is another possibility to nullify the question of this project. One could think that we can separate moral integrity from personal integrity. In her paper “Does integrity require moral goodness” Jody L. Graham considers the idea to make a distinction between those two integrities. As she understands, we may be able to appreciate the fact that the person with an evil character is often “not so obviously immoral, but instead struggles between fulfilling obligations to others and fulfilling his own desires or projects.”¹⁰

It is a genuine question to ask the relationship between personal integrity and moral integrity although this project is not intended to answer the question. It would be one simple solution to the question that I pursue in this project if we can separate these two kinds of integrity. If that were the case, we would be able to say that integrity incorporates two separate kinds of integrity so that an evil person could still possess personal integrity whereas he does not have moral integrity. In this project, my assumption is that moral integrity and personal integrity are not two separable things. Although I do not delve into the issue in this project, I will discuss the reason briefly.

Jody L. Graham argues that it does not make sense that one’s personal integrity, but not one’s moral integrity, is threatened.¹¹ Graham gives an example

¹⁰ Graham, “Does integrity require moral goodness?” p. 239.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 238-241.

of James Baldwin's commitments. James Baldwin struggled between his two commitments. One was his commitment to his craft and the other was his commitment to the community during the civil rights movements. Because he had to continue to serve his community, he was forced to a public life. And this hindered his ability to do the first commitment effectively since the craft required him to spend time alone. According to Graham, when James Baldwin struggled between his artistic commitment and his social commitment, his struggle was also between his 'personal integrity, artistic integrity, and moral integrity.' Graham argues, however, that a right description of the conflict is the one within morality, "namely a choice to adhere to artistic principles or to abandon them for the sake of some other obligation." After all, Baldwin's question was not 'should I opt for moral integrity or personal/aesthetic integrity?' but 'what should I do?'¹²

The problem may not simply be because we don't know how to separate one's personal integrity from moral integrity. What makes the explanation of the

¹² I am not sure if the example represents the conflicts between two kinds of integrity. One could say that the example only shows that there was a problem with figuring out the right time to do this or that and if one can satisfy with the compromise of the time split, there is no genuine conflict from the beginning. Baldwin's difficulty was not an infringement of his artistic principle but finding the time to complete his artistic work. It makes the issue of the relationship between moral integrity and personal integrity a contingent issue.

Still, there is a genuine conflict between one's artistic integrity and one's moral integrity in the case of Kevin Carter. He committed suicide after receiving the Pulitzer Prize for taking a picture of a starving Sudanese child being stalked by a vulture. Even though Carter could and did help the child, the fact that he even thought of the ways to make a good photo when he saw the scene bothers many people. The conflict that Carter might have is not the time split between two separate things. For most people, and presumably for Carter as well, in the end, one's moral integrity, as well as his personal integrity, was infringed upon when he thought of taking the photo and acted upon the thought.

relationship more difficult is not just the nature of morality but also the nature of moral theories. One's trivial activities, which presumably are a part of one's personal integrity, are irrelevant to one's moral integrity according to some moral theories whereas they are not according to some other theories. For instance, utilitarianism could point out different details of a person's life from deontology regarding what should be counted in for decision-making. Unless we think that there is one correct moral theory to explain what is relevant to one's moral decision, it would be difficult to separate one's personal integrity from moral integrity.

3. What are the Unmoralized Views of Integrity?

Before I present my position, I need to show what exactly the debate is between the moralized view of integrity and the unmoralized view of integrity. Although I described the debate between them briefly, it is necessary to make sense of my opponent position more clearly.

Some people may have a hard time even imagining the immoral principles as a possession of a person of integrity. Although I suggested already that a philosopher such as Rawls would commit to such a view, it may not be obvious for those people how one could solidly defend the idea that such a person could possess integrity. This seems more so considering that what Rawls

did in the context was to extract the formal notion of integrity from the ordinary sense of integrity. At least in the passage where he disputes integrity as a plausible candidate value for us to rely on, he considers it only as a virtue that a person can formulate in whichever he wants to design. According to him, “[i]f no one knows what is true, at least we can make our beliefs our own in our own way and not adopt them as handed to us by others.”¹³ More importantly, there is a doubt that Rawls was denying such a heavy notion of integrity mainly because it was a necessary part of his view. As he wanted to suggest his own alternative view of the social contract, he had to deny the heavy notion of integrity. Since he does not even try to examine the notion at least in the passage, it is hard to say that he actually denies the heavy notion *per se*; it is likely that he did not need to engage in the discussion of the notion of integrity as long as his own theory works well.

As a matter of fact, people may have a good reason for their intuition that integrity is only for a morally good person. Even if theoretically one would be able to formulate the dry notion of integrity, people may believe that it is practically hard to find the actual case where a person who lives a great life is still with vicious commitments. For instance, once a person tries to possess

¹³ Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, p. 455.

integrity he would finally come to realize the wrongness of his commitments in reality.

For such a reason, even if ordinary people are convinced by philosophers that the real meaning of integrity is such and such, they may still believe that only a good person is a person of integrity. Although Hitler may have done many great things that other people could not dare to achieve, those ordinary people would say that he is not a person of integrity. He is not a good person after all. It is deeply embedded in an ordinary person's mind that if a person possesses integrity he or she is a good or even a great person. Therefore, it may sound nonsensical to say that a person with a vicious principle, which is presumably far from a good person, would be a person of integrity.

Indeed, there seems to be some typical case that most people imagine as a person of integrity. Although integrity could be separable from the other good qualities, one would believe that in most cases it is likely that they go hand in hand. Underneath such a picture, there is a tight connection between a person living a great life and a person possessing the quality of integrity. It seems for many people that if one commits to vicious principles he cannot be regarded as leading a great life and does not possess integrity.

However, it is not too difficult to find an elaborated view of this side even from the ones who admit that integrity is indeed a part of a good or a meaningful life. For instance, Hume is famously committed to the idea that a virtuous life is a good life. It is interesting to see, for this reason, that there is a seed of the idea that a person who commits to immoral principles would lead a good or even great life as well as possess integrity. With Aristotle's virtuous person I will try one more case where a person, who may be with a vicious principle, could still be taken as possessing integrity. What is common between Hume and Aristotle is that they both share the idea that a person should be good in order to be happy or to have a flourishing life. So, it is surprising to see that their views could read as the unmoralized view of integrity.

One thing that I have to assume from the beginning is that wholeheartedness is a certain sense of integrity for Hume as well as for Aristotle. Since a part of this project is to find the answer to what integrity is, we do not know what integrity is at this point. It would even require a substantial argument to explain why wholeheartedness could be a gist of integrity. For instance, I would even need to give an answer to why a person with a wholehearted mind would not have many disconnected commitments but only several important commitments that explain one's life patterns. Nonetheless, the purpose of this discussion is only to give a sense of what would be like to have a

position that a morally vicious person could also be a person of integrity. Thus, assuming that wholeheartedness towards one's commitment is one important part of having integrity for many people,¹⁴ I will build the case of Hume's and Aristotle's integrity based on the assumption.

4. Hume's Account of Integrity

Some people may read Hume as saying that there is no such thing as integrity rather than saying that there is integrity which does not require any moral commitment. Some may argue accepting Hume that if there is only a bundle of impressions but not a unified conception of self, there is no such thing as integrity. If we cannot even assume the possibility of self, it would be impossible to describe how one formulates a certain personality or character traits of the self. Since the concept of integrity which I attribute to as Hume's view heavily relies upon the possibility of the concept of character, I will discuss the issue in detail before I move on to how I understand Hume's view of integrity. A part of the reason that I take the issue seriously is that anyone could doubt the possibility to draw a concept of integrity if he or she takes Hume's causal theory seriously.

¹⁴ See, for instance, Harry Frankfurt, "Identification and wholeheartedness," in F. Schoeman (ed), *Responsibility, character, and the emotions: new essays in moral psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 42.

First of all, one may wonder whether what Hume says in his metaphysics or epistemology could be exactly applied to his moral psychology. It could be presumptuous to think that those areas have exactly the same contents.¹⁵ However, in his discussion of moral psychology, especially in Book 3 of *Treatise*¹⁶ Hume uses the word 'character' many times. This tells us that Hume accepts a certain sense of character. He, however, does not explain what he means by 'character.' He might have thought that he does not need to explain it because he is accepting the average people's notion. Or, he might have thought that he does not have any clear distinction between motives and characters. Still, the words 'character' and 'motive' seem to be often interchangeable, and some scholars think that they are the same things or there is no real difference.

Before moving on to a real discussion, the following question seems to arise naturally. What difference does it make regarding Hume's overall theory?

¹⁵ In *Treatise of Human Nature*, Hume's purported project is to provide 'an accurate proof of [the] system of ethics' (3.3.6.1). It is generally accepted that his entire project is to describe moral sentiment rather than offering a normative claim on morality. For that very reason, Hume's account needs to be based on his understanding of how people feel and think about other people. This seems to imply that his explanation needs to include how, he thinks, the average people understand the conception of character, rather than how he himself understands the conception.

If Hume accepts that people think that others have characters, then many parts of his discussion might be his understanding of others' thoughts, rather than his own notions. Then, when we ask how Hume understands the notion of character, the real question that we are asking is how Hume thinks that other people in general think about character. It means that we are asking what role the notion of character plays in our moral psychology according to the average people's understanding. So, it is not plausible to draw Hume's real notion of character from his discussion of moral psychology.

¹⁶ David Hume (1739), *Treatise of Human Nature*, D.F. Norton & M.J. Norton (eds) (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

What does Hume's view amount to if they are the same things or not? For simplicity, we can call the view that character and motive are the same things 'the thin notion of character.' According to this view, character is thin because every motive is the same as character and there is no need to assume that character bears a heavy notion such as durability or consistency. On the other hand, we can call the view that character and motive are not the same things 'the thick notion of character.' According to the view, character is thick because character means a durable and consistent element within an agent. At first glance, the thin notion of character seems to be more consistent with Hume's general view. I will discuss more in detail why I think that this is not necessarily the case. First, we need to understand the thick notion more carefully. Most people seem to agree that character is what is durable or constant to an agent. As a matter of fact, Hume seems to give some merit on the view. "The action itself may be blameable; ... But the person is not responsible for it; and as it proceeded from nothing in him, that is durable or constant."¹⁷ At least, Hume seems to agree that there could be something durable or constant within an agent.

Still, if Hume's view needs to rebut the concept of durable or constant character, what does it exactly mean by the 'durable or constant character'? Does it mean 'not changeable'? If character means 'never changeable under any

¹⁷ Ibid., 2.3.2.6.

circumstance,' it would be a view that no one would hold since it is too absurd to assume that a person's character never changes. So, it seems obvious that Hume would deny the view. Then, what is the view that some scholars want to deny as Hume's view? I think that there are at least two different interpretations of 'durable or constant character.' One meaning would be that there is some commonality among an agent's different motives. For instance, if one intentionally sabotages her sister's date and ruins her friend's wedding, then one could say that the two actions have some commonality in terms of her character trait of jealousy. Another meaning would be that there is some degree of consistency among an agent's motives. Suppose the same agent in the example also pretends to bump into a man who she secretly has affection for. We could say that her actions or motives are consistent in the sense that she does whatever she thinks best for herself. This second sense of character seems rather loose than the first.

If scholars who are against the thick notion of character maintain that motives and characters are switchable, then they seem to deny even the consistency of someone's motives. Their view holds that a person acts from discontinuous, different motives depending on circumstances. In what follows, I will defend the idea that such a thin notion of character is impossible.

In "Complexities of Character: Hume on Love and Responsibility,"¹⁸ Nancy Schaubert argues that Hume's moral theory does not require a robust concept of character. In order to defend the idea that Hume's view is well understood with the thin notion of character, she addresses our practice of attribution of responsibility. Her basic idea is that we do not assume that a person has a durable or consistent character, but only that a person has a certain motive. According to her, we do not need to know the person's character in order to feel that the person deserves praise or blame.

According to Hume, we hold someone responsible for an action because the action is caused by an agent, or more precisely by something internal to the agent. If an action was not performed by the agent's own willings or desires, it would be meaningless to praise or blame him. As a simple example, if a person standing next to you bumps into you by the force of the wind, you would not blame him. Hume, as a matter of fact, seems to commit to this so-called 'internality requirement.' "[A]s it proceeded from nothing in him, that is durable or constant, and leaves nothing of that nature behind it, 'tis impossible that he can ... become the object of punishment or vengeance."¹⁹

¹⁸ Nancy Schaubert, "Complexities of Character: Hume on Love and Responsibility," *Hume Studies* 35, no. 1&2 (2009): 29-55.

¹⁹ Hume, *Treatise*, 2.3.2.6.

In response to this 'internality requirement,' at first glance, most people would assume that Hume agrees that there are a consistent, unified *character* which makes someone a responsible agent. In other words, the view that an agent's inner factor is what makes him be responsible for his action seems to indicate that the inner factor is actually the person's character. It seems that people commonly think in this way: he is a mean person so that the character of 'meanness' causes him to do such an action; since the person's character of being mean is truly his own, he is responsible for the action.

However, Schaubert thinks that we do not need to assume that the inner factor is one's character. Instead, it could be regarded as one's motive. As I mentioned above, character seems to be some commonality or consistency among one's motives. So, if we want to say that he is responsible for his mean action, he should have many mean motives and these mean motives are what make his character mean. Against the view that character is what makes someone's action responsible, Schaubert thinks that motive is enough to be responsible for the person's action. According to her, we do not necessarily make connections with an agent's other motives to evaluate a person's current motive itself.

According to Schauber, a better way to describe someone's moral responsibility is as follows: what we do is to infer a person's motive from his action since we have seen that similar actions by other people have the same motive. For instance, according to Schauber, we normally think that an agent's action of fitting out a guest room indicates the person's motive to be hospitable based on our observation that the action is what hospitable people often do. "We infer that Margo acts from hospitality not because we witness her fitting out her guest room many times (hospitality does not require constant decoration), but because she does what many others do to be hospitable."²⁰ In short, we assume that a person's action is performed by his or her motives unless we think that there are good reasons to doubt it.

One thing to be noticeable is that Schauber does not consider the cases of when we doubt that a person's action is from his own motive. Still, what would be a case where we doubt that a person's motive is not the person's own motive? It sounds a circular to say that an agent's action is performed by his own motive if we do not doubt it. In order to say that there are some cases where we doubt it, it seems that Schauber needs to provide explanations of when we do. Although I do not think that her lack of explanation is fair, I will first try to make sense of her reasons.

²⁰ Schauber, "Complexities of Character," p. 37.

First of all, her explanation is based on her emphasis on Hume's causal theory. She thinks that it is fairly important to make use of the concept of causality in Hume's moral views. As well known, Hume claims that there is no necessary connection between an incident A and another incident B although we may believe that A causes B. To put it roughly, Hume thinks that necessity is a matter of constant conjunction of like objects and "inferences of the mind from one to the other."²¹ According to Schaubert, Hume points out that "no one in actual practice doubts that there is a constant conjunction and inference in the realm of action."²² Based on Hume's point, Schaubert claims that no one doubts that there is a constant conjunction between actions and motives. Since this causal theory establishes in the moral realm that we do not doubt the connection between actions and motives, Schaubert thinks that she does not need to consider exceptions to the connection.

Second, it may not be fair to say that Schaubert does not consider exceptional cases of the connection at all since she brings up some cases in her other discussions.²³ The case where Schaubert considers them is the one in which

²¹ Ibid., p. 36.

²² Ibid.

²³ To be precise, this case is considered as a counterexample of her opponent's view. Still, I think that it is a kind of exception for the connection between motives and actions that can also be used for her positive account.

there was some brainwash. If an agent was brainwashed before an action, then he would not be regarded as acting from his own motive.

Considering these two reasons, Schauber seems to assume that the average people do not doubt that a person's action is performed from his motive except in some extreme cases, and that explains the phenomenon of holding responsibility. So far, I have explained Schauber's claim on moral responsibility. As I indicated, I do not think that her lack of explanation of when we doubt a person's motive is fair. More specifically, I do not think that her account is enough to explain our practice of praise and blame. Why should we assume that people doubt about a person's motive only when there are extraordinary circumstances? It seems to me that a more usual case where we doubt someone's motive is that we are not sure about what kind of person he is. We are likely to doubt someone's motive to help others when we know the person's usual behaviors.

As a matter of fact, Schauber seems to assume that there is only one kind of causality involved in the discussion of moral assessment. Schauber thinks that we can infer someone's motive to be hospitable based on our observation of the causality of other people's cases. For instance, we see many times that people usually have motives to be hospitable and perform the actions of fitting out the

guest rooms. So, in this case, too, we infer that he has a similar motive by looking at the person's action.

However, there is at least another kind of causality. In addition to our experience with similar actions of different people, we also experience similar actions of the same person. If we have seen that an agent had similar motives in the past, then we will infer that the person has a similar motive this time again. For instance, if we have seen that an agent helped an old lady cross a road and carried a heavy bag for a disabled person and helped his friend move to a new place, etc, we will formulate our idea of him as a hospitable person. The actions that I enumerated are sufficiently different, so it would be hard to say that the motives have one commonality. It is, nonetheless, not problematic to say that these motives are similar in a different sense.²⁴

²⁴ I should mention that Schaubert may not have thought that her project is to describe a detailed phenomenon of holding responsibility. Clearly, she gives the impression that she only discusses a general phenomenon rather than specific ones. She seems to agree that there could be cases where we are not sure about a person's motive if there are more than one possibility to interpret. So, she may be arguing that, only at a general level, we hold someone responsible for his action by making an inference from an action to a motive.

Nonetheless, if the discussion of the general inference was the only purpose of her project, it does not show anything regarding our actual practice of holding responsibility. Since she makes it clear that her discussion is "not theoretical, but rather phenomenological," (Ibid., p. 48.) it seems to me that she at least must be understood as defending Hume's view in the actual practice. If her only point was to describe the general law that people infer motives from actions and that is how we hold someone responsible, that explanation is the one that no one would argue against. Therefore, I think that her point is that a person's motive rather than a person's character is what is responsible for his action and that is the correct way to describe our practice of holding someone responsible. Thus, my criticism against her point stands.

As I indicated above, there could be a different meaning in saying that motives are similar. The motives can be traced back to the agent's mental trait of being hospitable. Or, one could describe the similarity of motives in a more loose way as follows: although it is difficult to say that all the actions indicate that the person has a mental trait of being hospitable, there is a consistency in the person's motives. Either way, it seems certainly true that you would be very surprised if the agent acts in an entirely different way than the previous cases. Suppose you see the agent refuses to help an old lady carrying some heavy stuff. You would think that there are some good reasons for him to say 'no.' You might continue to imagine such as that the old lady actually stole his car before, without blaming him.

Even in this loose sense, we tend to assume that there is some consistency in a person's different motives. Then, it seems safe to say that people actually think that other people have certain characters or character traits although it is not always easy to say what they are exactly. Once we have formulated our idea of the person as a hospitable person, we will see his character differently from another person who has done the opposite sorts of things. So, it seems that one important exceptional case between an action and a motive would be that we know the person enough and we are sure that the motive in appearance is not the one that the person normally has.

Therefore, it is not fair for Schaubert to say that moral responsibility is based on our inference from one's action to his motive based on the observation of similar actions performed by others. Even if we give enough weight upon Hume's causal theory in the moral realm, it does not follow that Hume's view commits to the thin notion of character.²⁵

Having established the possibility of character traits, I will now move on to Hume's notion of integrity. In *Treatise*, Hume gives a special emphasis on the fact that one needs his own assurance of what he does and this seems to be very close to a certain sense of integrity.

But tho'an over-weaning conceit of our own merit be vicious and disagreeable, nothing can be more laudable, than to have a value for ourselves, where we really have qualities that are valuable. The utility and advantage of any quality to ourselves is a source of virtue, as well as its agreeableness to others; and 'tis certain, that nothing is more useful to us in the conduct of life, than a due degree of pride, which makes us sensible

²⁵ Against my argument, one could object that we do not make connections with an agent's character whenever we see his particular action. Even when we do not know the person's character, we tend to hold him responsible for his actions. Furthermore, even when someone does not act out of his character, if he behaves in the way that is blamable, we would hold him responsible for his action.

I do not argue against this point. All I argue is that we also make connections with a person's character as well as inferring his motive by making comparisons with similar motives from other people's similar actions. Although I do not intend to specify all the cases of how we hold an agent responsible, let me provide a brief, general response to the cases which I brought up here.

One good way to resolve the worry is to compromise the two causal views. Then, a general answer to 'how do we normally hold someone responsible?' is that we infer someone's motive from other similar actions done by other people in general, except in circumstances where we doubt that the person has that specific motive considering his character traits or character. If this is right to describe our practice of praise and blame, then it seems wrong to assume that we can explain our moral psychology without assuming character.

of our own merit, and gives us a confidence and assurance in all our projects and enterprises.²⁶

In this passage, Hume suggests the usefulness of ‘conceit of ourselves’ and ‘pride’ for one’s projects and enterprises. Whereas Hume’s discussion of pride in other parts focuses on pride in general, this passage is specifically about one’s projects or commitments. According to Hume’s description of pride here, a person needs pride in his projects and enterprises because they are useful for pursuing the projects and the enterprises. At first glance, it appears that the only reason that Hume offers as the value of having pride is its usefulness to the continuance of the projects. Nonetheless, a careful look reveals that a person would not have pride in his project if the project itself is not agreeable or even valuable on its own. Donald Davidson’s summary of Hume’s theory of pride would be useful to look at.

[T]he cause of pride is a conjunction of the idea (of a house, say) and a quality (beauty). The quality causes the separate and pleasant passion, which under the right conditions causes (by association) the similar pleasant passion of pride. The passion of pride itself always causes the idea of self to appear, and this idea must be related (causally, by association) to the idea of the object (the house) on which the quality is placed.²⁷

²⁶ Hume, *Treatise*, 3.3.2.8.

²⁷ Donald Davidson, “Hume’s Cognitive Theory of Pride,” *Journal of Philosophy* 73 (1976): 744-757, p. 748.

According to this summary of pride in general, the subject of pride should have a separate quality that is agreeable to others.²⁸ In the case of pride in one's projects or commitments, those projects or commitments should be valuable on its own. Otherwise, other people would not see it as valuable. And it seems that the obvious reason why a person would have pride in his projects or commitments is that the person has a strong assurance of his projects. This sounds that one needs to commit to one's project and have a wholehearted mind towards what he does. A person would not have that much assurance of what he does if he is not wholehearted towards his projects.

Still, if we take other parts of Hume's passages seriously, the person who is wholehearted towards what he does is not the kind of person who does what he is assured of, regardless of how other people think. First of all, the proud person who commits to one's own projects has such pride because he would accept the same kind of pride from other people. Summarizing the psychology of Hume's pride, Davidson states that "if someone is proud that he exemplifies a certain property, then he approves of, or thinks well of, others for exemplifying the same property." (a Principle of Self-Other Parity)²⁹ Furthermore, according

²⁸ For a view of why Hume's account of pride fails, see Robert W. Burch, "Hume on Pride and Humility," *New Scholasticism* 49, no. 2 (1975): 177-188.

²⁹ Davidson, "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride," p. 748. The name of 'a Principle of Self-Other Parity' is from James King, "Pride and Hume's Sensible Knave," *Hume Studies* 25, no. 1 & 2 (1999): 123-137.

to Hume, people have a narrow circle as an evaluation tool to judge a person's characteristics. When I make a moral evaluation of someone's actions or qualities, I sympathize with the people in his narrow circle such as his family members, friends, and community members, etc. This could affect someone's way of decision as well. Like someone judges another's quality or action from the narrow circle, third-person perspective, I could judge my action from the narrow circle. If I think that my narrow circle does not approve of my action, then I might change my mind and try not to do it. If that is the case, then we get the conclusion that a person who wholeheartedly believes in what he does should also have some confidence that what he does is not against what his narrow circle approves.

A question is how much someone's way of continuing his own projects is affected by others' opinions. One could say that in order to have that much confidence a person would need to be in line with what other people agree; otherwise, a person would be in a constant question of whether what he is doing is right. However, the tension does not seem to be the one that can be easily resolved. At least, Hume seems to take it as a genuine tension.

The passion of pride and humility is the very first vice or virtue that he discusses as a particular instance of virtue and vice in Hume's discussion of sympathy and comparison, and Hume needed to say that an extreme amount of

self-conceit is a vice since it gives others the immediate disagreeableness when they sympathize with the person's self-conceit and compare it with their own pride.³⁰ For this reason, Hume states that "[t]is, however, certain, that good-breeding and decency require that we shou'd avoid all signs and expressions, which tend directly to show that passion."³¹ A person with pride needs to conceal the fact that he has confidence about himself or about his project. This may be more so considering that "[n]o one can well distinguish in himself betwixt the vice and virtue, or be certain, that his esteem of his own merit is well-founded."³²

This obvious reason to categorize self-conceit as a vice, however, does not stop him from saying that self-conceit is not a real vice. Although a direct expression of self-conceit is condemned, as we see in the passage, Hume says that self-conceit is 'laudable' because it makes someone continue to do his projects and enterprises. The reason why self-conceit is that much important is that Hume thinks that the continuation of one's projects and enterprises is that much important. If pursuing or continuing one's projects and enterprises has

³⁰ Hume, *Treatise*, 3.3.2.1-3.3.2.15. The same problem may occur even in the case of a due amount of pride in a person. For the discussion of how such a comparison or the 'reversal-comparison' that begets disagreeableness is not the dominant mechanism of pride, see Lorraine Besser-Jones, "Hume on Pride-in-Virtue: A Reliable Motive?" *Hume Studies* 36, no. 2 (2010): 171-192.

³¹ Hume, *Treatise*, 3.3.2.10.

³² *Ibid.*, 3.3.2.10.

such a great deal of importance, this means that a person would not stop what he thinks is good or right to pursue simply because others do not agree with him.

Although it is not true that such a person would do whatever is necessary for his projects, there is a real challenge for the person who wants to do his projects and enterprises which may violate what others think are morally right. Hume agrees that if a person knows himself and has a justification of his certainty it is fine to pursue his projects and enterprises with that level of confidence. "'Tis necessary, therefore, to know our rank and station in the world, whether it be fix'd by our birth, fortune, employments, talents or reputation. 'Tis necessary to feel the sentiment and passion of pride in conformity to it, and to regulate our actions accordingly.'"³³ Citing Alexander the Great, he argues that whatever we call heroic virtue is nothing but 'a steady and well-established pride and self-esteem'. If it is fine for a person of a great mind to pursue what he has set his mind to do, it seems fine that the person sometimes violates what others or even himself believe is wrong for a sake of something greater. This would be allowed in Hume's view as long as one conceals his attitude that may give rise to a disagreeable feeling among his fellows.

One thing to make clear is that this person of a great mind is not exactly the same kind of person as the sensible knave at the end of the second *Enquiry* IX

³³ Ibid., 3.3.2.11.

ii.³⁴ In his paper “Pride and Hume’s Sensible Knave” James King argues that the sensible knave from *Enquiry* cannot take pride in herself that Hume discusses in the *Treatise*.³⁵ If the person of integrity here is the same as the sensible knave, the question arises if we are right to think that such a person can even have pride in what he does. This question, however, makes sense only if we assume that their reasons for pride are the same. According to King’s analysis, the knave is the kind of precivilized person who tries to benefit himself as long as it does not diminish her reputation as a decent person.³⁶ Such an understanding of the knave is different from what I present here as an immoral person although not without integrity. The person that is depicted here is not the kind of person who tries to benefit himself secretly. At least, it is possible that such a person’s goal is good enough so that it would bring benefits to people in general. One way to think of this possibility would be to imagine the case of Alexander the Great again. We could say that what he tried to achieve was not just his own fame but a big unification of the world although it could also mean a lot of sacrifices not just from him but also from other people.

³⁴ “[T]he cunning and sagacity of the old, who have learned, by long observation, to avoid what hurt them, and to pursue what gave ease or pleasure.” David Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (1748), P. Millican (ed) (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 76-77.

³⁵ King, “Pride and Hume’s Sensible Knave.”

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

At the end of his discussion, King considers the possibility that the sensible knave could also defend his knavery and take pride in himself by making use of the argument from the greatness of mind. As I said, this sensible knave is different from the person of a great mind. Still, his argument against this possibility is worthwhile to look at since it can be an objection against what I presented above. The possible argument that he considers is that the very structure of greatness may be to belie self-other parity and that “what defines greatness is that the great should identify their project precisely in terms of differentiating themselves from the common run of people (a motive that, I take it, sounds decidedly Nietzschean).”³⁷ Using this argument, one could ask if the virtue of my depicted person of integrity is the fact that such a person just places oneself higher than others and makes a maxim to be great. Nonetheless, it would be a mistake to think that the very structure of the great mind itself is a simple contradiction of ordinary people. A more precise understanding would be that whereas contradicting ordinary people is an inevitable means to achieve a great goal the essential structure of the great mind is that the person shows steadfastness, courage, and strength in the face of adversity.³⁸

Thus, it seems that Hume’s person of the wholehearted mind is the kind of person who can have immoral commitments by betraying ordinary people. If

³⁷ Ibid., p. 134.

³⁸ Hume, *Treatise*, 3.3.2.13.

we can assume that wholeheartedness is a big part or the gist of integrity, we can conclude that a person of integrity in Hume's view does not necessarily commit to moral principles.

5. Aristotle's Account of Integrity

We have seen how a vicious principle could be conducive to a person's greatness in a way that does not harm his integrity. For Hume a person could achieve a greater good by deceiving others and this does not change that he has a certain sense of integrity. Like Hume, Aristotle does not use the word of integrity much less than he proposes it as a separate concept. Nonetheless, some scholars think that they can find the concept of integrity as a moral virtue in Aristotle's view,³⁹ and I agree that we can build a concept of integrity in Aristotle's view. Whereas Hume's view may be seen as the active negation of the idea that only a person with a morally good commitment is a person of integrity, I think we can build a milder version from Aristotle's view.

From my understanding, having integrity for Aristotle is a neutral thing—one has integrity has nothing to do with having morally right or good commitments. Seeing integrity as a virtue means for most people that integrity itself requires a morally right sort of commitments. This would be even more so

³⁹ For instance see John Cottingham, "Integrity and Fragmentation," *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 27, no. 1 (2010): 2-14.

if the virtue is one of moral virtues. I doubt that it is necessary to commit to the idea that integrity for Aristotle is a virtue, and I will give a reason later. Regardless of whether it is a virtue or not, I think that we can read Aristotle in *Nicomachean Ethics* as holding the view that a person does not need to have morally right sorts of commitments in order to have integrity.⁴⁰

Before I discuss how we can understand the concept of integrity in Aristotle's view, I should explain why my view may divert from the common understanding of virtue. Most commentators think that Aristotle is committed to the idea that all the virtues are interrelated somehow so that if you have one virtue you have them all.⁴¹ Especially, when Aristotle discusses the notion of *phronesis* or practical wisdom in 1144b32-1145a2, he seems to suggest that all the virtues are reciprocal or formulate a more strict sense of unity. Then, a person of integrity would be the type of person who has all the other virtues including moral virtues. So, it would sound absurd to say that for Aristotle a person does not need to possess morally right commitments although he has integrity.

However, even if possessing one virtue means to possess all the other entire set of virtues, we can still discuss the virtue of integrity separately. First, it

⁴⁰ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Terence Irwin (tran) (Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1999).

⁴¹ For instance see Terry Irwin, "Disunity in the Aristotelian Virtues," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, Supp. Vol (1988): 61–78.

would be less illuminating what each virtue means to us if we do not discuss them separately at all. Second, it is less favorable for Aristotle to limit the discussion only in the way to interpret that all the virtues are intertwined and there is no room for the discussion of integrity separately. Integrity is very likely to be described as a master virtue that encompasses all the virtues in Aristotle's view if we start assuming that all the virtues are interrelated.⁴² This interpretation would make Aristotle's view far away from our current usage of integrity considering that most people do not believe that integrity is impossible to obtain. "It takes us back to a now obsolete sense of integrity as a state of perfect and unimpaired virtue and sinless purity. While this reading would make integrity distinctive, it also makes integrity distinctly anachronistic."⁴³ Thus, I will assume for argument's sake that we can discuss integrity as a separate virtue that does not require the entire set of all the other virtues.

In his unpublished paper, Jonathan Webber argues that having integrity does not mean having a morally right commitment. He argues that the correct way of understanding integrity is to think it as an aid to reasoning capacity. Although Webber is assuming that integrity is an ethical virtue, he argues that having integrity does not mean to possess the right ethical commitments. His

⁴² Although Scherkoske does not think that this should be the real meaning of integrity, he considers such a concept. See Greg Scherkoske, "Could Integrity Be An Epistemic Virtue?" *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 20, no. 2 (2012): 185-215, p. 193.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

argument shows a good example of how we can see Aristotle's integrity from a different angle.

According to him, the essence of integrity is the right balance between one's respect for his reasoning about what is good or right and one's respect for his deeply held motivations based on his reasoning about what is good or right.⁴⁴

He further argues that

One can possess the virtue of ethical integrity without having the right evaluative commitments, since all that is required is the commitment to respecting reasoning about what is good or right and so to striking the right balance between fresh reasoning in response to situations and respecting one's existing commitments.⁴⁵

What Webber assumes is that the capacity to reason well is different from the capacity to find the right balance between one's current reasoning and his past reasoning. I doubt that these two things are separate things. Of course there can be a difference between one's practical reasoning and one's action to follow them. Even if one reasons well it does not mean that the person would follow his reasoned conclusion well. Although one reasons well he may not give proper respect for his own reasoning and fails to follow it. A person could be too timid or lazy so that he often fails to put into action. Or, a person could have a devious

⁴⁴ Jonathan Webber, "Integrity and Practical Wisdom" (an unpublished conference paper for the 5th Annual Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues conference at Oriel College, Oxford University, Thursday 5th – Saturday 7th January 2017), p. 7.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 9.

motivation to revenge his mother by having a failure's life. Anyway, the capacity to reason well is different from the capacity to follow his well-reasoned conclusion. Nonetheless, What Webber cares about is not such a difference. Everything that he says is really about how one reasons—one reasons and then figures out how to incorporate this new reasoning into his past ones.

It is true that such incorporation may have to do with action if you consider a person's attitude towards his past reasoning. People could have different tendencies towards their past reasoning. One may have a tendency to disrespect his past reasoning whereas some others do not. And this tendency may lead to a different result in one's action. However, this does not tell us that there is a difference between the capacity to reason well and the capacity to find the right balance of one's current reasoning and past reasoning. Even one's attitude toward one's own past reasoning does not seem to be purely one's tendency or personality. One's good reasoning capacity means that he is good at figuring out which one should gain more weight between his past reasoning and his current reasoning. Assuming that he has a belief that he reasoned well in the past, this belief will be intervened properly by his new belief. And if one really has the capacity to reason well, he would reconcile the conflicting beliefs well. Then, it is wrong to assume that one's reasoning capacity and one's capacity to find the balance between his past reasoning and current reasoning are different.

What I agree with Webber is, though, his general approach to Aristotle's view. Webber and I agree that integrity should be understood in its own right rather than as a part of a big concept of virtue. He thinks that although integrity is an ethical virtue in Aristotle's view, it does not mean that one's possession of integrity guarantees that he has morally right commitments. For him, integrity simply means that he has the right attitude towards what he believes is right. And what the person believes is right is not necessarily the right one. I think that what we can draw from Aristotle's view of integrity is this line of position.

To be clear, I am not saying that Webber would agree with me that a person of integrity would or could have vicious principles or commitments in Aristotle's view. His point was that his understanding of the concept of integrity itself is distinct from people's understanding of practical wisdom.⁴⁶ It does not mean that he agrees that integrity itself is a separate quality from practical wisdom in a person's virtues. What he probably would want to accept is that we can make a distinction between these two virtues in our discussion, but he would more lean towards thinking that if one has the virtue of integrity he would have the practical wisdom as well as the right moral commitments in the end. So, according to his picture of a virtuous person he would eventually have the right

⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 8-9.

moral commitments. Still, the point that he makes is the same that even if a person has integrity he could have morally wrong commitments.

Now, I want to move on to what I think is one possible way of seeing integrity in Aristotle. I want to suggest that a similar concept to wholeheartedness can be taken as integrity, but I should confess that this is not intended to be a full version of the concept.

According to Aristotle, one should be able to enjoy his virtuous action in order to be regarded as being virtuous. Aristotle points out that

someone who does not enjoy fine actions is not good; for no one would call a person just, for instance, if he did not enjoy doing just actions, or generous if he did not enjoy generous actions, and similarly for the other virtues.⁴⁷

In this passage, Aristotle does not give a specific reason why a person who does not enjoy a virtue does not enjoy it. What would be the reason for a person to fail to do so? It could be because he is not really in the mood of doing those sorts of actions. He may be doing the actions simply because he believes that they are what he has to do. Or, he might be distracted with other thoughts than the things that he is doing. Anyway, a person has failed to reach the level of harmonizing his desires or emotions.

⁴⁷ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1099a18-20.

A more relevant question to my point is what would be the thing that makes a person still do the virtuous thing even at the moment when he has not arrived at the state of being virtuous yet? As we can see, the person has not harmonized his desires and emotions yet. So, there could be enough of the hindrance for the person not to do a virtuous thing.

A close look at the passage suggests that I am not wrong about that we need to pay attention to the importance of the continuous actions for the same virtue. According to Aristotle, we cannot be a virtuous person simply by doing some virtuous actions. Rather, a person should do virtuous actions in the way in which virtuous people would do them.⁴⁸ This seems to imply that one should do virtuous actions over and over rather than doing them just one time.

Of course, the passage is not really about the frequency of the actions. It is focused on the way a person does the actions. Still, it seems right to think that a person would not be able to be virtuous unless he does the actions many times. In order to see this, we might want to ask this question first. Is the passage really open to the possibility that a certain person could do a virtuous action at a certain point in his life while he spends so much time on doing vicious things? It

⁴⁸ "[A]ctions are called just or temperate when they are the sort that a just or temperate person would do. But the just and temperate person is not the one who [merely] does these actions, but the one who also does them in the way in which just or temperate people do them." (Ibid., 1105b7-10).

seems to me that the answer is 'no.' Rather, it tells us that there are ways that virtuous people do those actions and these people have accumulated a certain way of doing the actions.

This means that a person could do a virtuous action or virtuous actions only by performing similar virtuous actions many times. A person who consistently tries to perform virtuous actions would end up being a virtuous person once he arrives at a certain level of consistency. Therefore, it is safe to assume that a person's future obtainment of a virtue depends on whether he consistently does a similar virtuous action or not.

Then, coming back to the question, what would make a person keep doing the same sort of virtuous action? One would think that although the person is not fully virtuous, he has the required amount of disposition to do a virtuous thing. So, the answer would be that the person has the minimum amount of virtue already in his possession. It would be a perfectly adequate answer to say that a potentially virtuous person does the virtuous thing because of his possession of the small amount of virtue, considering that it makes a perfect sense to say that a virtuous person does a virtuous thing because of his virtue. Nonetheless, the question is what would be the thing that makes a person *keep* doing a virtuous thing.

I think that this is exactly the moment when we should be careful not to include everything within the bag of virtue. It seems to me that one would need to do things consistently towards what he believes is right even before one arrives at the state of obtaining a virtue. This arduousness is rather separate from the state of doing a perfectly right thing at a perfectly right moment. Suppose there are two people who have exactly the same amount of virtue or the disposition to do the right thing. And one person pays more attention to doing things with a serious-minded attitude and the other person does not. For instance, one person would care about whether he finishes his job whereas the other person would be rather careless in general. In that case, we would say that the first person's faithful and sincere attitude in general facilitates the future obtainment of the virtuous state. As I assumed these two people's amount of disposition to the right thing at the moment is the same. Still, we can imagine easily that the current state of being virtuous in each person does not mean that they would have the same amount of virtue in the future.⁴⁹ If that is the case, this extra thing other than the disposition to do the right thing should be called another quality that is not included in the virtue in hand.

⁴⁹ In the Korean language, there is a word to mean this specific virtue—Sungsil(誠實). It has a great to do with paying attention to or caring about whether he finishes things, whatever those things are, in general. I should add, however, that a person does not necessarily lack Sungsil even if he fails to finish the job.

This extra quality that can be summarized with 'sincere and arduous attitude' is another virtue that Aristotle could have offered since what his view must assume is such a quality. What makes this quality different from the usual sense of sincere or faithful attitude is that it has more to do with a person's series of actions that involve not just consistency but also an arduous effort. To put another way, one could fake a sincere or faithful attitude with one time action whereas one cannot fake arduousness until he finishes a given job. For instance, you may mistakenly believe that your future son-in-law has a sincere or faithful attitude towards marriage. But he could turn out to be not doing any arduous series of actions to make the marriage work.

Here, what we can roughly define as 'a consistent effort to do a certain thing with a sincere or faithful attitude until accomplishing it' can be called integrity. I assumed at the beginning of the discussion that wholeheartedness is a certain sense of integrity for Plato and Aristotle. This quality of sincere and arduous attitude sounds to me close to wholeheartedness. When one has the general attitude to be serious about whatever he does, he is very likely to be wholehearted towards what he does. And assuming that they are more or less the same, I think that there is a glimpse of the concept of integrity for Aristotle in this concept.

This concept of sincere attitude or wholeheartedness is not reduced to another virtue such as loyalty. One could think that being serious about a job or wholehearted to what he does is just another aspect of loyalty. It seems true that when one is loyal to another person or a company, he manifests the quality of sincere attitude or wholeheartedness. Nonetheless, loyalty is toward another agent whereas sincere attitude or wholeheartedness is toward your life in general. In a way, integrity in this understanding means a respect for yourself. Thus, integrity is not reduced to another virtue.

I have assumed that integrity in my account is a virtue. But it does not need to be understood in that way. This quality that helps to obtain a particular virtue does not exactly fit in the usual description of a moral virtue. According to Aristotle, being excellent at showing a particular moral quality is generally understood as doing an excellent job at targeting the intermediate between two extremes of the quality.⁵⁰ For instance, courage on a battlefield would be understood as finding the mean between cowardliness and recklessness. On the other hand, sincere and arduous attitude toward a certain thing until one accomplishes it would be just one-way direction towards the accomplishment. Thus, integrity can very well be understood as an executive quality that

⁵⁰ Ibid., 1106a26-b28.

facilitates the obtainment of a moral virtue.⁵¹ When one is not equipped with the real virtue of courage yet, it would be helpful to have a wholehearted attitude when he does courageous acts.

If what I have built in Aristotle's view can be called integrity, we can say that integrity for Aristotle does not guarantee morally right commitments of the person. No one would be against that Hitler showed a consistent effort to do a certain thing with a sincere or faithful attitude until accomplishing it, and people would agree that he committed to morally wrong principles.⁵² This tells that a person's possession of integrity and the same person's morally wrong commitments are compatible in Aristotle's view.

6. Conclusion

I examined the necessity of a new approach to find the relationship between integrity and morality. Because of a certain difficulty to deal with the relationship scholars have assumed or denied the tight relationship without

⁵¹ From my understanding, what Webber suggests as integrity is not a virtue, either. Although he says that it is a moral virtue in his view, it is rather different from any other moral virtues such as humility, courage, and temperance. The right balance between one's current reasoning and his past reasoning concerns directly with one's intelligence, which makes it more like an intellectual virtue. The only reason why it is still regarded as a moral virtue is that resources of reasoning can be moral commitments. So, integrity in his account can very well be regarded as the virtue that works between intellectual virtue and moral virtue, and it is not a typical moral virtue.

⁵² We can say the same thing about courage. "[C]ourage is not operating as a virtue when the murderer turns his courage, which is a virtue to bad ends." Philippa Foot, "Virtues and Vices," in *Virtues and Vices and Other Essays in Moral Philosophy* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1978), p. 16.

much of a serious discussion. I will defend the moralized view of integrity that a person with a morally vicious commitment is not a person of integrity. To be clear about the dispute, I provided several versions of the unmoralized view of integrity first after the elaboration of the nature of the question.

One thing that is common among those unmoralized views of integrity is that each view assumes a particular way of seeing what integrity is. Each of these different notions of the unmoralized view of integrity assumes a certain conception of integrity. The legitimacy of the view depends on the legitimacy of the conception of integrity and I will come back to this problem in Chapter 3.

CHAPTER 2

THE MORALIZED VIEW OF INTEGRITY

The previous chapter dealt with the necessity to reconsider the moral nature question of integrity and at the end of the discussion I showed how people hold the unmoralized view of integrity. In this chapter, I will show what the moralized view of integrity is. To put it roughly, the moralized view of integrity says that a person of integrity cannot be a person who commits to immoral principles. I will first offer some preliminary cases of the position with the examples of Plato and Kant. These two examples will show how one can hold the idea that a person of integrity cannot be the one who commits to immoral principles.⁵³

I will then consider one immediate objection to the moralized view of integrity by examining the relationship between morality and integrity. This discussion has two parts. First, I will examine an argument present in Greg Scherkoske's work. This discussion will show that there are ways to say that

⁵³ According to Ramsay, morality requires what he calls 'emotional integrity.' Hayden Ramsay, *Beyond Virtue: Integrity and Morality* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), p. 111. My focus in this project is, though, whether integrity requires morality.

integrity could be a moral virtue against Scherkoske's arguments. Second, I will show that even if there is a direct relationship between morality and integrity it is not necessarily the case that integrity is a moral virtue. I will argue that it is a solid position that integrity is not a virtue at all. This discussion will show that the moralized view does not need to commit to the idea that integrity is merely a virtue so that it could be more than a moral virtue.

1. What are the Moralized Views of Integrity?

Previously we have seen how each of Aristotle and Hume's works is seen as a position of the unmoralized view of integrity. They both think that having integrity does not need to mean to possess morally good principles or commitments. So, in this reading, they hold the unmoralized view of integrity that even a person with immoral commitments could be a person of integrity. In this section, we will see the opposite position. According to the moralized view of integrity, a person with immoral commitments cannot be a person of integrity. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, it is rather difficult to see exactly why they hold the moralized view of integrity although many philosophers believe that integrity and morality should go hand in hand. This was because their understanding of the relationship between morality and integrity is entangled with their individual, rather complicated theory of what integrity is.

In what follows, I will present two cases of the moralized view of integrity. These are not the only cases where morality is a sort of requirement for integrity by any means. Still, their views of integrity present easy cases to understand why they think that morality is necessary for integrity. The first is that a person with morally wrong commitments would fail to have a harmonized soul and in turn fail to function as a unified person. The second case shows how to think of moral quality as the gist of a person's character that lasts even after one's death.

2. Plato's Account of Integrity

Plato's discussion of justice provides a paradigm case of how we can think that a person having morally questionable commitments does not possess integrity. Although he does not use the word 'integrity,' his account of justice seems to give some insights on the position. In *Republic*,⁵⁴ Socrates, Plato's mouthpiece throughout the *Republic*, discusses why a just person's life is better than an unjust person's. At the beginning of Book 2 of *Republic*, Glaucon offers a challenge to show why it is good to be just. With the story of the ring of Gyges,

⁵⁴ Plato, *Republic*, E. Hamilton & H. Cairns (eds) (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1961).

he argues that there is no reason for a just person to continue to be just if he can get away with being unjust and profit from it.⁵⁵

Before proving that justice is always in our interest, Plato has to offer an account of justice. He starts with the relationship between functioning or doing well and virtue. In Book 1, Plato claims that each thing has its function and a thing does well by means of its own peculiar virtue.⁵⁶ Therefore, one way to find the virtue of a certain thing is to imagine what it would be for the thing to function well. According to him, the condition that enables the thing to function well is the virtue appropriate to that thing.

Holding the view that justice is a virtue appropriate to both a city and an individual, Plato describes the perfectly good city in order to see its own peculiar virtues that enable the city do well. Plato defends the idea that we can discover the nature of the virtues of a city, in particular, the virtue of justice by isolating the features of a city that enable it to be good. According to him, the perfectly functioning city is the city which all of the citizens are provided the greatest possible happiness.⁵⁷ Plato argues that the needs of the individuals which constitute a city are best fulfilled when each person does the work that suits him

⁵⁵ For a discussion of what question or implication the tale of Gyges exactly presents, see Christopher Shields, "Plato's Challenge: the Case against Justice in *Republic II*," in G. Santas (ed), *The Blackwell Guide to Plato's Republic* (Malden, Oxford, and Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), pp. 63-83.

⁵⁶ Plato, *Republic*, 353b-c.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 420b.

or her best by nature.⁵⁸ Therefore, some individuals, for example, have natural tendencies to be good at farming, building and selling whereas others are at defending the city against enemies. Finally, some individuals, the guardians, are best suited for developing and living in accordance with their rational capacities and these guardians should rule the city.⁵⁹ With this description of the perfectly good city, Plato identifies the condition that enables the city to flourish, or justice in the city. According to him, justice in the city is that each individual does his or her own work and does not attempt to do another's work.⁶⁰

The real question, however, is whether we can apply such an account of justice to the individual. There is an immediate problem for thinking that the same account of justice applies to the individual: if the same account is to apply, the individual must have parts, each of which is best suited for playing a certain role in the individual's life. Plato gives an account of why the human psyche has also parts. According to Plato, we often experience mental conflict. We could want something, for example, a drink, but at the same time wishing that we did not want that drink.⁶¹ Our reflecting and calculating part will convince us not to drink the seawater even when we are extremely thirsty because it will cause nausea later. The reason why we have such mental conflicts is that psyche has

⁵⁸ Ibid., 370a-c.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 370c-414b.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 433a-d.

⁶¹ Ibid., 439a-c.

distinct sources of motivation that can come into conflict. He distinguishes at least three parts of the psyche: the appetitive part, the spirited part, and the reasoning part.

According to Plato, the three parts of the soul represent the values that motivate our actions and each part of the soul loves a certain object. For instance, the appetitive part loves money which is the means for satisfying things that appear pleasant.⁶² Secondly, the spirited part is described as loving honor,⁶³ since we are honored when we live up to our own or others' ideals. Lastly, the reasoning part of the soul is characterized as loving learning and wisdom.⁶⁴ In this account, a person experiences conflict because he or she reaches different conclusions from the perspective of each part of the soul. What is clear to Plato is that only reason can resolve this issue since reason knows what is best for ourselves as a whole.

With this picture of our moral psychology, in Book 4, Plato provides his definition of justice. According to Plato, "it [justice] is not concerned with someone's doing his own job on the outside. On the contrary, it is concerned with what is inside; with himself, really, and the things that are his own."⁶⁵ When

⁶² Ibid., 580d-e.

⁶³ Ibid., 581a-b.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 580d-581c.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 443c.

a person does an unjust thing, in this account, it is a bad thing not because a person may be caught by other people. Rather, it is a bad thing because what happens to the person's own soul. Plato continues to explain that

he [a just man] does not allow the elements in him each to do the job of some other, or the three sorts of elements in his soul to meddle with one another. Instead, he regulates well what is really his own, rules himself, puts himself in order, becomes his own friend, and harmonize the three elements together ... He binds together all of these and, from having been many, becomes entirely one, temperate and harmonious. Then and only then should he turn to action, ... he considers and calls just and fine the action that preserves this inner harmony and helps achieve it[.]⁶⁶

According to Plato, a person achieves justice when elements of one's soul do their own work and there is no disunity in his soul. Considering his explanation of each part of the soul, justice in an individual is the state where a person's reason does its work to decide what to do. For Plato, it is clear that the person with a just soul would not engage in unjust actions such as embezzling, temple robberies, thefts, betrays of friends in private or of cities in public life, breaking promises or other agreements.⁶⁷ In this account, a person acting immorally does such an act because his calculating and wise reason does not do the job properly and the person acts out of ignorance.

There is a gap to fill out, of course, because it is not clear why a person ruled by one's reason does not perform immoral acts. Furthermore, it seems

⁶⁶ Ibid., 443c-444a.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 442e-443a.

problematic that one should not act immorally not because of what it does to others but because of what it does to oneself.⁶⁸ Nonetheless, what seems to be clear from Plato's discussion of justice is that once a person commits to unjust or immoral acts, he would suffer from the disunity of his soul. Plato's discussion of justice brings us one representative case of the moralized view of integrity. True that it would require a substantial argument on why a just person is the same as a person of integrity. Nevertheless, without even assuming such a thing, we can say that the same point on justice could be said on integrity. After all, what Plato says about justice sounds very much like one representative understanding of what integrity is for the average person. It seems to be a common way of thinking that if a person commits to unjust or immoral acts, his soul would not be unified and the person fails to possess integrity.

Against Thrasymachus, Plato's Socrates pointed out already in Book 1 that an unjust person's injustice will make him "incapable of acting because of inner faction and not being of one mind with himself."⁶⁹ At first glance it seems too much to say that a person is not able to act at all when he has some injustice.⁷⁰ If

⁶⁸ Singpurwalla suggests a different interpretation of Plato's defense of justice that behaving unjustly is incompatible with being unified with others. See Rachel G. K. Singpurwalla, "Plato's Defense of Justice in the *Republic*," in G. Santas (ed), *The Blackwell Guide to Plato's Republic* (Malden, Oxford, and Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), pp. 263-282.

⁶⁹ Plato, *Republic*, 352a5-7.

⁷⁰ For a serious work to show that this is really what Plato means, see Christine M. Korsgaard, *Self-Constitution*.

we do not take Plato's wording of incapability of action literally, this may mean some psychological instability. We see a person performing unjust or immoral actions all the time. So, it is not true that a person acting immorally fails to act at all. Still, it seems true that when a person performs immoral actions, he could experience some hesitance. Different from what Plato had to say about justice, people often know that what they are about to do is wrong. In those cases, they could have mental conflicts; one side of his mind would say that he should not do it and the other side would say that it is okay to do it. Therefore, a person who is about to do those actions may experience some hesitance of his actions.

Nevertheless, for Plato, what injustice does to a person is not just some psychological instability. If it was just psychological instability, Plato's project to show that an unjust person's life is far worse than a just person's is unsuccessful. It would not be a significant fact for an unjust man that he had some difficulty to overcome when he did an unjust thing, as long as he continues enjoying the gains from his unjust actions. Therefore, if the effect of injustice is a moment's unstable feeling of what a person is about to do, it should not be the only effect that Plato has in mind. There must be, then, something else that can affect him more permanently.

According to Plato's account of justice, a person performing unjust or immoral acts has his soul in conflict. This conflict seems to lead not just to a

moment's pause but to a more permanent one because it affects his soul than anything else.⁷¹ Although a person did the act out of his reason's malfunction, the person could rationalize what he did after his wrongdoing. The problem is that such a rationalization does not make any difference since it does not justify his action and does not allow him to discard his deed. If the person already knew about the action's wrongfulness deep down in his mind, his thought of the fact that he is doing something wrong would have been permeated in his soul before he is aware of. When a person sees something, he remembers the thing. It would be even more if he does the thing. This seems to give enough reason to think that a person doing unjust or immoral deeds is in a disparity between what he wants him to be and what he is. This in turn will make his soul fail to be harmonized.

A person who has morally vicious commitments or principles would experience the same sort of disunity in his soul whereas having unity or a harmonized oneness in one's soul seems to be the very definition of integrity. So, one could build the position based upon Plato's discussion of justice to say that it is impossible for one to possess integrity when he commits to immoral principles.

⁷¹ For an account of a unitary condition of the psychic parts with the emphasis on temperance, see A. W. Price, *Virtue and Reason in Plato and Aristotle* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 85-111, especially p. 110.

3. Kant's Account of Integrity

Although Kant does not distinctively discuss the notion of integrity, some scholars derive important features of their theory of integrity from Kant's view on virtue. For instance, Hayden Ramsay argues that Kant's view on virtue contributes to the concept of integrity.⁷² According to Ramsay, virtue is "the experience of those who commit themselves to ends that are part of their own nature, and do so not from sensuous motives but from an interest to which these ends themselves give rise."⁷³ Such a notion of virtue offers Ramsey the basic psychology of integrity. In his brief explanation he suggests that integrity involves a person's belief that what he or she tries to maintain matters fundamentally. In other words, a person needs to strive to be committed to what is genuinely worthwhile.⁷⁴

We can formulate the notion of integrity in a more directly relevant way to our discussion. Ramsay's view suggests that whether a person makes an effort to obtain something worthwhile or not is important to whether a person possesses integrity or not. Nonetheless, none of the discussion says directly that a person needs to commit only to morally good things. At least, the discussion needs to involve Kant's complicated moral theory.

⁷² Ramsay, *Beyond Virtue*.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 57.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 56.

We can find, though, a simplest form of the moralized view of integrity which could appeal to the general audience. In the second *Critique*, Kant argues that God would see all our actions as a continuation towards a moral perfection.⁷⁵ According to Kant, a complete conformity of the will with the moral law is possible “only on the presupposition of the *existence* and personality of the same rational being continuing *endlessly* (which is called the immortality of the soul).”⁷⁶ One plausible way to understand such a continuation of the actions towards a certain goal is seeing it as a certain sort of integrity. Although a person himself would not necessarily see his actions making such a continuation, they could be seen as such. According to Kant, since God can see all the actions that a person has done, he can also see them as a continuum towards a moral perfection. When God perceives a person as one individual, it seems that He would do it not only as a bundle of many different qualities but also as one particular quality – moral quality.

For a rational but finite being only endless progress from lower to higher stages of moral perfection is possible. *The eternal being*, to whom the temporal condition is nothing, sees in what is to us an endless series the whole of conformity with the moral law, and the holiness that his command inflexibly requires in order to be commensurable with his justice in the share he determines for each in the highest good is to be

⁷⁵ Immanuel Kant (1788), *Critique of Practical Reason*, in Mary J. Gregor (tran & ed), *Practical Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 102-103. (Prussian Academy Edition, V 122-123.)

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 102. (Prussian Academy Edition, V 122.)

found whole in a single intellectual intuition of the existence of rational beings.⁷⁷

This moral quality seems to be the same as the one we can call integrity. I do not suggest that integrity should be understood as something that will continue even after our death. Or, only moral quality should be regarded as what defines one's integrity. Still, there is a sense in which a person's moral quality is one of the few things that people in general think would survive or be remembered even after our death. Moreover, if integrity is understood as something that has to do with a continuation within a person, there is a clear connection between what Kant sees as moral quality and what many people see as integrity.

After all, it seems rather natural to think that what is important as a person in God's mind is not the appearance or any sort of outside aspects but some inner aspects. Although different religions would say different things, it seems to me rather clear that a person's moral quality is indeed what God would see as important. If that is the case, then it is also natural for many people to think that a person's continuous quality from God's perspective is what matters as well when we think of integrity. Thus, Kant's statement that God would

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 103. (Prussian Academy Edition, V 123.)

perceive a person's actions only as a continuum towards moral perfection has great relevance to integrity.

Some people may wonder at this point whether Kant's view that I elaborate here indeed leads to the moralized view of integrity. Although I have established a tight connection between integrity and morality or even the equivalence between them, it does not tell anything about a person of integrity directly. Instead, it only says that integrity should be understood as such and such. To put the question more precisely, one may wonder what it means to say that there is a direct equivalence between integrity and morality. Does it mean that if God would see a perfect state of a person's moral quality even when there is only a progress towards a moral perfection, even a person who does not try hard and is in a morally imperfect state by any standard would be seen as a morally good person or as a person of integrity? Or, does it mean that there is only one kind of person of integrity and such a person is impossible in this world since only God would be able to see the moral perfection?

One thing is clear from Kant's suggestion. A person cannot be a person of integrity if one does not have any sort of moral commitments. The worry that Kant started with in the passage was how one could get rewarded if he or she does not live a good life in this world even if the person tries hard to manage a

morally good life.⁷⁸ This means that a person who does not try hard to manage a morally good life is not what concerns him. Therefore, what Kant puts forward as a solution implies that only a person who tries hard to do morally good things will be seen as having achieved the necessary amount of moral perfection in God's eyes. This means that if integrity and morality are the same things, such a person would be seen as a certain sort of person of integrity in the sense that he is already moving towards a perfect amount of integrity in God's eyes. Thus, there is no way that a person who is not pursuing any sort of moral quality at all could also be seen as a person of integrity.

It is interesting to see why Plato and Kant hold that one would not be able to have integrity without moral commitments. For them, integrity is a kind of minimum requirement to be a person. Without relying on any particular theory of personal identity, I assume that the meaning of 'person' is some sort of immaterial, continuous subject of one's own consciousness that lasts even after one's life in this world. For Plato, one cannot function well as a person, if one is not unified. He may not be able to act because he would experience ambivalence. For Kant, one cannot be regarded as a person, if one is not having any sort of

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 99. (Prussian Academy Edition, V 119.)

moral qualities. God would perceive a person's actions only as a continuum towards moral perfection when He sees him as a person.

This is a big difference from the other position. Previously we have seen that Aristotle and Hume think that integrity is what is necessary for a good character. It turned out that it does not mean that integrity itself is a moral concept although it is required for one to possess a good character. But here we see that a person would not be even a person if one does not have moral commitments.

It would be a genuine question to ask whether what Plato and Kant think of integrity would be really different from what Aristotle and Hume think of integrity. One may doubt if their difference might be because the range of the things that they apply to the concept of integrity is different. For one thing, as I suggest, Plato and Kant seem to think that integrity itself is the category that goes beyond one's characteristics whereas Aristotle and Hume think that it is a part of one's characteristics. In fact, their divergence on the moralized view of integrity is likely to depend on what kind of conceptions of integrity they have in mind. So, we might not conclude that their difference is a real difference until we figure out the common ground to compare their sides.

Nonetheless, according to the descriptions that I have offered, there is a difference between their positions on the relationship between integrity and morality. The point of my elaboration was more to present some typical or representative cases of the opposite sides of the issue rather than offering the accurate reading of those philosophers' positions. For this reason, I will leave it an open question whether their divergence on the issue should vanish once we find a common ground to compare them.

What I can do here is only to be satisfied with the general idea that there is a real difference regarding two sides of the positions. In regard to the moralized view of integrity, one side of the view says that one cannot commit to a morally wrong position as well as having a sort of unification of oneself whereas the other side says that one can. And I have offered some cases of the moralized view of integrity in this chapter. Although my elaboration of the view was only limited to two of the cases, in my understanding these are some representative cases that any average person could think of integrity. Whether the moralized view of integrity is a legitimate one or not is a real issue in this project and I will defend the view in detail for the rest of the other chapters. Before I present the arguments as well as the method to deal with the question in hand, one significant threat of the view should be examined first. In the rest of this chapter, I will defend against one objection to the moralized view of integrity.

4. Lack of Motivational Thoughts Problem

The moralized view of integrity that I offered so far is only a brief idea and there needs to be a more detailed argument to support the position. Especially, it would be necessary to discuss exactly in what sense integrity would require morality within a person. I will delve into this question in the next chapters. Before this, however, I need to consider an immediate objection to the moralized view of integrity. This objection is rather an urgent one considering that it is related to the issue of what kind of species integrity belongs to.⁷⁹

The objection that I will offer below is based on a certain assumption about the moralized view of integrity. Once we accept that a person of integrity cannot commit to such immoral principles, we are also committed to the idea that there is a certain relationship between integrity and morality. This seems to mean for many people that integrity is a moral virtue. For some people, however, it is hard to sustain the idea that integrity is one of virtues. I do not believe that the tight relationship between integrity and morality should be rendered into the view that integrity is a moral virtue. I will provide my reason for such a doubt.

⁷⁹ It would be worthwhile to mention that my discussion in this section is better understood as relevant to a virtue theory rather than virtue ethics. Although my discussion would involve discussing the concept of virtue to a certain degree, it is not about defending an idea that integrity is a virtue. Russell makes a distinction between them as follows: “a virtue theory is a theory of what the virtues are, whereas virtue ethics holds the virtues to be central to a theory of the ethical evaluation of action... To be sure, every virtue ethic must build on a virtue theory, but no virtue theorist ... need for that reason be a virtue ethicist.” Daniel Russell, *Practical Intelligence and the Virtues* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. ix.

But for now, let us assume that the moralized view of integrity commits to the view of seeing integrity as a moral virtue. In “Could integrity be an epistemic virtue?” Greg Scherkoske provides arguments that integrity could not be a moral virtue.⁸⁰ Scherkoske’s criticism is based on Bernard Williams’s insight. According to Williams, integrity is not a virtue since it is neither a first-order virtue nor a second-order virtue: it is not a first-order because it does not possess a distinctive motivation; it is not a second-order because it does not play a role to enable or bolster other virtuous motivations, such as courage or strength of will.⁸¹ Agreeing with Williams’s point that integrity could not be a moral virtue,⁸² Scherkoske considers all the possible objections to the position. After examining different responses, Scherkoske concludes that it is not a moral virtue, because none of the responses works. In response to his criticism against the view, I will show how one can defend the idea that integrity could still be a moral virtue against Scherkoske’s arguments.

According to Scherkoske, the first possible response is that you can name the opposite virtues to integrity and that means that we are not in total ignorance of what integrity is. But he thinks that just listing all the different vices does not

⁸⁰ Scherkoske, “Could Integrity Be An Epistemic Virtue?” p. 192.

⁸¹ Bernard Williams, “Utilitarianism and Moral Self-Indulgence,” in *Moral Luck: Philosophical Papers 1973-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 49.

⁸² Scherkoske still disagrees with Williams that integrity is not a virtue at all. Scherkoske argues that it could be a different virtue from a moral virtue.

make it clear what kind of thought and motivation integrity gives rise. He also considers the idea that integrity could be not just a second-order virtue but a sort of capstone virtue such as Aristotle's *phronesis* or practical wisdom. However, he thinks that this view makes integrity normatively inadequate because one does not necessarily need to obtain all the other virtues in order to have integrity.

The second possible response is that integrity is a second-order moral virtue rather than a first-order. This view can avoid the problem that integrity does not give rise to any distinctive motivation. However, he thinks that this view is inadequate because integrity becomes a descriptive redundancy.⁸³

I do not think that he exhausts every possibility that one can explain the problem of a lack of thoughts and motivations. Even if we cannot collect our thoughts around one unique quality of integrity, it does not mean that the word 'integrity' becomes redundant. Let us look at his argument closer:

The biggest problem facing this suggestion is that taking integrity to be a second-order moral virtue threatens descriptive redundancy. Integrity becomes nothing apart from exhibiting the relevant first order virtues on the right occasions: e.g. of being honest when honesty is called for, sincere when sincerity is required, [D]escriptive redundancy threatens the sense in which integrity is itself a self-standing virtue, that is, a distinctive excellence of persons. This looks to impugn (V) [(V) Integrity is a distinctive virtue: it is an admirable trait of character and a genuine

⁸³ Scherkoske, "Could Integrity Be An Epistemic Virtue?" p. 192.

excellence of persons in its own right.]. Integrity becomes the all-encompassing virtue of doing the right thing at the right time.⁸⁴

The reason why integrity could not be regarded as a second virtue is that it would become descriptively redundant. This is a big problem for Scherkoske because he thinks that integrity should be regarded as a distinctive virtue, which was his initial assumption.

The question is why we should accept that simply by calling integrity as a second virtue it becomes a redundant word. The reason why Scherkoske even considers integrity as a second virtue was that it had some appealing points. According to him, the suggestion is appealing if we recall “definitional links between integrity and first-order virtues such as honesty, sincerity, dependability and fair-dealing.”⁸⁵ Nevertheless, if integrity is a second virtue, it lacks a characteristic thought for the simple reason that “its function is to enable and marshal other virtues into service at the relevant times.”⁸⁶

What leads to Scherkoske’s quick judgment, though, is the way that he sees integrity as a second virtue. Although it does not stand out immediately, there is a difference between the way he treats integrity as a second virtue and

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 192.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

the way he treats other second virtues. If we look at the initial division between first-order virtues and second-order virtues, the difference between them is not just the fact that the first-order virtues have some distinctive characteristics and the second-order virtues do not. What makes them different is also the second-order virtue's characteristic that it helps the relevant first-order virtues. For instance, strength of will could be a second-order virtue not just because it lacks a characteristic thought or motivation but also because it helps other virtue to work better. Suppose you want to be a more modest person. Strength of will would help you achieve it because you would know how to restrain your desire to show off to others in some cases.

Nonetheless, when Scherkoske considers the possibility of integrity as a second-order virtue he has to dismiss it immediately simply because he assumes that the only characteristic of a second-order virtue is not to have any distinctive motivational thought. In a sense the conclusion that he draws is already there. The logic is pretty much like this: a second-order virtue does not have a X-quality (a distinctive motivational thought); if integrity is a second-order virtue, it does not have a X-quality; since it's impossible for integrity not to have a X-quality, it should not be a second-order virtue.

The problem of this sort of argument is that it does not really give room for that integrity could be a second-order virtue from the beginning. Although it appears that there is a possibility to be considered as such, there is actually none. It was obvious for him that integrity is not a first-order virtue because it lacks a X-quality. And that was already enough for it not to be a second-order virtue. Although the fact that it does not have a X-quality made it the candidate of a second-order virtue, the simple fact that it lacks a X-quality was already problematic as a candidate to be a virtue at all. This is because he already assumed that integrity should have a X-quality if it is to be considered as a distinctive virtue at all. The simple reason that integrity is not a virtue at all is just that it does not have a X-quality. So, the fact that integrity lacks a X-quality is enough to be not a virtue at all in his account.

The way that Scherkoske considers the possibility of integrity as a second-order virtue may not be the only problem that goes wrong here. There is already a problem with Williams's own categorization of the first-order and the second-order virtues. According to William's categorization that Scherkoske agrees with, a first-order virtue possesses a distinctive motivation and a second-order virtue is an executive virtue that facilitates other virtues. For instance, courage or strength of will is a second-order virtue because these virtues help a person to execute some other virtues. Scherkoske's argument is based on the assumption

that there is a clear cut division between the first-order and the second-order virtues. When he considers the different possibilities against Williams's point, he provides the argument that since integrity is neither a first-order moral virtue nor a second-order moral virtue, it is not a moral virtue at all. According to him, it is not a first-order moral virtue because it fails to summon up the distinctive motivational thought. And it is not a second-order moral virtue because it would render integrity a kind of redundant virtue which clearly is not the case assuming that it is a distinctive virtue.

However, I do not think that Scherkoske's assumption is right. It is not even true that we can clearly categorize a virtue as a first-order or a second-order. For instance, honesty is usually regarded as a first-order virtue. It is rather clear that honesty is a distinctive virtue. But it does not need to be taken in that way always. Honesty is sometimes needed to promote other virtues such as courage. It is true that in order to be honest, you need to be courageous first. In that regard, honesty does not seem to promote courageousness. Nonetheless, more to my point, you also need to be honest in order to be courageous. This is because you need to be honest about what kind of person you are to be courageous. Only after you realize how timid you are, you can summon up your courage. In this sense you need honesty in order to be courageous. This shows that even honesty can play the role of an executive virtue and can be regarded as a second-order

virtue as well. If this is right, even in the case where a virtue appears to be a clear example of a first-order virtue the division is somewhat blurry.

If there is no clear-cut distinction between first-order moral virtues and second-order moral virtues, then it seems wrong to suggest that integrity is not a moral virtue at all because it is none of two kinds of virtues. One way to explain this circumstance is that many of the other virtues have the qualities of the first-order as well as the second-order virtues and that integrity is no different. Or, one can simply conclude that moral virtues cannot be labeled with such names of the first-order and the second-order virtues.

Still, there seems to be a third possibility to explain this. Some people could think that it was rather clear that its first-order virtue characteristic is more distinctive even in my description of the virtue of honesty. For them it is rather obvious that although honesty could be used as an executive virtue sometimes, its main job has more to do with a first-order virtue. For instance, if we look at the usage of the word 'honesty,' it may turn out that its usage is more related to the first-order virtue more commonly. Or, even without looking at the frequency of the usages between the first-order and the second-order virtues regarding a particular virtue, you may believe that once it is used as a first-order virtue it should be regarded as such. This may be right considering that the second-order

virtues that are commonly listed such as courage or strength of will are possible only as second-order virtues but never as first-order virtues. Therefore, if a certain virtue is possibly used as a first-order virtue, it should be regarded as a first-order virtue although it could be sometimes used as a second-order virtue.

Maybe we can accept the convenient categorization between two kinds of virtues. Even if we accept it, however, I am not very convinced that there is a good reason to deny integrity as a first-order virtue. The reason why Williams and Scherkoske initially dismiss integrity as a first-order moral virtue is that it fails to invoke a motivational thought. Nevertheless, it is not obvious to me that integrity indeed lacks a clear motivational thought. First of all, what we may need to make a distinction is a distinction between a motivational failure in general and a motivational failure in a specific case.

I am not sure if there is no motivational thought at all in a specific case of people's use of the word 'integrity.' You sometimes hear in a conversation in a TV show that an authority figure such as a father of the listener says "I know that you are a person of integrity and you should know what to do." And the listener does not question like "What do you mean by integrity?" Such a conversation does show that the speaker and the listener have collectively brought about the same motivational thought of integrity.

I suppose that a real problem is rather about the motivational thought in general. It seems true that people in general have not reached an agreement on the meaning of integrity. A part of the problem of motivational failure in general seems to be because we have not figured out one unique characteristic of integrity yet. Still, when philosophers theorize what integrity is, what they attempt to do is to come up with a clear motivational thought. Once people in general reach some agreement on the meaning of integrity they would be able to summon up a unique motivational thought altogether. Thus, it would be wrong to conclude that simply because we cannot summon up a unique characteristic thought of integrity it is not a first-order virtue at all.

So far, I have assumed with Scherkoske that integrity is indeed a virtue. The problem that Williams and Scherkoske raise is the problem only because we assume that integrity is a virtue. If it is not a virtue at all, it would not be a problem to raise what kind of virtue integrity is. Indeed, there seem to be ways to say that integrity is not a virtue at all. If this claim has any point, it is worthwhile to examine the position as well.

5. Integrity and Virtue

In this section I will examine the relationship between integrity and virtue. As we saw before, the moralized view is that there is a tight connection between integrity and morality. Needless to say, morality here is not the same as virtue. Still, many people seem to believe that integrity is one of the virtues. In my discussion of the previous section, I dealt with an objection against the moralized view that arises because of such an assumption. Nevertheless, I do not think that it is the only way that is for the moralized view of integrity. One could think that integrity is not a virtue at all.

There are two ways to say that integrity is not a virtue: first, integrity is not a virtue because integrity is not even a good thing to have;⁸⁷ second, integrity is not a virtue because certain natures of virtue do not fit in integrity although integrity is a good thing to have. The first way of thinking is irrelevant to our discussion of the moralized view. The basic idea of the moralized view of integrity is that it is at least a good thing to possess integrity. The simple reason is that when we categorize integrity as something that is related to morality, the assumption is that morality is a good quality to possess. So, when a person tries to make sense of the view that integrity has to do with morality, what they mean

⁸⁷ For example, Schaubert denies that integrity is even a virtue at all. See Schaubert, "Integrity, Commitment and the Concept of a Person."

is that integrity is a good thing to have. For this reason, I will leave aside the first position.

There are reasons to think that integrity is not a virtue. Integrity seems to be better treated if it is not taken as a virtue. At least, it is not clear what it means to say that something is a virtue, and regarding it in that way would make things unnecessarily complicated. Since the concept of 'virtue' could carry a lot of baggage, categorizing integrity as a virtue would make our discussion unnecessarily complicated. This does not automatically build the case that integrity is not a virtue at all. But it does mean that we have less of the reasons to believe it.

Taking one simple example, it is not obvious if we should even allow *eudaimonism* as a part of the concept of virtue. *Eudaimonism* is the idea that the most fundamental value in ethics is human good. Some people say that virtue is truly *eudaimonistic* whereas some others avoid such association. According to William J. Prior, a theory of virtue cannot explain many answers regarding virtue without the notion of *eudaimonism* and people deny it for wrong reasons.⁸⁸ According to Prior, the only philosophical reason to deny *eudaimonism* is that such an *eudaimonistic* view fails to see that the primary task of moral philosophy is to justify absolute moral requirements and prohibitions. Against this criticism,

⁸⁸ William J. Prior, "Eudaimonism and Virtue," *The Journal of Value Inquiry* 35 (2001): 325–342.

Prior suggests that we abandon the notion of moral obligation and return to *eudaimonism* since the demand for absolutism is misconceived from the start. On the other hand, Ronald Sandler argues that virtue should be explained with a teleological, pluralistic account. According to Sandler, “[o]ur rational and psychological capacities enable us to value things in themselves, independent of whether doing so promotes or is constitutive of our own flourishing. This raises the possibility that some character traits are justified as virtues on noneudaimonistic grounds.”⁸⁹

Resolving the dispute of *eudaimonism*’s relevance to the concept of virtue would be too much to do it here. I can only assume that one of the understandings of *eudaimonism* is correct and the others are wrong. If that’s the case, we would close a door to certain concepts of integrity by accepting a particular type of *eudaimonism*. This may not be so bad as long as we get the correct way of understanding *eudaimonism*. Nonetheless, it seems pretty difficult to figure out which one is correct considering all the competitive suggestions.⁹⁰ Then, it is undeniably true that regarding integrity as a virtue would involve

⁸⁹ Ronald Sandler, “What Makes a Character Trait a Virtue?” *The Journal of Value Inquiry* 39 (2005): 383-397, p. 392.

⁹⁰ I have tried the complexity of the concept of virtue only with the example of the concept of *eudaimonism*. Against the common understanding of virtue, Michael Slote presents a certain form of intuitionism by arguing that a virtuous action does not require deliberation. For a debate, or more for criticism on such an intuitionism, see Daniel C. Russell, “Agent-based virtue ethics and the fundamentality of virtue,” *American Philosophical Quarterly* 45, no. 4 (2008): 329-347.

associating integrity with so much of the complicated aspects of virtue that the theorists have not resolved yet. This may not be a devastating reason to think that such a categorization is wrong.

Nonetheless, there seems to be another reason to doubt the categorization. Some scholars could complain that regarding integrity as a virtue limits the boundary of integrity too narrowly. It would be a problem if such a categorization excludes plausible positions on integrity. To give an example, Christine M. Korsgaard's discussion of integrity does not exactly fit in the usual description of virtue.⁹¹ In *Self-Constitution: Agency, Identity, and Integrity*, what she presents as integrity is not really a concept of virtue although she uses the word 'virtue of integrity' throughout the book. Assuming that her version of integrity does not offer a virtue of integrity, we will be throwing out her version entirely from plausible explanations of integrity if we take integrity only as a virtue. I will show briefly why her view should not be regarded as depicting integrity as a virtue.

Korsgaard discusses integrity mainly incorporating or interpreting Kant's view. According to Korsgaard, integrity in the metaphysical sense and integrity in the moral sense are one and the same property. Based on her theory on

⁹¹ As I make clear here, I think that Korsgaard's view of integrity is a very plausible one. For this reason, I discuss it heavily in Chapter 4.

reason's publicity, Korsgaard argues that respect for humanity or reasoning together is a necessary condition of effective action. Only because you have respect for humanity and reason together with other people can you interact with other people. Such a respect enables you to make a law under which you can be unified. And being able to interact with other people necessarily requires you to be able to interact with yourself properly and to figure out what you can be. In other words, being able to interact with other people requires you to be one unified person.

Now, this means that only by respecting for humanity or reasoning together, you can be genuinely unified and your movements can be attributable to you. In other words, respect for humanity is necessary for you to do a certain action and be a certain unified person at all. This is because only after you put yourself together and decide what to do can your movements be attributable to you; if you did a certain thing without your own reasoning process your movements cannot be attributable to you.

For Korsgaard, integrity is not a mere virtue. To be more precise, it is better regarded not as a virtue. If it is a virtue, it is only a secondary concept. Following Kant, Korsgaard emphasizes reason's role for an agent. In her account, one would not be regarded as an agent if one acts in the way to fail to interact with other people. In other words, a person would not even be a person at all if

he does not respond to other people's reasons as well as to his own reasons. And as we have seen, the metaphysical sense of integrity and the moral sense of integrity are the same. What makes a person possible to possess the metaphysical sense of integrity is his own reasoning capacity. Therefore, integrity means a proper response to reason. One thing to notice is that both Kant's and Korsgaard's reason are not exactly human being's reason.

In *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant suggests that if there is a being with reason what he argues would apply to such a being as well.⁹² Following Kant, Korsgaard makes it clear that her discussion of reason is not just limited to the boundary of the human being. According to her, if there is an alien who visits the earth, even such a being would be able to understand the way we value things in a certain way.⁹³ From our human being's reflective scrutiny certain ways of living are acceptable and certain other ways not acceptable regardless of our particular roles, desires and identities. Those actions that pass the scrutiny are what we can call reason.⁹⁴ As I summarized above, integrity is the same as one's exercise of reason and, in turn, a person's possession of

⁹² Immanuel Kant (1785), *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, in Mary J. Gregor (tran & ed), *Practical Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 44-45 (Prussian Academy Edition, IV 389).

⁹³ The specific place where she discusses this example is in *The Sources of Normativity* rather than in *Self-Constitution* where she discusses integrity. See Christine M. Korsgaard, *The Sources of Normativity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996b), p. 72.

⁹⁴ See especially Korsgaard, *The Sources of Normativity*, p. 93.

integrity would be an exercise of one's capacity of reason to the level that would make sense to other existences than human beings. This characteristic of integrity goes beyond the boundary or the characteristic of virtue. At least, this is a huge contrast to what Aristotle presents as a virtue in *Nicomachean Ethics*.⁹⁵ According to Aristotle, one person's virtuous action could be different from another's because each person has different strengths in terms of dispositional appropriateness. For instance, the capacity of your braveness would be different from mine. So, one person's exercise of virtuous action would not necessarily be the kind of thing that other people should be able to make sense of. If this is the case, then it is safe to say that Korsgaard's version of integrity is not really a virtue of integrity as we understand Aristotelian virtue. Therefore, assuming Korsgaard's view of integrity is a plausible one, we should not take it for granted that integrity is a virtue.

If integrity is more than a mere virtue, what kind of thing is integrity after all? Does our discussion leave us now that integrity is nothing but a vague concept that does not belong to any category or species? One way to think of this kind of case may be to accept that our hope or eagerness to categorize integrity into some group is wrong. Although it is quite convenient that things are organized in the way we expect them to be, things may not be as tidy as we hope

⁹⁵ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1107a1-6

them to be. What I want to suggest, though, is that we may need to have an open attitude towards what kind of the thing integrity is till the end of our discussion. What we may need to accept at this point is that possessing integrity would be a good thing.⁹⁶

Considering both the accounts above, we have fewer reasons to assume that integrity is a virtue. At the end of this project, it will turn out to be that integrity has to do with a psychological state of realization that whom he thinks he is is the same as whom other people think he is. But it is also more than a psychological or mental state since it would require the real state of the fact that the person has unified himself in the way that not just himself but also other people's way of thinking of what a person should be like. This is not the kind of state of the fact that we can call a virtue.

⁹⁶ There are other ways to think of integrity rather than as a virtue. One possible way to think of integrity is that it is just a psychological state. In the Old Testament, Job was tested by Satan with God's permission and lost everything that he had. Still, Job believes that he did not do anything wrong and continues to believe that God has some plan for him. This belief state could be integrity and, according to the New International Version, his wife calls it in that way. "His wife said to him, 'Are you still maintaining your integrity? Curse God and die!'" (Job 2:9) Job's intact belief in God's plan is a certain psychological state that may last for a while or for a short amount of time. This is quite different from virtue that is a disposition.

6. Conclusion

In this chapter I showed what the moralized view of integrity would be like with two representative cases. With Plato's view of integrity, a moralized view of integrity can be formulated in the way that a person with morally wrong commitments fails to have a harmonized soul and does not function as a unified person. With Kant's view of integrity, another moralized view of integrity can be formulated in the way that one's moral quality, which could be interpreted as the same as integrity, is the gist of his characteristics that lasts even after one's death. Both of these views assume that a person of integrity cannot commit to morally vicious commitments. What I suggest in addition is that possessing integrity is a good thing although it is not necessarily a virtue. In Chapter 4, I will explain why the relationship between morality and integrity is a more subtle one.

CHAPTER 3

ACCOUNTS OF WHAT IT IS TO POSSESS INTEGRITY

In the past two chapters, I presented two opposite positions on the relationship between integrity and morality. The moralized view of integrity says that a person committing to morally vicious principles cannot be a person of integrity whereas the unmoralized view says that he can. Those positions have different views on the question of ‘whether a person committing to morally vicious principles can be a person of integrity.’ I will call this question the ‘moral nature’ question. In order to answer the question, I suggest that we consider another question: what is it to possess integrity? I will call this additional one ‘conception of integrity’ question. The first question is about a certain nature of integrity since it concerns with the question of whether we should include moral aspect as a part of the account of what integrity is. The second one is about a general conception of what integrity is. In this chapter I examine different answers to the second question.

The primary goal of this project is to obtain the answer to the moral nature question. On the other hand, the conception of integrity question must be resolved in order to gain the answer to the first question. When we examine different accounts of conception of integrity, we would also be able to tell what kind of answer the accounts of conception of integrity would give regarding the moral nature question. This is because defining integrity would involve considering many different natures or aspects of integrity and moral nature is a matter of one specific aspect of integrity. If we are able to tell which account of conception of integrity is the best, we would be able to focus on what the account has to say regarding the moral nature question.

One would think that we are not progressing at all since starting from one question as the main project we ended up with two separate questions to resolve. This may be more so considering that we cannot obtain the answer to the conception of integrity question immediately. At least, answering the conception of integrity question seems to involve answering the moral nature question as well. If we want to figure out what it means to possess integrity, there must be some criteria to tell what integrity is; one important requirement for an adequate theory on the conception of integrity seems to be that it should successfully explain our intuition regarding whether integrity is a moral concept.

Because of this problem, one could even consider the other way. We could disregard the necessity of the second question to be resolved simply because our goal was an answer to the first question. Then, it could be more sensible to address the first question first and then the second one. After all, whereas defining integrity would involve different aspects of integrity, moral nature is just one aspect. Nonetheless, in order to determine whether integrity is a moral concept, we need to know what integrity is; in order to see if a person committing to morally vicious principles could be regarded as a person of integrity, we should know what integrity means.

To resolve this issue, we need to look at what we can know from the fact that there are two separate issues in hand and they are interrelated. One thing is that if there is an account which makes the moral nature question disappear from our philosophical domain, that account is not an appropriate answer to the conception of integrity question. The entire project is based on the assumption that the moral nature question is a genuine one. Whatever plausible answer a theory offers to the second question, we cannot accept the theory as a plausible one as long as it does not take the first question seriously. For this reason, I will eliminate one account of the conception of integrity from the candidate views below.

After this, we can examine whether the rest of the candidate theories of the conception of integrity question do the job appropriately. While each approach would offer a plausible account, we can eliminate specific theories from the appropriate account because of the assumptions in the Introduction. For instance, some theories could disregard the most common usage of the word 'integrity.' As I said before, although a theory does not and should not accommodate all the different kinds of the average person's use of the word, it would be wrong to ignore some intuition that underlies the common usages. For this reason, I will exclude two theories from the candidate views. It means, again, that whatever answer the theories give to the moral nature question, we will not regard it as a right one to the moral nature question.

Finally, I will compare the last two accounts of the conception of integrity question and examine which view is a better answer. Considering that our primary goal is to answer the moral nature question, we may need to consider the possibility that the two accounts lead to the same answer to the moral nature question. In that case, we may not need to find the right answer between those two accounts. Nevertheless, if we leave behind which one is the better answer, we will not be able to tell how we should understand the conception of integrity. It would preclude us from gaining a rich account of the relationship between the conception of integrity and the moral nature. Once we obtain the right answer to

the conception of integrity question, we would be able to tell how some specific aspects of integrity upon the appropriate account to the conception of integrity lead to the answer to the moral nature question, rather than just offering a yes or no answer to the moral nature question.

1. Five Competing Views

There are mainly five different views on integrity.⁹⁷ Considering that I go in detail of each view when I consider objections to each view, I will provide only a brief introduction here.

First, according to the clean-hands view, integrity is a matter of placing the importance of one's principles and the purity of one's own agency above anything else. In particular, a person of integrity in this picture does not

⁹⁷ These five views are analytically distinct and the first four views appear in Calhoun's seminal paper "Standing for Something" (*The Journal of Philosophy* 92, no. 5 (1995): 235-260). Scherkoske tries to make a new distinction among different views on the meaning of integrity in "Whither Integrity I: Recent Faces of Integrity," but they are not analytically distinct. ("Whither Integrity I: Recent Faces of Integrity," *Philosophy Compass* 8, no. 1 (2013b): 28-39.) Therefore, I add only Scherkoske's own view to Calhoun's list.

Scherkoske adds two more to Calhoun's list apart from his own view. One of them is 'moral purpose' view. I do not see much difference between this view and clean-hands view. According to his explanation of clean-hands view, "[clean-hands] view comports well with paradigmatic cases of integrity: people who refuse to cooperate with corrupt or evil regimes, people who speak truth to power and suffer for it, as well as people who undertake smaller acts of resistance rather than be complicit." (p. 31) A person would indeed refuse 'to cooperate with corrupt or evil regimes' because of 'soundness of moral principle and uprightness' that Scherkoske summarizes as 'moral purpose.'

The other view that Scherkoske adds is 'strength of will' view. Scherkoske thinks that their view deserves to be called a distinct view, considering that John Bigelow and Robert Pargetter defends the idea that the enemy of integrity is nothing else apart from weakness of will. (John Bigelow and Robert Pargetter, "Integrity and Autonomy," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 44, no. 1 (2007): 39-49.) I will discuss this view in the last chapter.

compromise his bottom-line principles with the consequential concerns. According to this view, the main characteristic of a person without integrity is that he trades action on his own judgments too cheaply for gain, reward, or approval of others. "Or they trade their own views too readily for the views of others who are more authoritative, more in step with public opinion, less demanding of themselves, and so on."⁹⁸

The second view is called the integrated-self picture of integrity. According to this view, if you are integrating various parts of yourself into a whole, you have integrity. Starting from some etymological observation of the word 'integrity,' the view holds that integrity is unifying one's inner desires or volitions into one so that he does not fail to make up his mind. Harry G. Frankfurt claims that if an individual fails to identify 'wholeheartedly' with one's volitions or if he is ambivalent about identifying with his desires he may fail to possess integrity.⁹⁹ To explain this position, Cheshire Calhoun explains in this way: an individual of both inconsistency and ambivalence "cannot wholeheartedly say 'I will,' since there is no unified self to back the willing. She lacks integrity. Wholeheartedness, and with it integrity, would require

⁹⁸ Calhoun, "Standing for Something," p. 250.

⁹⁹ Frankfurt, "Identification and Wholeheartedness," p. 33.

integrating competing desires into a single ordering as well as separating some desires from the self and relegating them to 'outlaw' status."¹⁰⁰

The third view is the identity picture of integrity. This view is largely based on Bernard Williams's argument against the adequacy of Kantianism and utilitarianism. According to Calhoun's description, on this view, "integrity means fidelity to those projects and principles that are constitutive of one's core identity."¹⁰¹ Whereas the integrated-self picture takes integrity to be about all the cares that an agent may have, the identity view takes integrity only about those things that are important to an agent's sense of self or identity. Since all the important concerns or commitments are what define her identity, it is unthinkable for her to go astray from these concerns or commitments. So, a person will experience a loss of her identity if she betrays her core self.

The fourth view is the social virtue view. In her paper "Standing for something" Cheshire Calhoun argues that integrity is more like a social virtue rather than a personal matter. Starting with her criticisms of each view of the three above, she points out additionally that each view misses some critical aspect in that when a person of integrity stands for some values or principles they are worthy of defense because they concern how other community members

¹⁰⁰ Calhoun, "Standing for Something," p. 237.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 235.

also can do so.¹⁰² Offering the example of the fact that people criticized President Clinton when he capitulated to the joint chiefs of staff and members of Congress over the military ban on gays and lesbians for lacking integrity, she points out that integrity is not explained with the common concept that all the other three accounts share—integrity is basically not damaging one’s selfhood. From the critics’ perspective, as the argument goes, his wrongdoing is not because he betrayed himself but betrayed people who counted on him to stand up for what they took to be the better. With the insight from this example, Calhoun claims that integrity is giving proper regard to one’s own best judgment. In other words, a person of integrity has to have proper epistemic attitudes towards what he believes, and he should recognize the worthiness of his beliefs before other community members.

The fifth view is called ‘the epistemic virtue view.’ Being in line with the social virtue view, Greg Scherkoske argues that integrity is an epistemic virtue. According to Scherkoske, integrity has to do with an “epistemically virtuous way in which people stand for (or even revise) their convictions.”¹⁰³ In this view, if a person has integrity, it means that the person possesses a good epistemic perspective and tends to lead to cognitive success.

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 254.

¹⁰³ Scherkoske, “Whither Integrity I: Recent Faces of Integrity.”

In the next section, I will discuss why we can eliminate particular views from an adequate account of integrity. I will first dismiss the clean-hands view relatively briefly and then regard the fourth and fifth views as the same one after giving my reason why they are more or less the same.

2. Why Certain Views are not the Answers

2.1 The clean-hands view

Integrity on the clean-hands view involves having a certain principle. It is that there are things that you should never do such as taking a bribe or killing a person. According to this view, a person of integrity does not compromise his own principles with the consequential concerns standing on his bottom-line principles.

One may wonder if Williams's discussion of the problem of consequentialism gives some reason to be in favor of the clean-hands view.¹⁰⁴ In his well-known example, George who does not believe in chemical-biological warfare is offered to take a research job for that type of war. If he does not take the job, it will go to a more zealous researcher, so according to a utilitarian logic, it is better for him to take the job. It means that he should refuse on his principle

¹⁰⁴ Bernard Williams, "Integrity," in J.J.C. Smart and B. Williams, *Utilitarianism: For and Against* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

that certain things should never be compromised. Although interpretations of this example vary, most people would agree that something is regrettable in George's decision to accept the utilitarian logic. This seems to support the clean-hands view's intuition. There really are the things that you should never do no matter what. And a person of integrity would be the kind of person who does not give up his principle.

Calhoun argues that although the example was illustrated in the way that utilitarianism makes a demand to give up the conviction that some acts are wrong regardless of their consequences, she claims (following Blustein)¹⁰⁵ that the case "has everything to do with abandoning one's own judgment for another's. The more authoritative or more coercive the external demand that one do x rather than the y one thinks one ought to do, the more intense the integrity question becomes, namely, the question of whether one will act on one's own or an external judgment."¹⁰⁶ For some people this may not be clear because George could totally agree with the utilitarian logic, so the case is not necessarily about whether George succumbs himself to the authority. Nonetheless, it seems clear at least that George is not a utilitarian already. If he was, he would not have problems with accepting the offered job. Moreover, even if he has accepted utilitarian logic already, if he does have issues with taking the job, he probably

¹⁰⁵ Blustein, *Care and commitment*, p. 70.

¹⁰⁶ Calhoun, "Standing for Something," p. 251.

has not accepted them entirely anyway. So, the case could be read as about accepting an external judgment. If the essential nature of this case is not about the fact that there are things that one should never do, the implication of Williams's discussion is not necessarily in favor of the clean-hands view.

I do not intend to resolve the issue because there are other problems with the clean-hands view. One challenge of this account is that it is in favor of one particular moral theory. According to the clean-hands view, a person of integrity does not compromise his own beliefs with any other consequential concerns. The reason why a person like George does not want to compromise seems to be because he or she buys a kind of deontology. Such a person believes that one should not violate one's important obligations or duties. Still, a theorist holding the clean-hands view would need to explain why deontology rather than consequentialism wins apart from that he should explain why integrity should be in line with deontology. As I assumed in the Introduction, an account that accommodates not just one particular theory but different moral theories is better. Therefore, there is a good reason to doubt the credibility of the clean-hands view *ceteris paribus*.

Even a bigger problem is that the view does not allow room for the moral nature question. As I explained above, an answer to the conception of integrity question should not eliminate the possibility of the moral nature question in our

philosophical domain. An appropriate account on the conception of integrity should reflect the nature of the question that we are asking in this project. In other words, it should be able to explain why a certain person is a person of integrity and at the same time why we also give merit to a person who does possess morally questionable commitments as long as he or she sticks to the commitments.

It may turn out to be the case, at the end of the day, the adequate account of the conception of integrity tells that there is a tight connection between morality and integrity so that a person committing to morally questionable principles or commitments is not a person of integrity at all. Yet, an account of integrity that secures this result from the start by ruling out a certain type of person from a person of integrity would seem implausible. At least, if there is a theory that says that merely because morality and integrity are the same thing a certain type of person is not counted as a person of integrity, the theory does not do justice to people's common intuition that the gist of integrity is sticking to one's own principles or commitments. This is because people's puzzlement about the moral nature question starts from the very intuition that there is something positive about sticking to one's own principles or commitments and yet that it does not seem to be enough for the entire story about integrity.

To be more precise, assuming the tight connection between morality and integrity from the beginning would ignore the question of the moral nature question as an uninteresting or pseudo-question. Such a theorist simply shrugs off by saying that the moral nature question does not matter at all because there is simply the connection between morality and integrity without any explanation of why there should be the connection. Nonetheless, the presumption of this project is that any theory which does not give a serious thought on the matter of the moral nature question is not legitimate.

The clean-hands view points out well that a person of integrity could be a person of integrity because of the fact that he cares about some important values in his life. Nonetheless, that may not be the only explanation. Considering that all the reasons to be against the clean-hands view are not insignificant, we should exclude the clean-hands view from adequate answers to the conception of integrity question. It means that we will not try to find how the account would answer the moral nature question, which is our primary issue.

2.2 The social virtue view and the epistemic virtue view

For some people, Calhoun's point against other accounts of integrity has constituted a unique account, and people call her view 'the social virtue view.' According to Calhoun, integrity is having a proper regard for one's own

judgment as a deliberator among deliberators. According to the view, the analysis of integrity should not be confined to understanding it as a personal virtue. As Calhoun's argument goes, although the intuitive appeal of all the other accounts such as the integrated-self, identity, and clean-hands views depends on their explication of what is meant by standing for something, the views reduce 'standing for' to 'standing by.' Acting with integrity is "intimately tied to protecting the boundaries of the self-to protecting it against disintegration, against loss of self-identity, and against pollution by evil. ... What drops out of these accounts, however, is the centrality of standing *for* principles and values that, in one's own best judgment, are worthy of defense because they concern how *we*, as beings interested in living justly and well, can do so."¹⁰⁷

It is true that all the other accounts try to explain in what sense a person acting without integrity undermines his boundary of the self. They do not pay much attention to the fact that when a person stands for one's own principles and values, they are worthy of defense because their evaluative community also thinks of them as valuable. However, it is wrong to point out only this aspect in order to explain integrity. Calhoun supports her claim with two examples and one of them is the case where people criticized President Clinton for lacking integrity. Although he believed otherwise, he eventually gave in to others over

¹⁰⁷ Calhoun, "Standing for something," p. 254.

the military ban on gays and lesbians. From the critics' perspective, as the argument goes, he failed people who counted on him to stand up for what they took to be the better.

Nonetheless, it is doubtful that the example necessarily supports Calhoun's point. First of all, what is the nature of these 'co-deliberators'? I do not think that she could mean only real community members. Although it happens to be the case that the critics are the actual community members in the example, it does not necessarily need to be limited to the actual group of people. If we look at things simply from integrity perspective, exactly the opposite side of people who thought that Clinton's final decision was right could criticize Clinton for the reason that he changed his mind way too easily. If Calhoun's assumption is right that Clinton changed his mind without having a good reason to do so, he would be criticized by his own imaginary self as well. This is because when we deliberate and decide on things, we try to make sense of our reasoning to ourselves and some imaginary co-deliberators, not just to the actual community members.

In fact, there is something missing in Calhoun's explanation. Whether an agent makes sense of his decision to other co-deliberators or not could be less important than whether he can do so to himself. We can certainly imagine the following case. Some of the critics learn about some inevitable reasons why

Clinton had to change his mind, and they stop thinking that he is not a person of integrity. Although I should admit that Clinton's reason should be solid in order to convince these people, it really is a possible scenario. In that case, whether a person successfully convinces others with sound reasoning is less important than whether he actually has a good reason to make him do so. If Clinton failed to be a person of integrity with that particular decision, it would be more because he was unable to have a good reason and to make sense of his action to himself. Thus, merely pointing out the social aspect of someone's decision is not enough to explain what integrity is. When a person fails to be a person of integrity, there seems to be some damage to one's personhood. It is clearly a personal level of damage in the sense that he cannot defend his decision to himself. Thus, Calhoun's view needs to explain more about how a person's failure of possession of integrity is really about the social aspect.

For that reason, there is a real sense in which the social virtue view is not a fully blown view. The gist of possessing integrity may require a person to hold firm to what he believes. It seems, however, that the view either takes for granted some essential point or does not consider the point at all. In order to make sense of Calhoun's point, the person should have the right conviction or a conviction that is worthwhile to defend to give a proper regard for his conviction; we would not appreciate someone's quality if the person does not have the right conviction

and he happens to respect his own conviction. Then, the gist of possessing integrity is having the right epistemic judgment rather than a proper regard for what he believes.

Scherkoske's idea of the epistemic virtue view is greatly indebted to Calhoun's view, and in a sense his view should be taken as a full development of her view. For this reason, I will take Scherkoske's view seriously in what follows rather than Calhoun's social virtue view. As we can see from the following passage, claiming the same point that I just made, Scherkoske draws his main project from something that Calhoun thought as an obvious part of the answer that she provides.

... the claim that integrity involves a proper regard for one's judgment leaves the central problem largely untouched. What does it mean to exhibit proper regard for one's judgment? Given that integrity is most clearly manifest in sticking to one's convictions in the face of challenge and disagreement, and given that the epistemic import of such disagreement is (arguably) to call one's own convictions into question, this is a pressing question. ... if a person's convictions may be less defensible than she thinks, what, precisely, does the person of integrity get right? Does it make sense in this context to suggest that persons of integrity must aspire to have reasonable or (perhaps) correct convictions?¹⁰⁸

According to Calhoun, the gist of possessing integrity is to hold tight to what he believes judging that he can defend such belief against other community members. On the other hand, Scherkoske points out the importance of

¹⁰⁸ Scherkoske, *Leading a Convincing Life*, p. 108.

obtainment of the right sorts of judgment. One could ask if their views are after all the same. To be fair to Calhoun, her intention in the paper could be mainly pointing out the limitation of the current views on integrity rather than offering an equally full-blown analytic account. If that was the case, Scherkoske's account seems to be the right direction that Calhoun could have taken if she wanted to offer one. After all, what she pointed out as a good candidate for what amounts to possessing integrity is a good judgment on the good ways to live. When she says that integrity is one's proper regard for his own judgment of what is worthwhile to live for, she must have the thought that the person has the correct or the good judgment. If the person does not have the good judgment, there is no point of saying that it is a virtue that he has a proper regard for his judgment.

Then, what does Scherkoske add to Calhoun's view apart from making it explicit the underlying answer to the question that he asks? According to Scherkoske himself, Calhoun only thought that what matters for integrity is good ways to live,¹⁰⁹ whereas his account can accommodate other areas such as professional or academic expertise and aesthetic matters.¹¹⁰ Since integrity on this view is excellence of epistemic agency, it manifests not just in the area of one's moral principles but also in one's "aesthetic and personal ideals, in being an

¹⁰⁹ "Calhoun's view of integrity seems, in fact, not to capture the sense in which a person's integrity can be expressed in the regard for judgments *other* than those concerning good ways to live." (Ibid., p. 24.)

¹¹⁰ See especially Ibid., p. 29.

informed citizen, and in the trustworthiness of one's testimony to others."¹¹¹

Nonetheless, this difference mainly comes from the fact that he tries to answer the question that he asks against Calhoun's view. If a correct judgment is a necessary part of what it means to possess integrity, then we can easily extend the idea of integrity in areas other than one's own evaluative community. After all, it is not a great deal to say that a proper regard for one's judgment will be extended to other areas too.

I may have been harsh on Scherkoske's contribution, but I do think that he provides a good version of the fully developed idea that Calhoun starts. In what follows, I will take this extended version seriously, offering what I am against the view.

According to the epistemic virtue view, integrity is basically a complex set of traits of "an agent's capacity to have reasoned and justified convictions."¹¹² A person of integrity is, on this view, someone who has justified convictions as a rational agent because of his own experience. Since having justified convictions means forming and acting in the ways required by his own convictions, acting in accordance with his convictions is a part of the intellectual capacity that a person of integrity shows.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 64.

¹¹² Scherkoske, "Could Integrity Be An Epistemic Virtue?" p. 208.

There are some appealing points in the epistemic virtue view. Scherkoske seems to think that he can resolve the problem of explaining why an evil person cannot be a person of integrity as well as telling why we give some merit to a person for sticking to his principles even when we do not agree with his principles.¹¹³ It is true that once integrity is an epistemic virtue, then it successfully explains our intuition on both. First, it can explain why an evil person cannot be a person of integrity. As we have seen, integrity is primarily understood as an agent's capacity to have reasoned and justified convictions. Then, integrity requires a person to regard his judgment as worth adhering to, preparing to defend against opposing views even when some other verdicts appear to require revision of his decisions in question. The fact that the person's commitment is something that is defensible against other people's opinions must play a role to control what a person can commit to. The person cannot commit to whatever he fits right but only the things that he thinks that other people also find appropriate or at least the things that he can defend against other opposing views.

It also explains our intuition that there is some merit to the person who sticks to his principles or commitments even when we do not agree with his position. Different from the clean-hands view, the epistemic virtue view gives

¹¹³ Scherkoske, *Leading a Convincing Life*, p. 176.

merit on a person who sticks to his commitment as long as he regards his commitment as something that is worthwhile to defend. Scherkoske describes this aspect of his view as follows, “a commitment to regarding one’s judgment as worth standing for is in a sense a loyalty to oneself – or more precisely, one’s epistemic agency.”¹¹⁴ Therefore, Scherkoske’s view can explain why people would admire a person of integrity for his proper regard for or his loyalty to one’s best judgment, which could sometimes be against other opposing views.

Nevertheless, I do not think that Scherkoske’s account is successful at providing an answer to what integrity is. As a rebuttal of possible objections, he considers the ‘practicality objection.’ He anticipates the argument as follows. “Since we think this virtuous kind of holding fast involves more than merely not changing one’s mind, or holding to one’s convictions in epistemically irresponsible ways, it is natural to suppose that integrity must centrally involve the sort of resoluteness that precludes weakness of will, backsliding and compromising one’s judgment.”¹¹⁵ Even if one formulates an epistemic conviction, a more important part of exhibiting one’s integrity would be that one successfully acts on his conviction and maintains the act rather than that one has successfully formulated the conviction or not. If the argument is successful,

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. 65.

¹¹⁵ Scherkoske, “Could Integrity Be An Epistemic Virtue?” p. 203.

Scherkoske's new approach to the meaning of integrity would be a grotesque failure.

Against this possible objection, Scherkoske argues that there is no need to assume that one would fail to execute what he intends to do. Giving an example of someone who obviously fails to act on his conviction, Scherkoske claims that "[t]his over-readiness to revise one's intentions in the light of new deliberation is itself a kind of irresoluteness."¹¹⁶ If the person actually formulated his conviction with an epistemically good judgment, he would not have failed to execute to act on the conviction. Therefore, the representative failure of acting on one's conviction does not prove that the epistemic view itself is a failure too.

Scherkoske is right to consider the practicality objection. For most people one obvious failure of possessing integrity is backsliding or failing to overcome temptations. However, this representative failure of integrity does not simply raise the worry that a person of integrity would fail to execute his conviction. After all, it is not so difficult to accept that a person's good epistemic judgment would lead him to act on the judgment rather than abandoning it in the face of challenge. The problem seems to be, rather, that it does not accommodate our practice of criticizing someone for lacking integrity.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., p. 206.

To explain what I mean by the claim that I just made, let me divert a little. Although we would not give credit for every usage or practice that integrity is being used, an appropriate theory on the concept of integrity should not ignore the average person's intuition about what integrity is. What I mean by the average person's intuition is that people use the word 'integrity' to encourage or discourage certain types of actions. True that it is hard to tell who the average person is. It is, however, almost always true that people use the word 'integrity' not just to describe someone's characteristic. When a person says that someone does not have integrity, we understand him saying that the person has some faulty characteristics. The person could do a certain type of more desirable actions but she did not. Although it could be a simple description of the fact that she has such and such characteristic, it is usually understood as more than a simple description. Even when it sounds only a descriptive claim about someone's certain characteristics, it is right to take it as a normative claim.

For this reason, an appropriate account of integrity should reflect this normative usage of the word of integrity. Any plausible theory would tell us why a certain type of person possesses integrity and why a certain other type does not. An adequate theory, however, should go beyond such an explanation of a descriptive usage. It should not eliminate the very phenomenon that we use the word as a normative claim. If there is a theory that makes our practice of a

normative claim disappear or makes it marginal from our discussion, the theory is not a tenable position. I think that Scherkoske's theory of the epistemic virtue view is not a tenable one for this reason.

According to the epistemic virtue view, a person of integrity possesses an epistemic virtue which is understood as "any stable cognitive trait, habit or process that reliably places its possessor in good epistemic position."¹¹⁷ This view is based on the idea that a person of integrity is praised or relied upon by other people for his good judgments in difficult situations. We would assume that the person has achieved this amount of knowledge regarding the issue because he has acted on the knowledge in the area of his expertise. So, one would think that acting upon one's knowledge is a part of the requirement to be a person of integrity even on the epistemic virtue view. Nonetheless, the real focus on the epistemic virtue view is still whether a person possesses the relevant knowledge or not. If there was a person who knows a great deal in the relevant area, he would be a person of integrity in that area according to the epistemic virtue view.

Now, the question is whether knowledge is really the gist of integrity. If knowledge is the gist, it becomes hard to understand our practice of criticizing someone for his lack of integrity. At least it makes the practice itself irrelevant to understand what integrity is. Let us try to imagine as many situations as possible

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 196.

where we criticize someone for his lack of integrity. What is common in our practice is that the person did not do what was right. Or, to put it more precisely, the person did not do what he believes to be a right thing to do. Whether we criticize someone for his lack of integrity is mainly dependent on whether a certain action has happened or not rather than whether the person gained the relevant knowledge correctly or not. In other words, knowledge itself seems to be pretty insignificant in our practice of chastising someone.

Before building my point that knowledge is less significant than it may appear, however, I may need to accept the importance of knowledge to a certain degree. It is true, after all, that in our practice of the criticism we assume that the person knows what a good thing is to do. If you do not think that the person knows what is right and wrong in his mind, you would not criticize the person by saying that the person lacks integrity. When you assume that the person knows what is right and wrong in his mind, you do not need to commit to the idea that there are absolute objective truths. Still, what you need to assume is that there are at least some amounts of truths about what is right and wrong that you and the other person can agree on. Otherwise, there is no point of criticizing him for his actions. This may appear to some people that knowledge is after all important in our practice.

Nevertheless, knowledge itself is not the central relevance to why you would criticize someone for his lack of integrity. At least, your reason for criticism is not because he did not know better. To be more precise, you would not criticize a person for failing to know better although you would do so for not trying to know better. The fact that normativity has more to do with someone's action becomes more evident if we consider the case where someone's knowledge is significantly off. Even when someone's acting on his knowledge is based on his wrong information, it makes sense to criticize the person's lack of integrity. You could still criticize a person when you hear that he did something contrary to what he believes to be the right thing to do.

Suppose a person betrays his friend for his own financial benefit. Assuming that this person already knows that it is wrong to betray his true friend, let's say that you and this person agree upon that it is wrong to betray one's friend. In this scenario, you would feel repulsive about his act of betrayal. So, this certainly seems to be the case that the person lacks integrity.

Changing the scenario, however, suppose that his friend was also secretly betraying him. In this case, your feeling of repulsiveness towards his action may decrease. Someone may even say that his betrayal of his friend is not really wrong in such a situation. Because his knowledge that the other person was his

true friend was significantly off, the betrayal of the person was not a real betrayal. After all, he did not betray his 'true' friend.

Nonetheless, the fact that his knowledge was significantly off does not seem to make our criticism of his characteristics disappear. Either he mistakenly believed the other person as his true friend or not, it does not change the fact that he performed the action of the betrayal of the person he knew as his true friend. For this reason, our repulsive feeling towards his betrayal is still there, if the strength of the feeling has decreased. We find one's betrayal of his belief repulsive because it really is detrimental to some good quality that the person could have. As in the previous case, the quality seems to be integrity. Regardless of whether a person has acted upon true knowledge or not, the person's action of impairing his integrity has happened in both of the scenarios. Therefore, we can say that the obtainment of knowledge itself is less significant compared to one's acting on knowledge in terms of integrity.

Some people may wonder whether knowledge is really insignificant. There seem to be cases where an agent's knowledge is important in our practice of chastising someone. We sometimes withhold our criticism of a person's integrity depending on whether the agent has obtained a relevant knowledge or not. This is true when you know for sure that the person lacks some critical objective information. A politician who is criticized as a hypocrite would be

forgiven easily once we find that an important piece of knowledge on his side was missing and he acted out of ignorance. As in the previous case, this person's action is based on his misguided information. And this misguided information seems to be exactly what makes our criticism of his lack of integrity disappear. If this is right, then my claim that a person's knowledge is less significant would be wrong. If someone acted out of his ignorance of true knowledge of the matter, it makes sense to withhold our criticism that the person lacks integrity.

Nonetheless, on the contrary to what it appears, this is in fact another case where a person's knowledge is less significant than his action. The reason why we withdraw our criticism of his lack of integrity is that there is no disparity between his knowledge of what he is supposed to do and his performance of the action. In fact, the simple reason that he lacked the relevant information did not change the whole story. Rather, the fact that we mistakenly believed that there was the disparity between his knowledge and his action changed the story. So, someone's obtainment of knowledge does not seem to be the main relevant factor in our criticism of the person's lack of integrity.

The point that I have established leads us to think that there is something missing in the understanding of the epistemic virtue view. The problem is that we cannot chastise a person who lacks integrity with this understanding. As we just saw, according to the epistemic virtue view, possessing integrity in a certain

area is basically understood as being an expert in the area. If so, possessing integrity in the area of how to live is basically knowing better at how to live. This means that a person who lacks integrity simply does not have the knowledge of how to live.¹¹⁸ But this emphasis of knowledge does not reflect the nature of our criticism of a person's lack of integrity. As we have seen, the very minimum of normativity in our chastising a person's lack of integrity comes not from the fact that he does not know better but from the fact that he did what he knows he should not do.

The epistemic virtue view makes our practice of criticizing a person's lack of integrity disappear from our discussion. At least, it makes the reason why we chastise someone's lack of integrity irrelevant to how we understand integrity. While the epistemic virtue view could offer an appealing point from certain respects, it renders the very phenomenon that we use the word as a normative claim disappear from our philosophical domain and cannot be a tenable position.

¹¹⁸ People may hear Aristotle's voice lurking here. There is a difference between knowledge and belief, and if knowledge that the epistemic virtue view has emphasized all along is knowledge or 'a justified true belief' rather than 'a justified belief,' then integrity would be possible only for a person who has the access to the justified 'true' beliefs. Still, a person can only act upon what he believes to be true and, as we saw, what matters more for our practice of criticizing someone is the person's belief; whether we can criticize someone or not depends on the person's belief rather than the person's access to truth. Even if the epistemic virtue view's emphasis of knowledge is focused on someone's obtainment of true belief, that is exactly the problem that we have against the epistemic virtue view.

2.3. The identity view vs. the integrated-self view

So far, I have discussed why two competing views such as the clean-hands view and the social and epistemic virtue view do not offer an appropriate explanation of what integrity is. The other two views are the identity view and the integrated-self view. Again, on the identity view, a person of integrity maintains fidelity to his projects or principles that are constitutive of his core identity. Whereas the integrated-self view takes integrity to be about all the cares that an agent may have, the identity view takes integrity to be only about those things that are important to an agent's sense of self or identity. The two views share the intuition that integrity is more about one's own unification of all the different parts of oneself. A person's object of the unification is all the desires and volitions on the integrated-self view whereas the object of the unification is one's identity on the identity view. Assuming that they are right that integrity is essentially unifying all the different parts of oneself, the real question is which one is a better description of what integrity is.

Out of these two views, I think that the integrated-self view is a more solid one. The primary reason is that there is no good reason to think that one's way of unification should be around one's identity. It could be a natural result of one's unification of different desires and volitions into one since a person would try to

unify his or her desires and volitions in the way to reflect one's identity in most of the cases. Nonetheless, it certainly is not the way that things would happen always. If what it means is that a person 'ought to' unify his desires and volitions only in the way to reflect one's identity, this would lead to a dead end. The answer leads to the question of why even when one is clearly better to unify his volitions in a different way than to reflect his identity, it is still the way that remains to possess one's integrity.

In order to see why the integrated-self view is better, I will first deal with the problem of the integrated-self view that is pointed out by the identity view. In "Does integrity require moral goodness?" Jody L. Graham argues that the identity view is the best account.¹¹⁹ In the paper, Graham's main argument is that integrity requires moral trustworthiness and that the identity view offers a better way to accommodate this intuition than other views. Whereas she spends a decent amount of time on her explanation of why the social virtue view fails to accommodate the moral trustworthiness requirement, she rebuts the integrated-self view relatively briefly. The reason is that it fails to be an adequate candidate to be a serious view even without considering if the view passes the

¹¹⁹ Graham, "Does Integrity Require Moral Goodness?"

requirement.¹²⁰ According to Graham, a person's unification of first order and second order desires does not guarantee integrity because one could unify the desires in the way to make the person rather shallow.

The problem of shallowness arises because we assume that a person could be integrated into any way that he or she wants to unify oneself.¹²¹ However, it seems that there are some limitations for one to unify oneself. The first question to ask is how we can define a shallow person. Typical cases of a shallow person seem to be the cases where a person cares for his own pleasure and material gain and comforts. One would think that this list includes only the cases where a person does not care for others at all. So, at first glance a shallow person has a characteristic that is described as only caring for oneself. Still, we cannot just say that one who does not care for others is shallow. One who has concluded that although others' interests are important one's own interests are far more important should be taken at least not as shallow as the one who did not care for others' interests at all, considering that he pondered on matters to a certain degree.

¹²⁰ Although she does not say this explicitly, I do think that this is what she has in mind and that is why she did not spend a good amount of time on the view.

¹²¹ Lynne McFall points out this problem as well, although it was not directly against the integrated-self view. Lynne McFall, "Integrity," *Ethics* 98 (1987): 5-20, p. 9 (reprinted in John Deigh (ed), *Ethics and Personality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992): 79-94.)

If so, then there must be a better way to think of a shallow person. According to Oxford English Dictionary, we describe a person shallow if he is “wanting in depth of mind, feeling, or character” or lacking depth in “thought, reasoning, observation, knowledge, or feeling.” Considering that being shallow or deep is possible only by measuring something even figuratively, there must be some sort of object that should be measured as being shallow or deep. I think that when we talk about ‘a shallow person’ we could be mainly concerned with the person’s thoughts. Or, at least, thought seems to be easier to me to measure rather than measuring someone’s emotion or feeling.

There seem to be two ways to think of the depth of thoughts. One way is to think that it is related to the content of one’s thoughts and a person would be regarded as shallow if a person’s conclusion of reasoning does not include many aspects of the related matter. So, according to this understanding, the object of being shallow or deep is the conclusion that one arrives at on a certain matter. If we should be able to tell what are shallow or deep simply by looking at someone’s conclusion of thought, there must be an objective ground that most people agree on in terms of what deeper or shallower thoughts are.

Although it would be difficult sometimes to tell which conclusion of thought is a deeper one, we may be able to tell in general which thought is a

deeper one. In general, something that has more to do with one's physical body is more superficial whereas the opposite is regarded as deeper. For instance, we believe that if a person tends to spend a great amount of money on clothes compared to his budgets, we would think that appearance is important to the person and think that this person is rather shallow; if a person gives almost everything to donation although he is very parsimonious on his own needs, we will think that he thinks that helping others is important and we would think that this person is the opposite of being shallow.¹²² So, according to this understanding, if a person's thoughts that we can see from his action tend to be closer to what most people see as deeper thoughts, he is regarded as a profound one, and *vice versa*.

There is another way to think of the depth of thought. We could think that the object of being shallow or deep is a person's actual process or procedure of thinking. So, the depth itself is related to how much a person has spent the time on a certain matter; if a person's route of thought tends to be from x to y, from y to z, and from z to w, then the person's thought would be deeper than another person if this person's route of thoughts is from x to y. It would be of course difficult to say that a person's thought xyzw is deeper than another person's

¹²² Of course it does not mean that the person is automatically a compassionate person. To see the relationship between dispositions and character traits, see Christian B. Miller, *Moral character: an empirical theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), especially pp. 12-21.

thought xy in some cases. (going to grocery = good food for his body = his wife's compliment = compliment that he would get if he donates some money to society vs. going to grocery = need to drop by a place to donate money because it's Friday)

Still, there is a certain advantage to think that the depth of thoughts is mechanically just about the time-related matter. At the beginning of this discussion, I introduced a case where a person thinks carefully and still arrives at the conclusion that he wants to take his interests far more seriously. Some people might think that this person is rather shallow just by looking at his attitude that his own material gain is far more important. Still, there is a genuine sense of not being shallow. If there is a person who concludes in that way after thinking very carefully, the person would be called vicious or something else, but not shallow. This is because we generally think that a shallow person would not think many different aspects of the matter and the fact that he spends quite a good amount of time on a certain matter tells that he is not a shallow one on this matter at least. So, what we gather regarding the depth of thought in terms of process of thoughts is that a shallow person's thinking process is relatively short.

I do not know how the process and the content of one's thoughts are related to each other. Although one would arrive at a deeper thought if he

spends more time and thinks more carefully, it is not necessarily so. Moreover, although one would spend more time in general in order to gain a deeper conclusion it would not necessarily be so for some people. But there seems to be something that is certain. If a person is a shallow person, it is not because the person himself has made a bad or a wrong decision about what to do. Rather, the person does not really care what decision he should make. This seems to be the reason why the time that he spends on the decision is short, and that is why he did not exhaust many different aspects of the matter.¹²³

So, the picture of a person that we are imagining as a shallow person is the kind of person who does not think carefully and chooses what his first order desire wants to do. His second order desire would confirm what his first order desire wants because he does not really care about how things should be regarding the matter. Or, to be more precise, it could be the case that the person did not go through asking his second order desire to confirm the first order desire. Although this second case is equally plausible for a shallow person's unification, I think that we have a reason to exclude this one. Initially, the shallowness argument was raised because there was a worry that even if a person unifies his first order desire and his second order desire he might end up

¹²³ I think that this understanding of the meaning of 'shallow' is compatible with Merriam-webster dictionary. According to the definition, being shallow is "not caring about or involving serious or important things."

with being a shallow person rather than being a person of integrity. Now, the only picture that we have as a shallow person is the one who unifies his first order desire and his second order desire by not seriously asking his reason of having the first order desire. What I want to claim here is that such a picture of a shallow person does not seem to be compatible with the picture of a unified agency.

Let us imagine a person who cares about her appearance a lot. Even though she knows that she could spend the money on buying some books to prepare for her to enter a college, she is tempted to and buys a new pair of shoes that are displayed beautifully. As described, this person is a shallow person because she does not care about what is more important for her; she spends relatively a short amount of time to decide and does not consider different aspects of the matter.

It is doubtful that this person genuinely unified herself. She may genuinely believe that appearance is important, and she accepts that she is such a person. There would be no problem for her to unify her first and second order desires in the case. She has a desire to buy a new pair of shoes and she has no problem that she has such a desire. Therefore, some people may think that this

person is indeed a person who has all her desires unified and is a candidate for a person of integrity.

Nevertheless, it is unimaginable that she can truly endorse her own desire once anyone asks her if she likes her way of desiring things. As defined, a shallow person's second order desire does not question much about the reason of the first order desire because she does not really care about the way the decision is made. This means that once her second order desire of endorsing the first order desire is questioned, she would question herself the reason of having the first order desire as well as her reason of endorsing the first order desire. If she could change her heart on the matter even by being triggered by a small new aspect of the matter, she is not genuinely unified herself.

I cannot go in detail why a person would choose to act in the way she does if she would be so easily disturbed by a different thought. Still, I think that if one deeply looks at things that she cares about, she would realize that there are other things that she cares about as well. Therefore, it is wrong to think that anyone being okay to have her current first order desire has genuinely unified her desires.

This explanation does not rely on any particular theory on human nature. Rather, it appeals to the fact that a person's human psychology would not work

in the way that only leads to a shallow unification of one's wills. This does not mean that we never see a shallow person who is content with what he desires. What I exclude as a possibility is someone who is genuinely satisfied with who one has become when he unifies oneself only in a shallow way.

Therefore, it is wrong to argue that a person who unifies one's wills and volitions could be merely a shallow person so that he fails to be a person of integrity. If it is impossible for anyone to be a shallow person and at the same time to unify all his wills, we cannot criticize the integrated-self view for its wrongful description of integrity.

Maybe the problem is not just the shallowness itself but the way that one unifies oneself in general. The integrated-self view does not, one may argue, appear to accommodate the fact that there must be restrictions on the reasons that can be motivated by a person of integrity. As Calhoun points out, "[s]ome sorts of reasons seem incompatible with integrity, for instance, a primary concern with one's own comfort, material gain, pleasure, and the like at the expense of one's own judgments about what is worth doing."¹²⁴ If so, it seems better to accommodate the obvious restriction as a part of understanding integrity.

¹²⁴ Calhoun, "Standing for Something," p. 241.

The identity view can discriminate between desires one stands for and desires one does not stand for. In that regard, one may think that the identity view is a sort of modification of the integrated-self view. I will deal with the question of whether the identity view is right to differentiate between the two kinds of desires whereas I will come back to the problem of conflicting reasons for the integrated-self view in the next chapter.

The identity view is appealing since it accommodates the fact that certain desires that we have are not essential to our integrity whereas certain desires are. As explained above, this point is appealing because the view seems to overcome the very limitation of the integrated-self view. However, it does not seem to be okay to think that a person of integrity does not need to integrate his desires as long as the desires are not essential to his identity.

Before I start the actual discussion of why the identity view is not the answer, I will consider one thought that the identity view is no different from the integrated-self view. Most of the wills or desires that a person has seem to be relevant to his identity. Indeed, it would be hard to imagine a kind of desire that is not really related to one's own identity.

Suppose one wants to go to a farmer's market although going to a grocery is usually his wife's job. He feels that he wants to do some house chores that he

has not done for a long time. His desire to go to a grocery store is not really related to his identity because it is not his job any longer since he got married. However, once we, from the third-person perspective, think of the case more deeply, we may point out that this new desire is not really alienated from his identity. Although he did not really make sense of his desire at first, it could be the case that he wanted to do something unusual because he is currently tired of his office work and he somehow missed the time when he spent his time away from the office going to the grocery store. Whereas it appears that the desire is really new to his identity, it could actually be related to his identity, which he happens to hate now.

However, I do not think that the integrated-self view is no different from the identity view because it is not true that every will that one has is substantially relevant to the person's identity. Although we could make sense of one's desire by relating it to his identity somehow, the fact that it is done from the third-person perspective with only a remote relationship between the desire and the identity tells that the person's desire is indeed remote from his own identity. We do sometimes want to do something unusual and we find it hard to explain why we want to do this in the first place.

I will now turn to the actual discussion on why the identity view is not the answer.

In order to explain what makes a certain person a person of integrity more precisely, you might want to exclude a certain aspect of a person's life from the explanation. It would be a distraction from facts if you list unnecessary things when you report what happened. In the same vein, giving too much information would sometimes be taken as giving no information. The same seems to be true for the description of integrity. It would be unnecessary to include all the aspects of a person's life in order to explain why the person is a person of integrity. For instance, you are not telling exactly why a person possesses integrity if you start describing all the desires a person has starting with illustrating the person's desire to eat a certain breakfast this morning along with all the other desires.

Some people would think that it is one thing to say that a person's certain desires are irrelevant to what makes him a person of integrity and it is another to say that a person does not need to unify his desires that are irrelevant to his integrity. Still, if we say that a certain characteristic is what defines a person of integrity, this description is also used to see if we are right to criticize a person for not satisfying the characteristic. So, when we say that a person of integrity is described in such and such a way, this means that a person who fails to satisfy

the description falls short of possessing integrity. Therefore, even if we are tempted to think that certain desires are not relevant but only desires that represent the core self, we need to be careful if this description fits normatively as well.

The identity view fails on this. According to the identity view, integrity is about integrating one's core desires that are relevant to the person's identity. This means that a person of integrity would unify his wills around his identity and that these wills would be only some important ones that he has. If so, a person of integrity is okay not to harmonize with one's own unimportant wills and volitions. This renders the view away from the normative appropriateness that I explained above. This is because we would not think that a person who fails to unify oneself on small matters but only on big matters is a person of integrity. As Cheshire Calhoun points out, it is important to unify oneself even on small matters.¹²⁵ We would call a person a hypocrite if one unifies oneself on big matters but not on small matters.

Of course it is not the case that a person has to unify all of his desires and volitions. In fact, it would be even hard to imagine what it would be like to unify all of one's desires. For instance, it would not mean that a person should restrain

¹²⁵ Calhoun, "Standing for Something," p. 245.

his desire to read a novel today because it will interrupt his preparation schedule today to go to Paris next week for a big conference. We could say that there is a certain sense of disunity because the person fails to make the necessary adjustment of his small desire to his bigger commitment. We could, on the other hand, say that there is a different kind of unity here because the person is able to make his project of the preparation more efficiently with a good break such as reading a novel. Thus, it would not necessarily mean that one has to unify all of his desires in line with his commitment in an instantly obvious way.

Nonetheless, we should assume that there are certain types of small or irrelevant desires. Otherwise, the identity view does not make sense because it says that only core desires related to one's identity matter to integrity. Then, there should be certain small desires that are irrelevant to one's identity. Suppose a person has three cups of the same design at home and sees the same design cup in someone's house. Since he wants to get one more of the same kind, he steals it from the house. This desire to have one more of the same design cup is related to none of his projects or commitments to be a better surgeon and a better mother. Such a small desire, however, is relevant to one's integrity.

The reason why some people think that certain desires are irrelevant or trivial to integrity is that a person of integrity is indeed unifying these trivial or

small desires without any difficulty. It would of course not be true that a person of integrity does not have any difficulty to unify all of his desires and volitions. Still, the difficulty would not be from the trivial or small desires. If a person has a desire that is difficult to harmonize with his other desires, the desire would not be regarded as a trivial one. Only because one's desire is not in conflict with other desires, can it be trivialized.

There might be a good reason to think that a person's identity is what matters when one unifies oneself and possesses integrity. Nonetheless, it seems wrong to think that identity itself is the same as integrity. Without any additional explanation, the theory does not give a good answer to what it is to possess integrity.

3. Objections against the Integrated-self View

I have defended against some of the views that are not appropriate for an account of integrity. Since the main purpose of this project is not to defend a certain view, I do not intend to offer detailed reasons to be in favor of the view that turns out to be the most promising. Still, since we are about to treat the view as the one to offer an answer to our main project, I need to ease the doubts about

the view. In this section, I will defend against some of the most urgent objections to the integrated-self view.

Before starting the discussions on the objections, here is the reminder of the integrated-self view. According to the integrated-self view, one has integrity if one integrates various parts of oneself into a whole. This view holds that integrity is unifying one's inner desires or volitions into one so that he does not fail to make up his mind.

One may think that there is an obvious exception that a person who fails to unify oneself is not necessarily a person of integrity. Suppose a person consistently affirms her identity as Latina against racist oppression. Within the Hispanic culture, however, lesbianism is an abomination, and she happens to be a lesbian. Now, she has to struggle between these two identities and her desires are in conflict between these two identities. Although she is ambivalent about Hispanic values and ways of living, this does not necessarily mean that she is not a person of integrity. This is a serious objection against the integrated-self view.

¹²⁶ According to the integrated-self view, the person does not unify all the desires she has and should be regarded as lacking integrity. Most of us, however, would not think that this person obviously possesses some flawed characteristics or

¹²⁶ I borrowed this example from Calhoun's paper. "Standing for Something," pp. 238-239.

lacks integrity, even if there could be some regrettable feelings towards the person.

Taking this type of objection seriously, some scholars even argue that one sometimes needs to be ambivalent in order to be true to oneself and the best way to resolve the issue is to accept radical ambivalence. Against Frankfurt's idea of wholeheartedness, people argue that being wholehearted does not necessarily need to be in the way that he unifies his conflicting desires. Out of the rich literature, I argue against two main arguments and conclude that ambivalence *could* be a real threat to a person's integrity.

Logi Gunnarsson argues that radical ambivalence is what a person needs to accept when both of the conflicting attitudes are constitutive of who the person is.¹²⁷ After examining five different reactions for an ambivalent person to choose he concludes that the only way to choose is to accept radical ambivalence in order to be true to himself. The five reactions are rejection, transformation, residual ambivalence, division, and radical ambivalence.

Both when one chooses rejection of one option and when one does transformation to the third option, he could be wholehearted towards the

¹²⁷ Logi Gunnarsson, "In Defense of Ambivalence and Alienation," *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 17 (2014): 13-26.

options. Still, the options would not be true to himself since he should ignore the other option for 'rejection' and both options for 'transformation'. When a person chooses residual ambivalence he would not be wholehearted to any of the options. A person could be wholehearted towards two options at different points of time when he chooses 'division.' In a sense, he could be true to himself because he continues to pursue both of the options that are important to him. Nonetheless, according to Gunnarsson, it would be a betrayal to himself because he has to give up his ambivalence. So, he concludes that radical ambivalence is the only way that a person should choose in order to be true to himself.¹²⁸

However, I think that his conclusion does not necessarily come from what he assumes. A person who experiences ambivalence is described as the one who believes that both of conflicting options are fundamentally important to him so that he is unable to reach all-things-considered evaluations between the two options. Because the fact that the two options are fundamentally important means for Gunnarsson that they are parts of who the person is, continuing to have the two options or the ambivalence is also a part of who he is.

Nevertheless, even if the contents of the two desires tell who he is, this does not mean that the continuation of the state of possessing them should be a

¹²⁸ Ibid., pp. 21-23

part of who he is in order to be true to himself. To see the difference, let us consider a different example. Imagine a person who has two separate desires: the one to move to a different city because he got a new job and the one to live with his girlfriend who has a stable position in the city. We could say that these two desires are equally parts of who he is in the sense that each option tells what he values in his life. But then we can ask if there is not a desire who wants to settle this matter. If he is not an irrational person, he would see that he has to choose either to stay in the city giving up the job offered or to move to a new city giving up living with her. Although the two desires are a part of who he is in the sense that the values in each desire are essential to who he is, continuing to have the two desires does not need to be a part of who he is.

One would say that there is a real difference between the example in question and my example. In the original one, a person's conflicting situation does not require a person of choosing between the two desires because one can act upon one desire after the other whereas in the second example the physical impossibility asks him to choose between them. The action of not choosing between the two does not render the person irrational in the first example whereas it does in the second.

True, the tension between the two competing desires is a type of the ones that require a more urgent decision in the sense that he does need to do either to start his job in the new city or to turn it down in due course. Still, how much the person recognizes the tension between two competing desires as a real one is affected by how vital the two desires are to who he is. Considering that the two desires are a part of who he is, as Gunnarsson describes, we can imagine that one desire would keep saying its voice when he acts on the other desire. If each desire reappears over and over whenever a person wants to act on the other desire, this amounts to be saying that the tension between two desires is a real one. If it does not require a more urgent decision, it does seem to be a kind of tension that makes the person irrational if he does not decide between the two desires. Therefore, if the tension is a real one that requires a further action of decision between two desires, a person would see it as irrational not to do anything on the matter.

Some people may wonder if I made the difference between the two examples blurry by merely relying on the possibility that a person can make mistakes by not reasoning carefully. It is obviously possible that the person can act on each desire in the first example whereas it is not in the second; if the agent does not see it, as the argument goes, it is simply the person's mistake. Nonetheless, whether not to do any further action of decision is irrational does

not rely on whether it is logically possible or not. Regardless of its logical possibility, if a person sees the tension between the two desires as something that requires a further action of decision, it is irrational not to do anything.

One thing to make it clear is that what I have explained does not rely on a person's reasoning capacity. Although I have relied on the fact that a person cannot ignore his reasoning to make a decision between two opposing desires, I am not making integrity any reasoning capacity. I provided a reason why a person cannot and should not ignore the necessity to make a decision by making use of a new example, but this was not intended to show that there is a real urge for a person of integrity to do better reasoning than the average person. Instead, it shows that as much as the person sees his opposing desires as parts of who he is, should the tension between the two desires be as real and this acknowledgment of the tension must be a part of who he is.

Assuming that a person of integrity would be careful to make harmony between his different desires, he would be cautious about the circumstances where some desires are inevitably opposing. Once we start imagining the detailed description of the person's life in the original example, we would see that how the tension between two opposing desires could be a threat to the person's integrity. Suppose a person in the example goes to her family gatherings

and wonders when her girlfriend is going to pick her up. Or, if she is smart, she would say to her girlfriend not to pick her up today because it is her family gatherings. Or, if she is really a person of integrity, she would start thinking that there is a real difficulty to harmonize between her two separate worlds of being a lesbian and affirming her Hispanic identity. Although I do understand that there is something wrong to think that all Hispanic lesbians automatically lack integrity, there is a real sense of being less of a person of integrity if she does not do anything about her identity as being a lesbian as well as being a proud Hispanic. It is not unimaginable that she starts going to some meetings to change her Hispanic culture for instance.

What I am trying to object here is, of course, against the possibility that one can maintain a radically ambivalent life while at the same time possessing integrity. Still, the implication of this argument is more or less that it would be impossible for one to manage a radically ambivalent life itself.¹²⁹

In “On being wholeheartedly ambivalent: indecisive will, unity of the self, and integration by narration”¹³⁰ Thomas Schramme analyzes different interpretations of ambivalence and establishes that internal volitional

¹²⁹ Gunnarsson thinks that the impossibility of someone’s managing a radically ambivalent life is not a real threat to his view. See p. 18. But I think that it is.

¹³⁰ Thomas Schramme, “On being wholeheartedly ambivalent: indecisive will, unity of the self, and integration by narration,” *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 17, no. 1 (2014): 27-40.

inconsistency is the most important and clear-cut example of ambivalence. According to him, a person experiences internal volitional inconsistency when he cares for X and at the same time cares for $\neg X$. For instance, using the example that was referred by both J. David Velleman and Frankfurt, Freud's Rat Man is stuck in a love-hate relationship with his own father. The person desires X wholeheartedly and does not want X wholeheartedly and "there is a direct conflict of cares within the volitional structure of a person."¹³¹

Schramme argues that a person can integrate ambivalence by narration. Using Daniel Hutto's explication of folk psychological narrative,¹³² Schramme argues that a person's wholehearted ambivalence can be seen as a whole from a third-person perspective. Since narrativity is a construction by those who witness, the story of someone's life either by the person himself or by another person cannot just be invented. When we tell our story to others, we provide reasons which are understood as belief-desire pairings. It means that one can give an understandable account of one's ambivalence, and "it is possible to give an account of one's own ambivalence by being able to tell a story as to how it

¹³¹ Ibid., p. 34.

¹³² Daniel D. Hutto, *Folk Psychological Narratives: The Sociocultural Basis of Understanding Reasons* (Cambridge, London: The MIT Press, 2008).

integrates into one's self."¹³³ Schramme thinks that Frankfurt does not allow such a possibility of integrating ambivalence by narration.

Nonetheless, one's own unification is possible only diachronically in this case. As Schramme rightly points out, Frankfurt's main concern is ambivalence as synchronic disunity, 'a division of the will at a particular point in time.' Although it is true that one does not need to be in disunity if one can make sense of this unification either to himself or to others, it does seem to be the case that the person's ambivalence is a genuine predicament to the person at the point of the time of ambivalence. When a person is in that difficulty, it seems to be a genuine disunity. This is more so considering that the unification itself needs to be achieved only from the third-person perspective.

As long as he has not moved his perspective yet to the third-person perspective, there are two additional requirements necessary for the person to move to the unification even by a narrative. The first thing is that he has to decide in his own mind that he needs to move to the third-person perspective. The second is that he has to finish his thought that he is divided into two different selves. This is not to say that one cannot move to the third-person

¹³³ Schramme, "On being wholeheartedly ambivalent: indecisive will, unity of the self, and integration by narration," p. 36.

perspective so that he unifies himself. Rather, the disunity itself is genuine until one does not take the narrative perspective yet.

My argument so far is the main one against Schramme's view. Although I am not against the fact that one can unify himself by taking a narrative perspective, I want to consider some difficulty to the idea. The possibility that one takes the third person's narrative perspective is scarce in most of the cases where one is in a genuine disunity. The two requirements above are more or less intertwined: when one moves to the third-person perspective, he is likely to realize that he is no longer divided into the two selves; once he is aware that he is not divided, he can move to the third-person perspective. How does a person take this initiative towards the third-person perspective to stop the thought of the divided selves? There is a real problem with taking the initiative.

One immediate response would be that it is difficult to cut the circle. If the requirements are intertwined to each other and there is a circle between them, it does not seem to be an easy job for the person to cut it. We can resolve this problem easily, though, if we accept that the two requirements are not really separate—they are after all really intertwined. Once one starts to take the third-person perspective, he would start seeing the possibility that his two selves are not divided. This means that once he starts making a conversation either to

himself or another from the third-person perspective about the situation, he would see that he is not divided.

However, the real problem is not such a circular one. Even if we accept that one can cut the circle and take the initiative to the narrative perspective, it is doubtful that an ambivalent person's story itself is something that the ordinary folk would understand. According to folk psychology, reasons for action should be explained in the way that other people can understand. And looking at another person's action, we can see reasons for his action. For instance, when we see a man approaching the closed door of a shop while struggling with bags of groceries you would hardly be surprised to see his next move is to put these down in order to open it. The reason why you are not surprised is that "you already know what to expect from others and they know what to expect from us in such familiar social circumstances."¹³⁴ So, in a way, a person's action is like a conversation that we make with others, and the author's suggestion makes an ambivalent person's action more like a conversation with others. But the problem is that the person himself has not finished the conversation with himself and finishing the conversation with himself seems to be necessary for a conversation with others.

¹³⁴ Hutto, *Folk Psychological Narratives*, p. 6.

In fact, whether some verbal expression is regarded as a conversation does not depend on whether exchanging some words or sentences has occurred. Instead, it seems more to do with whether the contents that are expressed in sentences have the element that can be made sense of to other people. And whether an ambivalence is a thing that has such an element depends on how the ordinary folk would understand the ambivalence. Putting aside the fact that any story could have its own peculiar characteristics so that it could have some element to make it difficult to understand, an ambivalence would be the type of thing that most people don't have experience with and would have a hard time to understand. We can imagine without much difficulty, after hearing everything that an ambivalent person has to say, one could ask "so why were you not able to come to a conclusion about your options between the two?"

The author does not pay attention to the fact that an ambivalent person's difficulty does not merely arise from his two separate emotional attitudes towards something. The real problem occurs because one continues to act on these attitudes. One's emotions are the things that can come and go, and even the opposite looking emotions can coexist. For instance, one could hate a picture that he saw for the first time and after hearing that it was painted by a famous painter he suddenly realizes that there was something that he liked along with the hate. On the other hand, the person's actions are the kinds of things that one needs to

make a decision about. If there is a person who does and undoes the same action, we would call the person a crazy one. Freud's famous 'Rat Man' may have his own reason that he has to call his father to express his love and then to regret what he has done repeatedly.¹³⁵

Nevertheless, it does not change the fact that his action is difficult to understand from his own perspective. The very moments when he does the two separate actions because of his ambivalence, he does the actions because he does not know why he wants to act this way and why he wants to act in the opposite way. When he does the actions, he is very much into these two separate thoughts. And the fact that he continues to want to act on two opposite actions tells that he has not finished his conversation with himself. So, even if he takes the narrative perspective, he would be regarded as making a conversation to himself or to others with the story that he does not quite understand.

¹³⁵ Sigmund Freud, "Notes Upon a Case of Obsessional Neurosis," in James Strachey et al. (eds), *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1953-1974), Vol. X, 153-249. Freud's patient who has come to be known as the 'Rat Man' experiences distinct love and hate towards his father. For a different interpretation of this man's experience as ambivalence, see J. David Velleman, "Identification and Identity," in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds), *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002), pp. 101-104.

4. Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined different accounts of conception of integrity to see which account is the best. Out of five accounts of what integrity is, the most tenable position turns out to be the integrated-self view. I also examined some possible objections to the integrated-self view in order to see how plausible it is to hold the view. The goal of this project is to find the answer to the moral nature question, which is whether a person committing to morally questionable principles can also be a person of integrity. In the rest of the chapters, I will examine which answer the integrated-self view can give to the moral nature question. First, in the next chapter, I will compare two versions of the integrated-self view to see which fits to offer the moral nature question.

CHAPTER 4

THREE VERSIONS OF THE INTEGRATED-SELF VIEW

In the previous chapter, we examined the question of what it is to possess integrity, which I call the conception of integrity question. I did this by looking at which one is the best out of the five views of the conception of integrity. In the next two chapters, I attempt to answer the question that I call the moral nature question, which is the main question of this project. The moral nature question is whether a person committing to morally questionable principles could be a person of integrity. I will answer this question by examining the best answer to the conception of integrity, the integrated-self view. Before we get the answer from the integrated-self view, there is a more urgent question to resolve. Between the different versions of the integrated-self view, we need to see which one is most appropriate. In this chapter, I will compare and offer limitations of two representative versions of the integrated-self view and then provide my own modification of those versions.

Among other philosophers, Harry G. Frankfurt and Christine M. Korsgaard offer the integrated-self view. If Frankfurt provides the original version of the integrated-self view, Korsgaard's version is a kind of mixture of the integrated-self view and the identity view. Although one may wonder why we should look at Korsgaard's view if it is not exactly the integrated-self view, I think that it is better to see it as a modified version of the integrated-self view. Considering that there is a clear reason why we cannot be satisfied with the identity view, there is a good reason to regard it as one type of the integrated-self view rather than one type of the identity view if we want to treat it as the best possible theory that it could be. Furthermore, since it possesses a seed of the best version of the integrated-self view, it is worthwhile to examine.

After I examine each view with my own explanation of why none of them is an ideal version, I gather the lesson from them. I then offer a way to resolve mainly the problem of Korsgaard's version. I will defend a view combining both the emotional/psychological aspects and the reasoning aspect for one's integration.

1. Frankfurt's Version of the Integrated-self View

Although Frankfurt does not defend a certain concept of integrity, some of the things that he says about wholeheartedness give a sense of what integrity would be like in his view. According to him, when a person sacrifices his main concerns, he becomes a different person, and his former self ceases to exist.¹³⁶ So, in order to remain as a whole person, he must be wholehearted by not being equivocal in his essential concerns. That a person decides to do a certain action means that he tries to cut off all the other desires that come to him except one; out of all the first order desires, he identifies with a particular one because he formulates the second order desire, which tells which one of the first order desires he wants to identify with.¹³⁷ To be more precise, Frankfurt thinks that formulating the second order desire is not because one thinks that such and such a thing is the best out of all the possible options. Rather, the second order desire is the second order desire because the agent decides to act upon that particular desire. Although 'a person may fail to integrate himself when he makes up his mind' he would try to cut off the other desires in order to act upon the desire that he decided to follow. According to this picture, a person who fails to unify his

¹³⁶ See, for instance, Harry Frankfurt, "Autonomy, Necessity, and Love," in *Necessity, Volition, and Love* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 139, n. 8.

¹³⁷ I should add that the view that I consider here focuses on Frankfurt's early works. He changes his view substantially later on. Frankfurt's talk of evaluation has more substance in his later works.

volitions and wills would not be a person of integrity because the person is not wholehearted about what he commits to.¹³⁸

Although there could be other places to start with, I think that one good place to look at is Frankfurt's concept of 'volitional necessity.' "Volitional necessity constrains the person himself, by limiting the choices he can make."¹³⁹ Roughly, volitional necessity is the necessity that one would feel to act differently from what one is required to act—whatever the reason for this requirement is. When one experiences the kind of volitional necessity is the moment when one would feel that the parts of oneself are torn into two. And when one decides to act in a certain way—either to follow his volitional necessity or the opposite direction, this is the moment when we can say that either one's integrity is compromised or not.

Against Frankfurt's view, Gary Watson explains why Frankfurt's position on volitional necessity is not satisfactory. According to Watson, 'volitional necessity' is different from 'deliberative necessity.' Citing Jane Austen's *Pride and*

¹³⁸ "A person may fail to integrate himself when he makes up his mind, of course, since the conflict or hesitancy with which he is contending may continue despite his decision. ... The conflict the decision was supposed to supersede may continue despite the person's conviction that he has resolved it. In that case the decision, no matter how apparently conscientious and sincere, is not wholehearted; Whether the person is aware of it or not, he has other intentions, intentions incompatible with the one the decision established and to which he is also committed." (Frankfurt, "Identification and wholeheartedness," p. 42)

¹³⁹ Harry Frankfurt, "On the Necessity of Ideals," in *Necessity, Volition, and Love* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 113.

Prejudice, Watson explains that Elizabeth's idea of marriage prevents from even considering the option of marrying Mr. Collins. Technically, she does consider the option, but the option itself is not an option in a narrow sense because her ideal of marriage does not even allow her to think of the option as a possibility. Thus, deliberative necessity is a kind of necessity that leads to doing the opposite direction of some option because the agent thinks the option unthinkable.

On the other hand, volitional necessity is different from deliberative necessity in that the factor that plays a role as a hindrance to a certain direction of action is not someone's deliberative activity, but something that is quite different. Watson suggests that different from the identification with one's endorsement there should also be a concept of the identification with one's caring. Borrowing Frankfurt's example, Watson introduces a woman who thinks that giving away her baby for adoption is the best choice of action in the circumstance but fails to act on the decision.¹⁴⁰ Watson sees two kinds of identifications: identification as endorsement—giving up the child—and identification as what she cares about—the relationship with her baby.

To make Watson's distinction between two kinds of identifications more relevant to our discussion of integrity, it is not clear which way of identification

¹⁴⁰ Gary Watson, "Volitional Necessities," in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds), *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002), p. 147.

we should focus on when we think of a person's integrity. In fact, ignoring the distinction would be a fault of Frankfurt's view if the distinction itself is a necessary part to explain his concept of wholeheartedness. Considering that wholeheartedness is about unifying oneself into one, it seems to be a problem that Frankfurt did not explain which way of unification one needs to make.

Some people would think that it is not a fault in his part at all considering that he did not think one way of unification is particularly better. It would be more so because Frankfurt himself denies that there are two kinds of identification in his theory.¹⁴¹ Nevertheless, if we can prove that there is a discrepancy between what he argues, it would be enough to show that Frankfurt's lack of explanation of the discrepancy is indeed a problem for his view.

The way that Frankfurt understands volitional necessity is as follows. One's way of unification is not necessarily the result of his evaluative activity. When one unifies his first order and second order desires, the way that one unifies is just accepting the fact that one happens to have a certain second order desire which has the authority over the first order desires.

¹⁴¹ Harry Frankfurt, "Reply to Gary Watson," in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds), *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002a), pp. 160-161.

Furthermore, according to Frankfurt, one's unification of oneself does not need to stop because one experiences such momentary indecision between two separate options.¹⁴² Once one starts acting the opposite way of her volitional necessity, it could be resolved in the way to unify oneself to the opposite direction of action in hand. For Frankfurt, one's decision towards a certain direction is what determines her second order desire after all.¹⁴³ In fact, what Frankfurt has in mind is this way of solution when he says that he does not see a real problem because "[i]t naturally does not limit her capacities to perform innumerable other actions, such as those involved in going to the adoption agency and completing all the work of giving up the child...."¹⁴⁴

Nonetheless, I do not think that Frankfurt's answer to the problem extinguishes Watson's worry. Watson's initial question was how to explain the situation where one experiences such a discrepancy, whereas Frankfurt's answer seems to be an explanation of how one can overcome the discrepancy. To the problem of explaining 'where does the problem come from' he answers 'how one could resolve the problem' by saying that one really could summon up the power to go against one's volitional necessity; one's decision of acting towards

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 162.

¹⁴³ Harry Frankfurt, "Reply to T. M. Scanlon," in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds), *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002c), p. 184.

¹⁴⁴ Frankfurt, "Reply to Gary Watson," p. 162.

the opposite direction of volitional necessity is sufficient to go against one's volitional necessity. The problem with this kind of understanding is that it ignores the fact that there really is such a discrepancy between what one really thinks is right to do and what one wants to do in her heart. Although it is momentary indecision between these two options, there really is such a discrepancy. Even this momentary indecision is a real problem that needs to be explained in Frankfurt's view as well. This is more so considering that Frankfurt's view focuses on a synchronic unity.

When Frankfurt suggests the concept of wholeheartedness, the unification that he is interested in is synchronic unity rather than diachronic one.¹⁴⁵ Even if one could be able to unify one's different volitions synchronic way, 'a division of the will at a particular point in time' would stop one from being wholehearted. Therefore, it would be wrong to ignore the momentary indecision between one's endorsement and one's caring.

A more serious problem seems to be that even if we accept Frankfurt's theory that one would often identify himself with a certain desire or motivation without measuring the value of the desire or assessing the desirability of the

¹⁴⁵ Schramme, "On being wholeheartedly ambivalent: indecisive will, unity of the self, and integration by narration."

impulses,¹⁴⁶ I do not find it very convincing that we always do so. Even if people actually tend to act in the same way as the previous ways of acting or for no reason at all, they do make this or that decision by an evaluative activity from time to time. When one's evaluation of the best choice tells this and one's heart tells something else, that is precisely the kind of moment when one really involves in such an evaluative activity.

In fact, it would be hard to formulate an integrated-self view without considering this sort of moment of indecision or one's evaluative activities at all. A part of an explanation of one's integration towards a certain person seems to involve an explanation of how a person would integrate one's decisions of actions that were made with evaluative activities. You cannot avoid one's evaluative activities entirely if you are committed to the integrated-self view because it would be amount to ignoring people's important parts of mental activities from the unification. In order to make sense of one's actions as a part of some projects or commitments, we need to explain how a person would integrate different sorts of deliberative actions.

¹⁴⁶ "What is essential to persons is not, in my view, a capacity to measure the value of their desires or to assess the desirability of their impulses. Rather, it is a capacity to identify themselves with (or to refrain from identifying themselves with) their tendencies to be moved in one way or another. These reflective attitudes of identification or of withholding are often based on or grounded in evaluations of desirability. However, they need not be. A person may identify himself with ... a certain desire or motivation for reasons that are unrelated to any such assessment, or for no reason at all." ("Reply to Gary Watson," p. 160)

What does it even mean that a person's evaluative activities would not be a part of the things that are needed to be included in the explanation of how one would unify oneself? People would of course be engaged in evaluative activities for their decisions. Frankfurt does not seem to deny this either when he says that a person's overcoming of volitional necessity does not 'need to' be an evaluative activity.¹⁴⁷ He at least does not deny that in some cases there could be evaluative activities. Then, why does Frankfurt need to hold that a person's decision for a certain action is not the result of his evaluative activity? I think that Frankfurt's main project was to explain the phenomenon of the unification of one's wills or volitions only at a general level. Since he was explaining what a person is only in a general level, he still insisted that "[w]hat is essential to persons is not, in my view, a capacity to measure the value of their desires."¹⁴⁸ It is true that one often simply follows his past psychological history of decisions. Making this point even further, one could even formulate a position that most of one's own choices can be traced back to all his psychological history of decisions. If this is true, it is more sensible to accept that one's integration is possible only when it is in line with his psychological history of decisions rather than one's particularistic deliberative activities.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

Either Frankfurt wanted only to focus on the general level of explanations or to incorporate different mental activities, one fundamental way of Frankfurt's understanding of human nature is that a person's evaluation of different possible options is not the main part of one's decision. Although one could exercise his capacity to measure the value of his desires, he often does not. Against such a view, Susan Wolf thinks that it is wrong to avoid value talk in Frankfurt's theory and she even says that Frankfurt would need objective value in his theoretical system.¹⁴⁹

According to Wolf, Frankfurt's theory cannot really make sense without using value words although he tries not to use them. Although caring and loving are goods in themselves, we cannot ignore the fact that caring and loving things that lack any value is regrettable. This does not mean that we should value things in proportion to the amounts of goodness. Rather, what it means is that it is wrong to accept that one should care simply about what one can regardless of how worthwhile it is. Nonetheless, in response to her criticism, Frankfurt himself says that Hitler's life would be a meaningful life as long as he thought that he

¹⁴⁹ Susan Wolf, "The true, the Good, and the Lovable," in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds). *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002), pp. 227-244.

was doing a meaningful thing.¹⁵⁰ The fact that his life was so dreadfully immoral does not have any effect on 'the value to him of living that life.'¹⁵¹

It may not be surprising that Frankfurt can commit to this view. After all, he thinks that any direction of integration is not particularly better than any other way, if not every sort of integration is fine. According to Frankfurt's understanding, value is what one creates because whichever could be regarded as valuable as long as one identifies it in that way. On his account, what one cares about is important to himself because it would bring him the meaning of life, even when others do not agree.

However, even if Frankfurt can consistently hold this view, the theory of the integrated-self view cannot consistently hold such a view. It's not because the theory cannot accept that such a life with a distorted meaning would be as valuable as any other sorts of a meaningful life. Rather, the reason is that the integrated-self view would not be such a view that a person values things only his own way. It is difficult for the integrated-self view theorist to accept that what one values is not shareable with other people.

¹⁵⁰ Harry Frankfurt, "Reply to Susan Wolf," in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds). *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002b), pp. 246-248.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 248.

We tend to think that this thing is more valuable than others by comparing what we value with what others value. This seems to mean to me that one would necessarily care about how others think of the value that he cares about. Such a discussion on value must be incorporated in a plausible version of the integrated-self view. When one unifies one's desires and volitions, one would necessarily involve the thinking of how others think of the value that he cares about. Although one would not need to make an effort to explain his choice of action to other people, it would be weird to choose things that do not make sense to oneself either. At least a person would try to choose what he is able to make sense to himself. For this reason, there would be moments of discrepancy if one fails to explain the reason to oneself. In order to explain things to himself, a person would need to compare his value to how others value. In fact, it is unlikely that a person's integration of oneself is complete only by considering one's moments of emotional or psychological unification. When one feels comfortable with an idea of a certain choice of action, that psychological security is possible because other people in general affirm the value of the course of action. This means that a person's self-integration involves a possibility for a person to share his value with other people. Therefore, a plausible version of the integrated-self view needs to hold that one's desires and volitions are integrated in the way of being valued by other people.

To summarize, Watson's criticism of Frankfurt's conception of volitional necessity has a good point because it also gives some insight into what the better version of the integrated-self view should be like. If there is no harmony between what one wants to do and what one thinks is right to do, it would be the kind of moment when the integrated-self view needs to consider as well. For this reason, Frankfurt's view is not an adequate view to look at to find the answer to the moral nature question.

2. Korsgaard's Version of the Integrated-self View

Luckily for us, there is another version of the integrated-self view that we can examine. In respect to the problem that I pointed out above, I should examine how Korsgaard handles the discrepancy. If Korsgaard also does not accommodate the idea that there is such a discrepancy that Watson pointed out, her view is not better. However, Korsgaard can handle the discrepancy without difficulty.

According to her, integrity in the metaphysical sense and integrity in the moral sense are one and the same property.¹⁵² Based on her theory of reason's publicity, Korsgaard argues that respect for humanity or reasoning together is a

¹⁵² Korsgaard, *Self-Constitution*.

necessary condition of effective action. Only because you have respect for humanity and reason together with other people can you interact with other people. Such respect enables you to make a law under which you can be unified.¹⁵³ And being able to interact with other people necessarily requires you to be able to interact with yourself properly and to figure out what you can be. In other words, being able to interact with other people requires you to be one unified person.

Now, this means that only by respecting for humanity or reasoning together, you can be genuinely unified and your movements can be attributable to you. This is because only after you put yourself together and decide what to do can your movements be attributable to you; if you did a certain thing without your own reasoning process your movements cannot be attributable to you. Therefore, respect for humanity is necessary for you to do a certain action and be a certain unified person at all. Roughly put, Korsgaard's view on integration is that a person unifies oneself if one makes his actions in line with moral laws exercising his reasoning skills well.

This view does not have the same problem that Frankfurt has. The problem with Frankfurt's view is that it does not have enough consideration for

¹⁵³ See especially Korsgaard, *Self-Constitution*, p. 206.

the discrepancy between one's own identification as endorsement and one's identification as what one cares about. The problem arises because Frankfurt did not allow the room for a person's evaluative activity at all. In Korsgaard's view, however, a person's evaluative activity itself is the gist of what constitutes a person. If we accept Korsgaard's view, volitional necessities are a person's results of deliberation about what is best. Regarding the unfortunate mother who considers adoption, Korsgaard would say that if she has volitional necessity that she cannot force herself to send the baby for adoption that is because her identity as a mother would not allow her to do so. Or, at least if she cannot do what she decided as the best option, that is because she has not unified herself and did not finish the process of reasoning of what she can be.

Korsgaard's argument that I have presented so far seems to be a solid argument to overcome Frankfurt's problem. If her view offers a good version of the integrated-self view, we may now move to the initial question that this project starts with. Our initial question was to see if we can find the good version of the integrated-self view in order to see what the view says about the moral nature question. Again, the moral nature question is the question of whether a person with immoral commitments could be a person of integrity. If Korsgaard's argument offers a good version of the integrated-self view, we may as well stop

our search for the answer to the moral nature question by examining what answer her version of the integrated-self view offers.

Korsgaard offers a very clear and direct answer to the moral nature question. Since one could be attributed a certain action only when the person acts together with other people, being a certain sort of agent means here that the agent acts in the way to be in line with moral laws. For Korsgaard, that a person unifies one's wills means that a person respects the moral laws which he shares with other people. Therefore, there is not even a gap between the metaphysical sense of being a person and the moral sense of being a person. In other words, being a person means in a broad sense being the kind of person who can act only 'in a moral way.'

Nonetheless, I do not think that her view would be the correct version of the integrated-self view. This is because her idea of the integrated person is based on a radical equivalence between a morally good person and a person of integrity. According to Korsgaard's argument, only a person who acts in a moral way is a person at all because the person acting immorally fails to be a unified person. The equivalence between those two kinds of people is more than what we need to prove. The reason why we ask the question of whether an immoral person is also a person of integrity is that we assume that such an immoral

person is a kind of person as well. But the main argument that she offers is that such a person is not a person at all. This makes it unclear what her view amounts to in terms of the relationship between integrity and morality. This is not a small problem. Since our purpose here is to find out what answer the integrated-self view offers regarding the moral nature question, it fails to give us the answer to the main project. We need to figure out why she takes such a radical position. I will examine her argument on the equivalence between integrity and morality. According to Korsgaard,

when we interact, we legislate together, and act together, for the good of the whole we in this way create. But action is simply interaction with the self. If this is so, then respect for the humanity in one's own person, and the consequent treatment of one's own reasons as considerations with public normative standing, are the conditions that make unified agency possible. Without respect for the humanity in your own person, it is impossible to will the laws of your own causality, to make something of yourself, to be a person.¹⁵⁴

What Korsgaard assumes here is that if someone does not have respect for humanity and fails to reason together with other people, he fails to be a unified person and in turn fails to be a person at all. To put it another way, a person means for Korsgaard that he is able to use the capacity of reason. Whether a person is a person or not depends on whether the person is able to use his reasoning skill or not. Why does she assume that a person's reasoning capacity is

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 204.

what makes a unified person? This is because she thinks that reasoning capacity is what makes human interaction possible and without any sort of interaction a person cannot be a person at all. Here she assumes that human interaction is possible because reason is public. In fact, Korsgaard's argument is heavily dependent upon her view of reason and she makes use of her own viewpoint of reason called 'public reason.'

To summarize Korsgaard's argument, she thinks that because of public reason a person is able to interact with oneself and with others and that this sort of interaction is what makes a person a unified one. I will examine this argument a little more in detail to see its legitimacy.

Public reasons are "reasons whose normative force can extend across the boundaries between people. Public reasons are roughly the same as what are sometimes called objective, or agent-neutral reasons."¹⁵⁵ In order to make sense of the idea that reason is public, she gives an example that two people try to schedule an appointment. If your suggested time does not work for me, you should suggest another time. Otherwise, both of us will fail to perform what we set out to do. If a certain time is not good for me, this means that it is not good for you either. So, you have to adopt my reasons as your own reasons, and *vice*

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 191. See also *The Sources of Normativity* 4.2.1-12, pp. 132-45; *Creating the Kingdom of Ends* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996a), essay 10.

versa. To put differently, we must reason together; I must treat your reasons as considerations that have normative force for me as well as for you. That is why reasons could only be public reasons rather than private reasons.¹⁵⁶

According to Korsgaard, whenever one acts with the full capacity of reason, he or she reasons together with other people. Because of the fact that reason is public, she establishes the idea that unification is the same as interaction both within a person and among persons. Korsgaard's main assumption is that the way one interacts with oneself is also the same as the way one interacts with others. Let us see one place where she argues this.

So to say that *only* the incentives that arise directly in me in the course of my individual embodied existence can be the source of "my reasons" is simply to beg the question against the possibility of personal interaction. I *must* interact with the conscious inhabitants of my body, because I must act with my body. But I *may* also interact with other people, and when I do, then their reasons, as well as my own, become as it were incentives in the deliberative process that we undertake together, resources for the construction of our shared reasons.¹⁵⁷

According to Korsgaard, public reason is necessary in order for the two ways of interaction—the interaction between one and oneself and the interaction between one and the others—to be possible. It is impossible that we stop acting at all, and in order to act, my interaction with myself is necessary. I can only

¹⁵⁶ *Self-Constitution*, p. 192.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 199-200.

interact with myself because reason is sharable with all the conscious inhabitants of my body. In other words, reason's publicity makes my interaction with myself possible. But more importantly, because of my interaction with myself I establish reason's publicity. What it means to say that I interact with myself is that I have successfully established shared reasons.

The same thing applies to interpersonal relationships. I can interact with other people because my reason is sharable with all the other people. What she also means is that when we interact with others we establish shared reasons. Thus, interaction is possible because reason is public both within an individual and for interpersonal relationships, and through interaction shared reasons are established.

I think that the common nature that she sees between the intrapersonal interactions and the interpersonal interactions is maximally strong. She is not saying that a person who is able to interact with oneself well is likely to interact with other people well. Also, she is not saying that one would be able to interact with other people if one gives good reasons to other people. What she is saying is that one would be able to interact with oneself only when it is done in the same way that one does with other people.

What she assumes is that the shared reason or public reason that I establish with different selves of myself through my interaction with them is already a part of public reason that I should be able to interact with others. In other words, if one fails to make sense of her action to others, her action would not be the kind of action that is based on a real interaction between his different selves. According to her, when one makes a certain decision by interacting with different parts of oneself, what he establishes is the legislation for his entire actions including his future actions. If the person were in the exact same circumstance, he would make the same decision in the future.¹⁵⁸

What this implies is that the decision that one makes in the present should be the one that can be applied not only to the future self but also to all the other rational beings. Since the self in the future will possess many different qualities from the ones that I have now, the self in the future is in a sense another person to me now. To put the same point in a different way, there could be the case that the self in the future is very similar to a particular stranger either in the present or in the future. Suppose also that the degree of similarity between the future self and the stranger is far greater than the degree of similarity between the future self and the present self. In that case, it is not too off to say that the future self is a stranger in a sense.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 198; p. 202.

If the way I understand is right, what Korsgaard's view leads to is that there is no real difference between the interaction that I have with my future self and the interaction that I have with another person. So, what she establishes here is not just an ideal type of interaction that one would have in terms of his interaction with himself. She is not merely extending some conception of how one interacts with oneself to the way that one interacts with others. Instead, it is almost the backwards of that. The possibility to interact with others is the very minimum requirement for one's interaction with himself. The only acceptable way that one can interact with oneself is the way that one interacts with other people.

However, I do not think that the way one interacts with oneself is the same as the way one interacts with others. They may be similar to a certain degree, but not the same. There are some obvious differences and the mistake here is not a small one. Although Korsgaard's argument has a great point, which I will come back in the next section, I think that her argument fails to be the integrated-self view that we can accept. If the way that one unifies oneself is the same as the way that one somehow unifies oneself with the other people in general, it seems weird to say that this is actually the view of self-integration. There must be a way to make a distinction between the unification of oneself and

the relationship with the other people in general. Otherwise, there would be no point of saying that the view that we accept is the view of 'self'-integration.

Let's start with a few of the differences between one's interaction with oneself and one's interaction with others. First, one can change his own mind without much trouble whereas one cannot in the case of one's interaction with others. Quite often, you need to tell others when you change your mind whereas it is not necessary for your interaction with yourself. Second, there would be fewer mistakes when you deliver your messages to yourself compared to your mistakes when you deliver your messages to other people. Presumably, you are the owner of the same body that you have possessed and since you know what you have wanted in general, there would be no trouble to deliver what you want to the acting agent of yourself. We can continue the list of differences. Still, the most significant difference that I want to focus on is as follows.

In the case of one's interaction with others, reason plays a far more significant role when it comes to decision-making. One's interaction with oneself, on the other hand, does not require the same amount of the capacity of reason. It would be nonsensical that two or more parts decide what is best after a long and hard consideration together and any of the parts does something else in interpersonal interaction. At least, it is breaking the promise to do what they

decided together. On the other hand, deciding to do a certain thing often does not mean much in an intrapersonal interaction.

Even before arriving at decisions, the conversations between the agents have different shapes. It is fine to say either to himself or even to others that 'I know that it's the best for me to do X, but I feel like to do something else. So, I will not do what is best for me.' Although one clearly knows that a certain thing is best for him to do, he could be inclined to do something else. It is more than fine to do so in an intrapersonal interaction. One sometimes is allowed to do what he wants to do even when he thinks that it would not be the best decision.¹⁵⁹ However, one could not say the same thing in interpersonal interaction. When you talk with other people in order to arrive at a decision for an action, you cannot say that 'I agree with you on that it's the best for us to do X, but I feel like to do something else. So, I will not do what is best for us.' The nature of the conversation does not allow you to say such a statement. The purpose of the conversation between the two is to follow reason's order so that it does not make sense that you would not follow the conclusion that both of the parties arrived through the reasoning process together.

¹⁵⁹ Notice that this is rather different from the point that I made with Frankfurt's theory. In the previous case, I focused on the fact that one would need to make up his mind in order to be wholehearted to what he commits to. On the other hand, this case is not about a person's main concerns and commitments but a persons' decision-making in general.

Here, we see exactly the opposite problem from the one that Frankfurt has. Frankfurt's unification of oneself did not allow enough room for one's reasoning capacity. What he emphasizes was only the aspect of one's emotional or psychological unification. On the other hand, Korsgaard assumed too much of the similarity between one's interaction with oneself and one's interaction with other people. Because of the similarity, Korsgaard's argument allows a person's unification only in terms of one's reasoning aspect. The argument amounts to saying that one could be unified if he uses his reasoning skill well, or more specifically his capacity of choosing only actions that make sense to other people. Such unification, however, does not reflect the truth of human nature. Although we are looking for a possible unification, we are not looking for any kind of unification that is possible for a human being. When we consider different possible unifications that are humanly possible, we would also need to consider if the view accommodates both of the psychological capacity and the reasoning capacity. Otherwise, what we suggest would be the kind of integration that makes sense only in terms of the integration itself without reflecting the true human nature.

What we can learn from this is that the unification that we look for should be the one that unifies both aspects of the emotional/psychological unification and the reasoning unification. It should be the kind of unification that not just a

particular aspect of human nature is emphasized but that all the aspects of the unification should be taken into consideration. I will defend my own view of such unification in the rest of the chapter.

3. Unification of Your View and Other People's View of Yourself

3.1 Alternatives of oneself

What would be the right way to combine both aspects of the integration that we find in Frankfurt and Korsgaard's ideas of integration? In what follows, I defend the idea that one's unification depends on the unification of your future self that you see as your best alternative of yourself and your future self that you think that others see as the best alternative of yourself. Frankfurt's extreme view was that one's integration is simply any way one can unify, which mostly is a past self's psychological decision—so, whatever you in the past will be you in the future. On the other hand, Korsgaard's view is the opposite of this one. Her view amounts to saying that whatever you decide now should be the one you be able to share with your future self as well as other people. In other words, you are not just you but you as the one unified with others. In order to combine these views, we should accept that the true unification is that one unifies with the self that he thinks other people see him.

Let me start with the lesson from Korgaard's argument. Why did Korgaard need to assume such a heavy notion of universality or objectivity in a person's decision-making? One would of course consider how others think when he makes a decision for his action. Still, it is certainly too much to say that every time one makes a decision, he makes a decision for everyone else in the sense that everyone would make the same decision if he or she were exactly in the same situation.

Although we cannot accept all the implications that reason's publicity offers to one's unification, we may need to accept the deep fact that one's unification of oneself does not necessarily mean that one is just unified with all the psychological or emotional elements within himself. One would not be genuinely unified if one simply unifies oneself in the way that one unifies just all the desires that one has. It seems true that one's integrated life itself is affected by how other people think to a certain degree. The question is how we are supposed to incorporate the idea that a person is affected by others' opinions or thoughts even when one tries to unify oneself.

In "Identification and the idea of an alternative of oneself," Jan Bransen argues that self-reflexive deliberation is a matter of considering alternatives of

oneself in Frankfurt's view.¹⁶⁰ In Frankfurt's picture of the self, one needs to see oneself as an abstract object and to judge which alternative would be the best alternative of oneself. The point of this view is that it is wrong to see Frankfurt's view in a certain way. The way that Bransen does not like is to see that a person's decision-making is a sort of a struggle within the person among different desires, volitions, and other motivational factors in order to realize a hierarchy among the parties involved. To name just a few, this new understanding can avoid the problem of locating the authority of the person himself in a non-question begging way and the problem of understanding autonomy in a passive way.¹⁶¹

One may think that it is not clear why we would think of the alternatives of ourselves whenever we choose to act. One may even think that Bransen's worry would disappear if there is really no difficulty to choose among different options of actions. In some cases what one wants to do and what is the better option are clear, and there may not be a real reason for an agent to think of different alternatives of oneself with the decisions. However, the point is not really about how difficult it is to resolve among different options of actions. Even when one finds it easy to choose, how one would turn out to be with a new decision is what makes a person's choice a possible trial of a new alternative of

¹⁶⁰ Jan Bransen, "Identification and the Idea of an Alternative of Oneself," *European Journal of Philosophy* 4, no 1 (1996): 1-16.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, especially p. 19.

oneself. So, the way that we see it as a matter of choosing among one's alternatives is necessarily there.

Without even accepting Bransen's suggestion that we should avoid the vocabulary of the struggle among desires and volitions in an inner arena of the agent, I think that we can make use of the point for the issue of integrity. A big part of one's integration would be the integration between one that has become so far and one that will become afterward, and this integration between the two, in turn, involves the decision of how we are supposed to think of ourselves.

There is first the difficult problem of the ontological status of 'alternatives of ourselves'. Is their reality constituted by our stories about ourselves? Or does their reality transcend these stories? If they don't, there is the meta-ethical problem of what it could mean to say that some of them are the right or the true alternatives.¹⁶²

Bransen worries that there is a problem of finding the true alternatives of oneself when one considers choosing among different options of actions.

In a way, Korsgaard's conception of reason's publicity could be understood as a way to answer this question. Again, the question that arises from the author's discussion is: how are we supposed to think of ourselves when we decide among different alternatives of ourselves? Korsgaard seems to think

¹⁶² Ibid., n. 22.

that a big part of seeing yourself is the self that interacts with others through a good reasoning capacity. If you exercise your capacity of reasoning well, you are somehow interacting with others in a good way—so, in a moral way—and that is the way that you should see yourself. Nonetheless, as we saw before, the picture of the self that we get from this sort of abstract concept of reasoning capacity is unsatisfactory.

Relevant to the discussion in hand, I think that Korsgaard's concept of reason's publicity makes the agent a thoroughly impersonal self.¹⁶³ Although it is for sure that the agent is the one who is using his own reasoning capacity, there is nothing particular about this reasoning itself. The reasoning itself is the capacity of seeing things from the eyes of the objective, third person's perspective. Therefore, what we need is a certain sort of more individualistic approach.

Although Bransen's short worry stopped at the point of figuring out how to find one's true self when he chooses for action, I suggest that the matter also involves the decision of how one thinks of oneself as well as how one thinks of others' opinions of oneself. As we saw already, one's integration of oneself would not be complete if one only incorporates one's desires or motivations. I

¹⁶³ For Korsgaard's own defense against this, see Chapter 10 "How to be a Person" of *Self-Constitution*; See also Korsgaard, "The Reasons We can Share" in *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*.

think that when you make a decision for your action, you would necessarily engage with the decision between the self that you see as yourself and the self that other people see as yourself. Such a decision for action would necessarily involve a compromise between the way that one reflects how other people would think of oneself and the way that one thinks of oneself with a certain decision.

When you make a decision among different options of actions, you would necessarily engage with the thought of how each of your options would be seen by others. Although it is true that how much you care about others' opinions on you would also be a part of your characteristics, I think that it is an inevitable part of your decision-making in general. Doing a great job at taking into consideration of how others think of your best version of yourself is what a person of integrity is good at. Such a person has incorporated different parts of oneself well. This is because how other people think of your best version is a part of yourself in a sense.

I think that when you make a decision for an action, there is always a suggested self that is brought up by others in your mind. Especially when you try to decide for an action that you think that others would disagree for your best possible alternative, you would ask yourself 'Are you okay with the way that

other people see you in this new way?' In other words, there is a part of others' thoughts of you in your mind when you make a decision. Two aspects are relevant to our discussion in terms of how others play a role in your decision-making. The first is that there is a rigid self that you have built yourself in others' minds and that you would necessarily recognize this others' ways of seeing your rigid self in your decision-making. The second is that these other people's ways of seeing you is not purely based on your own rigid self but something more. When they expect you to act in a certain way, they make use of a perspective of seeing people in general rather than a particularistic perspective that applies only to you. This general perspective is that people in general are cooperative. I will defend the first aspect in this chapter and the second in the next chapter.

3.2 Rigid self

First, I will explain why you must have the influence of others' ways of seeing your rigid self in your decision-making. There is a simple example. You sometimes hear someone else's voice in your head when you make a decision. For instance, when you consider going on a trip, this voice hits you that "What would my colleague, Tom think of me? Would he not think that I am running away from this difficult situation that I have in the office?" Even without your

deliberate thinking of other people's opinions, the thought of how he would think of you could interfere with your decision-making. Although it could be very much the case that Tom is particularly an important person in your life, it does not seem to be necessarily the case. The new perspective could be brought to you even without taking any particular person's voice. You could just think or say to yourself that "you don't want to be the kind of person who runs away from a difficult situation."

What I describe is not the situation where a person experiences some personality disorder or symptoms of schizophrenia. Even in our common decision-making, you could experience that a voice suggests a different action from the one that you initially thought you would want to do. The voices could be from the ones who you know well like your parents or friends or some others. Or, it could be just from your different thought. Either way, we probably would not need to identify who this voice is. Even when the voice starts with someone who you know well, your consideration of the new thought will be done with the question of whether another person in your shoes would choose this option as well. So, when you try to decide among different alternatives of you, you would put yourself in a third person perspective in general rather than any particular person's. The new perspective that is brought to you with someone else's voice could be the influence that other people's understanding of you has

on you. In fact, other people's understanding of your alternative is a part of your decision-making and in that sense it is the real influence on your decision-making.

There is a sense in which the kind of the new perspective above is other people's real influence on your decision even when you disregard the perspective. Between these two choices of option that you think is the best and the option that others think is the best, you need to compromise your decisions. I think that it is a sort of 'compromise' because you would take the other voice seriously.

When you look at things from another person's perspective in your mind, you would imagine what would be the best alternative for yourself from the perspective. Again, this does not mean that this new perspective that you are trying now is a better one than what you initially thought that you would want to do. Still, assuming that the option that is regarded as the best by another's perspective is also something that is reasonable enough to you, you would consider this different voice seriously. Therefore, even when you have to choose one option leaving the other one altogether, you would choose the in-between if there is a possibility to accommodate both options. All in all, you would sometimes choose your initial thought and sometimes the new voice's thought

and sometimes the compromised one if possible. This is, I think, a sort of integration between your future self that you see as your best alternative of yourself and your future self that you think that others see as the best alternative of yourself.

One may wonder in what sense this new perspective was brought to you by other people's opinions of you. It could be the case that the new voice or suggestion is simply your own thought all along. Because you have not reached a conclusion for action yet, both your initial thought and this new perspective are the options that you could come up with. If so, it is not obvious in what sense there is a particularistic element of you in this decision procedure except that as in Korsgaard's view the agent is simply you.

However, I think that the influence that other people have upon your decision-making is rather a more fundamental one. This leads to my second reason why other people's thoughts of you would be a real influence on your decision-making. Although I started with the case where you could only sometimes be influenced by other people's thoughts of you, such an influence is genuinely prevalent in your decision-making. The kind of influence that I have in mind is the one that you would obtain based on your grasp of other people's understanding of your rigid self.

I will show what I mean by others' understanding of your rigid self considering a figure from the animated TV series based on Lucy Maud Montgomery's *Anne of Green Gables*. In the novel, Matthew is seen as a certain type of person. Anne Shirley sees him as a type of person who does not show up in her Christmas event at school because he usually does not go to such an event. Because the idea that he would attend the event did not even come up to Anne's mind, Matthew could not even cross his intention to tell Anne that he would also attend to the event and she went out just with the words that she would perform the same thing in front of him.¹⁶⁴ Matthew's difficult to decide on a new thing seems to show a similar element that any decision maker could have. Like Anne, the person who attends the event is new to him so that he has to overcome the past rigid self that he and other people understand of him. Although he makes such an event in this particular case, he probably did not expect himself to do such an extraordinary thing before this one. My focus is more on the fact that he has constructed himself and is seen as a certain person rather than the fact that he made such a radical decision for this event. The reason why he is seen as a certain type of person is mainly that there is a rigid self that other people

¹⁶⁴ This particular part of the conversations was added in the version that Nippon Animation company produced with the title of 'Red-haired Anne' in 1979. In the original novel, Anne promises to Matthew that she would show the same performance just for Matthew, but he shows up at the concert.

recognize him as. And this rigid self would be because one habitually makes the same decision.

The fact that one habitually does what he usually does affects the decision-making as heavily as any other factors such as the strengths of the reasons. Of course, how strong the new reason is will affect the decision-making most importantly. Nonetheless, it seems to me that his habitual decision-making plays an important role in making a new decision in those cases of similar decisions.

What would be the nature of this habitual decision-making? One may think that because of the word 'habit' it would be more like the case that a person does not need to think at all before he arrives at his conclusion for an action. Still, this is not what I mean. What it simply means is that there are patterns of one's way of deciding things to do. It does not necessarily mean that one would make exactly the same decision but that there are things in common among those things that he has decided to do. One has a rigid self that the agent himself and others recognize all together and this rigid self makes the habitual decision-making.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁵ The word 'rigid self' may give the impression that I assume "a singular entity waiting to be found," which J. David Velleman attributed to Frankfurt's view of the self. ("Does the True Self Really Exist? A Critique of Winnicott's True Self Concept," in *A Psychoanalysis for our Time*:

This habitual decision-making is what had affected Matthew's decision before this new one. I will elaborate on such habitual decision-making. Consider the actual decision-making. He would first ask himself if he would go to the event. Then he would think himself that he does not want to go there because of the reason that he usually has. He does not like the crowd and does not want to be in an awkward position around new people. Now, suppose that a reason which is not big enough to change his mind comes up and that he still wonders if not going is what he really wants to. Because this reason does not have enough impact to change his mind, he concludes that not going is still what he wants to do. At this last step, the person concludes the same as before not simply because the new reason is only a weak reason. A part of the reason is that it is really what he usually does. He concludes the same as before because he is used to the way he concludes. He would conclude the same, not simply because he approves the content of the conclusion, but also because he concludes the same way. He knows that other people recognize him as a certain person because he and other people recognize that there is a rigid self that he has built himself.

We can see this if we also consider the decision not just from the decision maker's perspective but also from the perspective of the other people around the

Exploring the Blindness of the Seeing "I" (New York: New York University Press, 1998), p. 109/ recited from Velleman, "Identification and Identity," p. 98.) Contrary to the wording itself, I do not assume that such an entity exists.

decision maker. In a way, the agent's decision-making is greatly affected by the way that the agent has constructed himself. The agent is recognized as such-and-such a person in other people's minds. For this reason, if a person makes a radically new decision others would look at him as a new self, whereas if one makes the same decision others would look at him as the same self as before. There is, of course, a sense that the person is still regarded as being a new person even when one makes the same decision as before because the self with the same decision is seen as the self that continues to do what he has done before. However, there is a clearer sense that the self would be a really new one once he makes some radically different decisions than before. Therefore, when one makes a new decision, the self that could turn out to be different from his previous self would be a different self not just to himself but to others as well. This makes the case that when one considers this new decision, a part of the things that the person does is to consider how the potentially new self would be taken to others. On the other hand, when one considers a similar case and he leans towards an old decision, he would consider less how other people would think of his decision.

Furthermore, the fact that there is a rigid self in the agent's and the other people's minds is proven by that the agent can correctly presume how other people would understand his new self. Even when I started examining this

decision maker's perspective, my main focus has been on how the others would take on the matter of a person's decision-making. What I really need to emphasize is that the entire elaboration of the perspective from the others' perspective is actually what happens within the perspective of the person who makes such a decision. How, as a matter of fact, others would take the person's potentially new self is not really precise at all to the decision maker. It is really a presumption that one makes when one imagines that such and such a person, which is his own self, would now appear to them. Although it is a presumption, I think that it would not be off completely in most cases. If a person is recognized as the kind of person who never goes to a party, other people's anticipation or assumption that the person would not go this time either is not completely off. The agent himself is also right to assume that this would be the kind of self that is recognized by others in most of the cases. Therefore, the fact that the agent can correctly guess what other people would think of himself tells that he and other people share the rigid self that he has built himself.

This leads to the suggestion that I want to make. There is a hurdle for the decision maker to overcome if one wants to make a new decision. When one wants to do a radically new thing that will lead to a radically different self from the ones that he has been so far, he would consider how others would think of him as I elaborated above. Therefore, if it is not necessarily to be positive that one

changes into a new self, the difficulty to change would aptly be called a 'hurdle.' For this reason we can now say that there is a rigid self that other people understand of an agent and that when the agent decides to do a certain thing this rigid self could play a role to provoke a perspective of its own in an agent's mind. Thus, when the agent decides for action, the rigid self that other people understand of him could give him a perspective of how others would recognize him after the new action in hand.

Now I am in a position to answer the initial question that we had—how are we supposed to understand the fact that we consider others' opinions or thoughts even in the matter of our own unifications? I think that the description that I have offered tells us how to understand the question. Every time you make a new decision, you present a new self that overcomes the rigid self of yours that is recognized by others. This means that we cannot but think of others' opinions since we think of how others would think of ourselves with the new decisions of actions. Therefore, the way of how other people would think of yourself is also a part of your integration in terms of your decision-making. And this leads to the idea that we care about others' opinions even in the matter of our own unification.

Since I use the term of the rigid self, one may wonder in what sense it is the unification of my own thought of my alternative and other people's thoughts of my alternative. If other people's understanding that I guess is the correct understanding of myself, the rigid self is indeed a part of myself. If this is the case, then my consideration of how others would think of me is just my consideration of what kind of person I am. This seems to mean that there is nothing particular about other people's thoughts except just the fact that you are considering your own self that is in other people's minds.

Nonetheless, other people whose thoughts you guess are not people whom you create in your thoughts. They are the people you interact with. When you guess how others think of your future alternative considering your rigid self, the self of your alternative is what they think is the right version of your alternative. Since they are the actual people you would sometimes interact with, they have their own thoughts of how things should be. For this reason, they would think differently from you regarding what your rigid self is and what alternative you should choose. You would face these people's thoughts even in terms of the best version of you in the future. The right version of this alternative may not be the optimal one that you may agree with in some cases. Thus, when you make a decision for a certain action, the rigid self that you confront in other people's minds is not exactly the same self that you have established objectively.

It is more like the rigid self of yours that you occasionally meet in other people's minds.

One may think that the reason that I have given so far does not prove that a person would always care about other people's opinions or thoughts of his alternatives in his decision-making. Even a person of integrity would not always consider how he would be taken by others for his small decisions. What I have shown is only that a person would sometimes mind how other people think of his future alternative with a radically new decision. This does not show that one cares about other people's opinions even when one makes a minimally new decision or the same sort of decision. Therefore, according to this argument, even if you sometimes care about how others think of your future alternative, you do not necessarily do it all the time and your integration of yourself does not necessarily include your integration with other people's opinions of you.

Nevertheless, what I have shown is enough to establish that your integration with other people's opinions matters to your own integration. My suggestion so far is that you cannot but think of other people's opinions of you for your radical decision because a part of the process is to overcome your hurdle that you have built as your rigid self, which is also recognized by others. The reason why some people think that other people's opinions do not really matter

at all for your similar decisions is that they think that your rigid self that is recognized by others does not play a role in those decisions. Still, even in the cliché case of the decision, we should think that other people's opinions play their roles in your decision-making. Even when you do not make a radically new decision the fact is still there that once you start thinking of a new decision the rigid self recognized by others will come to the fore. So, we can assume that there is a bar between the case where one's rigid self plays a role as a direct hurdle and the case where one's rigid self plays a role as a hidden hurdle. Since one's rigid self is still there to make this bar operate, we can only accept that it really plays its role even when it does not appear to. If this is the case, we can say that a person's rigid self plays a role in every case of his decision-making. This means that even when a person makes a small or a similar decision his own rigid self is playing its role and that other people's opinions matter to such decision-making. Therefore, we should think that even in the case where other people's opinions do not really matter they really do.

3.3 Psychological unification of oneself

So far, I have focused on the lesson from Korsgaard's argument. I will move on to the lesson from Frankfurt's argument. When one tries to unify one's future alternative that one thinks is the best and one's future alternative that one

thinks others think is the best considering the person's rigid self, the unification that one tries to gain is a psychological unification. Especially when you try to decide for an action that you think that others would disagree for your best possible alternative, you would ask yourself 'Are you okay with the way that other people see you in this new way?' If the answer is yes, then you are psychologically unified. If the answer is no, then you are not. Such unification would be different from the unification that appeals to one's rationality. When one tries to unify psychologically, he does not need to give a full explanation of why his chosen action is the best possible one. You could think that others may have a better reason to opt for a different option for your alternative. Still, if you think that you are fine with the less than the best option even after the thought that others would disagree, you are unified in the psychological sense.

Such a psychological unification can be expressed in words that people commonly say to themselves. You sometimes hear that 'I could not live with myself if I do this.' Such words are an expression to say that one does not want to lose one's integrity. I think that the meaning of this expression is in line with the psychological unification that I offer here. At first glance, this expression suggests that there are only selves that are confined to yourself. The only way that you think of yourself in this expression seems to be how you think of yourself. According to this account, there are two selves: the one who recognizes

himself and the one who is recognized by himself. Nonetheless, this ignores the fact that there is one more aspect of the self that recognizes oneself. This self that is recognized by the agent himself is not the self that only the agent himself recognizes. Surely the point of this expression is that you would not bear the thought of you to be seen in a certain way that you recognize yourself. Nonetheless, if you are the only one who would recognize the person whom you will become, you would be fine with the thought. After all, what bothers you all the more is that other people would recognize the person who you are in the same way too.

This psychological unification is based on the fact that the way you would recognize yourself and the way other people recognize you are pretty similar or that you have a pretty good grasp of what is going on in your life. If you have a dull sense of how things are going on in your life or how others think of you, it would be hard for you to establish a good sense of what kind of person you are. Alternatively, if you don't have a good sense of who you are, it would be difficult for you to unify yourself. It is important to notice that such a person is not the one who does whatever he thinks that others would want him to do. Rather, such a person would know who he is in the sense that he knows what kind of person he is. He would be interested in why a certain person would recognize him in a certain way. The reason is not that he wants to be recognized

as the best way anyone could. The reason is rather that he wants to be recognized as the real self that he recognizes himself.

There would of course be certain cases where the self a person understands himself as is quite different from the self that is understood by other people. However, if there is a real discrepancy between them, it would be the symptom that he is not really a person of integrity.¹⁶⁶ The discrepancy seems to tell that the person is a certain sort of a hypocrite. The problem is not simply his ignorance of how things are going on in his life. It is more likely the case that he has not become the person whom he says or thinks that he is. If someone fails to realize how others see him, it is a good sign that he has not done a proper job at making an effort to become whom he says and thinks that he is.

Although a person could make a real effort to become a person whom he says that he would, the only possible way to become such a person would be by recognizing himself through the eyes of other people. In fact, the only way you really know who you are will be by seeing how you are recognized by others.

¹⁶⁶ I am aware that this sounds very much like that Matthew is not a person of integrity and that such a conclusion is quite weird to accept. I do not think that that conclusion follows from my view. There is a sense in which Matthew's new consideration is the kind of the one that brings up the issue of integrity. Nonetheless, if Anne could make sense of his decision instantly when she finds it, this seems to be a good sign that one does not need to doubt his integrity only because of this matter. Whether how fast people around the decision-maker's action make sense of his action tells a person's integrity is a separate question, which I do not deal with here. What I should accept is that the fact that one makes a radically new decision that severs from all his previous decisions does not automatically make the case that a person's integrity should be in doubt.

For this reason, integrity would not make sense at all for a person who travels all the time or lives in a remote area. Such a person would not have a solid ground to unify oneself. He does not have enough interactions with others to make him realize what kind of person he is. The type of person that I picture as a person of integrity is the one who lives very much in his community or society. And understanding integrity in this way seems to be in line with people's shared understanding. When you say that he or she is a person of integrity, you know pretty a lot about the person who you are talking about. Otherwise, you would not know if the person is a person of integrity.

So far, I have argued that an agent has to compromise between the self that he sees himself and the self that he thinks others see and that this is because one would need to overcome a hurdle to challenge his already established self within himself and others' minds when he makes a new decision for an action. This leads to the point that whenever one makes a radically new decision, he has to care about how others think. Regardless of whether an agent wants or not, when he makes a decision, he is compromising between his future self and his rigid self in other people's minds. This means that even when one tries to unify oneself in his decision-making, he is unifying his own self and the self that others think of him as. In this sense, a person's unification of oneself amounts to unification of oneself in his mind as well as of oneself in other people's minds.

4. Conclusion

In this chapter I compared two representative versions of the integrated-self view. Frankfurt's version of the integrated-self view does not give enough room for reasoning capacity in a person's integration of oneself. Korsgaard, on the other hand, overly emphasizes reasoning capacity for one's integration so that she ignores that there can be a real difference between intrapersonal and interpersonal interactions. Incorporating these views, I defend the idea that one's unification is between one's future self that you see as your best alternative of yourself and your future self that you think that others see as the best alternative of yourself. When one unifies in this way, he can say that he is fine with his decision even if there is a disagreement between his own way of seeing the best alternative of himself and other people's ways of seeing the best alternative of him. The person can be psychologically unified himself since he feels okay with his decision.

CHAPTER 5

GENERAL CONCLUSION—AN ANSWER TO THE ‘MORAL NATURE’ QUESTION

This project started with the assumption that the ‘moral nature’ question is answerable by looking at the most appropriate answer to the ‘conception of integrity’ question. In other words, the question of whether a person with morally vicious commitments can be a person of integrity is answerable by looking at the answer to the question of what integrity is. In the previous chapter, I defended that the most appropriate account of the conception of integrity is the integrated-self view. In this final chapter, I derive an answer to the moral nature question from the integrated-self view. My position is that a person committing to morally vicious principles is highly unlikely to be a person of integrity.

In Chapter 4, I considered which version of the integrated-self view is better between two representative theories. I also considered the weakness of each version and suggested a way to overcome the problems. According to my

version of the view, whenever a person makes a decision one is necessarily involved in the thought of how others would think of his future self with the new decision in hand. This argument is a transcendental claim rather than an empirical one.¹⁶⁷ We know that it is the way that any rational person goes through in his decision-making procedure because we know that there is such psychological stability about one's decisions. Whenever you make a new decision, you ask consciously or subconsciously if you are okay with that other people would recognize you in a certain way after this new decision. This is because an agent builds a certain conception of himself in other people's minds who he interacts with and this established conception of the agent plays a role of a hurdle to overcome when the agent makes a new decision. Whether an agent likes it or not, when he makes a decision, he is compromising between his future self that he thinks fits and his established conception of the self in other people's minds. Thus, we know that the necessity of incorporating other people's thoughts in our constitution is within the very process of our decision-making. An agent is integrated in the sense that a person is psychologically unified between his current self that he gathers from other people and the future self that he brings with his new decision.

¹⁶⁷ I tried to fix Korsgaard's argument in my modified version of the integrated-self view, but I did not fix her methodology after all. She also explicitly says that her argument is a transcendental one. *The Sources of Normativity*, p. 123.

From this new version of the integrated-self view, we can now derive an answer to the moral nature question. In my account, there is a clear sense of moral quality involved. The fact that you need to consider other people's opinions of your future self indicates that your own unification of yourself involves caring about other people's opinions of what is right or what is better for your choice of action. When you conclude yourself that you are okay with the person whom others think you will be, a certain unification is established. The unification is between your future self that you see as the best alternative of yourself and your future self that you think that others see as the best alternative of yourself. This means that a person with a vicious principle will not have such unification.

In most cases the person with a vicious principle will be forced to face other people's thought that possessing the vicious principle is not good. As I explained in Chapter 4, those people are the actual people he or she interacts with in his or her daily life and it is most likely that they will express their opinions about the principle. If not specifically about the principle, an agent would notice that similar ideas to his principle are not accepted by others in general. The person with a vicious principle, then, would have a hard time to unify himself between his idea of the best alternative of himself and other people's idea of the best alternative of him. According to my version of the

integrated-self view, this failure of the unification will make the person fail to be a person of integrity. Therefore, we can conclude that a person with a vicious principle will fail to be a person of integrity.

Nevertheless, some people may think that it would be hasty to conclude that the answer to the moral nature question is 'no.' They may think that it is even doubtful that the case that I present applies to most cases. Even if it is true that a person with a vicious principle will have a hard time to unify himself between his thought of what he wants to do in terms of a new decision in hand and his thought of what others would think of this decision, there remains the tricky case. It is not that every person cares about other people's opinions or thoughts of himself to the same degree. In fact, even though a person would unify his future alternative with the rigid self in other people's minds psychologically, the way he does could always be in the way to opt for his future alternative that he only cares about. Even if a person unifies his decision between one's own initial thought and other people's opinions, this does not mean that the person gives a proper weight on their judgments. For instance, there could be a rebel who does not want to see things how others see them and constantly does things that others do not like. To be clear, the rebel who I think of as a problematic case for my argument is the kind of person who would not mind fighting or stealing, resisting any authority. If he were the kind of rebel who

nonviolently tries to gather comrades sharing the same rebellious thoughts against the existing authority, it would not be a problem since he is carefully considering how others think of his decisions and actions after all. Now, if our rebel, who is more like an independent thinker taking violent measures, feels okay with how others see him, do we now say that he is a person of integrity?¹⁶⁸ To give a different example, there could be a person who selectively incorporates other people's views. A person could agree on and act along with other people's commitments to equality while rejecting their specific views about race. Do we now say that he is a person of integrity because he is okay with his decisions reflecting his advocacy of American racial segregation in the past?

I agree that such unification would be far from a moral one, and I admit that my answer to the moral nature question is not an emphatic 'no.' After all, it does seem plausible that a person can unify himself psychologically without incorporating other people's opinions regarding his best alternative. If an agent ends up with such unification, I should accept it as a person of integrity's unification in my account. Thus, we end up with a nuanced answer to the moral nature question; although it is not an absolute impossibility that a person of

¹⁶⁸ In what follows, I deal with the cases where the government is corrupted and has systemic problems rather than a problem on an individual level.

vicious principles or commitments unifies oneself psychologically, it is highly unlikely to be the case.

I could end my examination here since we have our answer to the moral nature question in our hands. I want to raise, however, some doubts about the unification above. One caveat is, though, what I offer as reasons of doubting the unification is not to show that my argument also works for the extreme case where an agent gives nonchalant shrugs all the time without caring about other people's opinions at all. What I want to show is that the hurdle or his rigid self that an agent has to overcome in other people's minds could be pretty high so that the rebel and the selective thinker will have a pretty hard time to unify themselves.

First of all, we should not be confused between the case where the person decides to be fine with his psychological uneasiness and the case where the person is indeed psychologically comfortable with other people's disagreement. The fact that a person successfully goes through the action of theft does not guarantee that he is psychologically comfortable with the process. It could be that he decided not to think about the fact that others would disagree with his decision. Needless to say, simple ignorance of the disagreement or the uneasy feeling does not make a person unified. He could think that he is fine

momentarily and is indeed fine sometimes when he tries to be not concerned about his own unification. His reason could sometimes win over his psychologically uneasy feeling. Nevertheless, it seems clear that he fails to be unified himself psychologically.¹⁶⁹ This means that he fails to be a person of integrity and we can rule out this type of case from a person's unification.

On the other hand, we can imagine the case where a person in fact unifies himself in the sense that he is fine with other people's disagreement even psychologically. Not just does his reason win over, he actually feels comfortable with the idea that people disagree with his decision. One very good reason for this would be that most people in fact expect that he would do such a vicious thing because they know him as such a person. As I have argued, the self that one has built would be the one that he has built with others in a sense. According to this understanding, the self is not such a being who can change into anyone who he wants to be at a certain point of his lifetime. I have explained already with an example that others' way of looking at you as a certain person is most likely to be based on a correct understanding of who you are. Because of a certain interaction with you, others have built a certain person who they understand as

¹⁶⁹ One good reason why a person fails to unify himself psychologically would be because one brings 'hostility or closedness with respect to basic goods.' For an explanation of why an immoral person's impossibility to obtain integrity by appeal to human goods, see Christopher O. Tollefsen, "Institutional Integrity," *Institutional Integrity in Health Care/ Philosophy and Medicine* 79 (2003): 121-137, especially pp.122-123.

you and there is a rigid sense of you there in their understanding. Therefore, if such a person who commits to a vicious principle can successfully integrate himself between two selves of his way of seeing himself and other people's ways of seeing, it is most likely that he has held such a vicious commitment a while and other people recognize him as such. This would mean that a person can unify oneself totally the opposite way than to be moral.

Nevertheless, it is doubtful if the description in hand reflects the correct understanding of one's unification. As I said, one's way of looking at oneself and the way that others see him are pretty rigid. And it would be wrong to think that this rigid self that other people see the agent as solely depends on the person who he has built himself. It would also be based on how other people think of another human being in general. When you see a person as a certain type of person, the way you see him is also based on how you would think of a human being in general. Another person's attitudes or actions would be understood with the background understanding of how a human being acts and behaves. So, it would be correct if we do not assume only the agent's constitution of himself matters for other people's understanding of the agent.

It would be a challenging question to answer what would be the general understanding that a person has towards another person. How you understand

another person would vary depending on what kind of human interactions you have so far. You could have had enough bad experiences with other people and decide in your mind that you hate people in general. Alternatively, you could think that there are so many good people in the world and you are lucky to have those people around you. Without ignoring such a diversity of people's interactions with other people, however, we can say that our lives are designed to be cooperative.

In fact, the way we interact with others requires our mind to work in a certain way—the way that we care about others' behaviors and thoughts. There seems to be good evidence that this is a correct understanding. Or, at least, the research result that even 2-year-old babies care much about how others behave tells the brute fact that human nature is designed to be coordinative with others. Basing on a looking-time study result, Onishi and Baillargeon claim that 15-month-olds have an understanding of belief and thus possess a Theory of Mind.¹⁷⁰ They gave the infants familiarization trials in which an actor hid a toy. Later, the actor was induced to have either a true or false belief that the toy was hidden in the green or in the yellow box. In the TB-green condition and in the TB-yellow condition, the actor was induced to have a true belief that the toy was

¹⁷⁰ K. Onishi, & R. Baillargeon, "Do 15-month-old infants understand false beliefs?" *Science* 308 (2005): 255–258.

in the green box and the yellow box respectively. When the actor had a true belief that the toy was hidden in the green box, the infants looked reliably longer when she searched the yellow, and conversely when the actor had a true belief that the toy was in the yellow box, the infants looked longer when she searched the green. On the other hand, in the FB-green condition the toy moved to the yellow box in the agent's absence. The infants having seen the agent reach for the yellow box looked reliably longer than those who saw the agent reach for the green box. In the FB-yellow condition, the toy was moved to the green box in the agent's absence and the infants looked reliably longer when the agent reaches for the green box. This study, in particular the result from the FB conditions, suggested that the agent's action of reaching for Location A surprised the infants and they looked at the scene longer, because they became aware of the fact that the agent still believed the toy to be in Location B—because she had not seen the movement of the toy occurred.

This could sound just as neutral in that there is no indication that this human nature is 'cooperative' rather than just being a nice tool to find a way to survive. Still, it seems to me that if a person has to live his life being mindful of other people's intentions and actions from the beginning, it is plausible to think that we see another human being as cooperative enough to attend to our needs.

A question here is whether we are right to think that being cooperative and being morally good are interchangeable. It seems to me that there is a clear sense in which they align with each other. It would require a significant amount of argument to prove that they are actually interchangeable, which goes beyond the scope of this project. What I can say, though, is that being cooperative would require one to be attentive to other people's needs and it would render a person a morally good person. Being able to be cooperative or bringing oneself to be an assistant to other people's needs seems to require one to be mindful of these people's needs. The ability to tell whether a person is in need of help is not solely dependent on whether the person can estimate the right moment objectively or not. It has more to do with the person's mindfulness of other people's needs. And having this sort of the mindfulness of other people's needs seems to be the very gist of being morally good. Although the person with a mindful attitude would not always bring himself to help others, he or she would at least be equipped with morally adequate qualities. If this is the case, then it is hard to imagine that the person with the willing attitude to help others would end up with the lack of morally good qualities. Therefore, we can say that being cooperative and being morally good are in line with each other.

If being cooperative and being morally good are more or less interchangeable and the way we see another person is based on this cooperative

and morally good aspect, a rigid self that we see from another person should include not just the person's particular characteristics but the quality of being cooperative or morally good behaviors in general. Then, it seems only fair to think that when a person unifies oneself with other people's understanding of his own rigid self, the person's unification would include this moral aspect. It is most likely that a person with a vicious principle would constantly have to face other people's disagreement with his commitment. Then, it seems pretty unlikely that the rebel and the racist in my previous example end up being psychologically fine with other people's disagreement of his future alternative. Thus, a person of a vicious principle is unlikely to be a person of integrity.

But I have to admit that it is not an absolute impossibility that a person unifies himself psychologically when he acts upon his vicious principles. In my account, an agent is after all a person of integrity if he finds psychological stability in his decisions bearing all the disagreements with others' view of his best alternative. In addition, whether a person is psychologically unified himself is a deeply personal question, and whether they are unified or not would depend on what kind of rebel or racist they are. Furthermore, I accept that there is indeed a type of vicious person who is most likely to be unified. A person who is often regarded as a sociopath would fit exactly into this category. I am not going to define what a sociopath is here. Relevant to my point, however, I imagine the

kind of person who can successfully interact with other people while living without any remorse or shame or guilt. I also imagine that such a person can commit to all different kinds of immoral principles. It is ironic that my view should accept that a vicious person would not be a person of integrity except in the case where his or her viciousness is extreme. And I am willing to bite the bullet and accept that such a type of person should be regarded as a person of integrity because that person successfully unifies oneself.

So far, I have dealt with the case where a person does not care much about other people's ways of seeing in his constitution of the self. In those cases, what hindered a person from unifying himself in a morally acceptable way was on an individual level. On the other hand, there could be the case where the problem is on a social level. There may be a case where a person indeed cares about other people's ways of seeing too much. Nazi-Germany seems to be a prominent counterexample to my argument. According to my argument, a vicious person has to face other people's views that possessing vicious principles is not good, and he will fail to be an integrated person. Nonetheless, what Goebbels and his team probably saw in other people's faces was not any kind of disagreements since Hitler, or rather Goebbels and his propaganda team, were able to

brainwash the people who then supported the extermination of the Jews.¹⁷¹ Then, this is a problem for my argument because it is not always true that an individual seeking self-integration would find disagreement in other people's faces when his integration is morally, significantly off.

It would be good to see a little more of why this is a counterexample to my argument. In some respect, Nazi-Germany does not simply represent a counterexample to my argument. It also tells us how easily one's thoughts and life choices can be influenced by others. This was true for Goebbels and his team members as well as for the people who came to agree with those leaders. Then, it supports my point in a way because other people's thoughts are indeed influential, possibly even to the degree to affect our own constitution or integration. Whilst it is true that sharing similar thoughts among the same society members does not always lead to positive, or morally good decisions, it is invigorating to see how this example could work to support my argument from a different angle. But, then, as we just saw, this example is indeed a

¹⁷¹ See Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Vintage Books, 1997). Throughout the book, he provides explanations of how "[u]nder the proper circumstances, eliminationist antisemitism metastasized into its most virulent exterminationist form, and ordinary Germans became willing genocidal killers." (p. 449, my emphasis) In the same vein, a person in a slavery society could just accept his conventional ways of living and end up being comfortable with his own maltreatment of another human being. I think that what I offer below as an explanation to the Nazi-Germany case applies to the slavery society as well, and for that reason, I skip a separate discussion.

counterexample because I argued that a person would find disagreements in other people's thoughts when his integration is not a morally acceptable one.

What I can offer to this counterexample is a different aspect that Goebbels or any of his team members may have experienced. We should not assume that their interaction with other people was limited to the same propaganda group or the people who are convinced by the propaganda. We can imagine circumstances where a person in the propaganda team had a chance to interact with the Jews. Or, it is not extremely hard to imagine the case where a person had a friend who had a Jewish friend. Or, it could be the case that a person found out later that one of his ancestors was Jewish and had to conceal the fact from other team members. Although a propaganda team could stay in the same mind group in the short term, it seems pretty hard to continue to live only in that kind of society. If this is true, then we do not need to assume that what Nazi-Germany people saw in each other's faces was a simple agreement.

Since the propaganda team deceived and manipulated the German population, it would be wrong to assume that the public knew what they were doing, let alone the wrongfulness of their actions. Nonetheless, it would also be wrong to assume that all the society members who did not buy the propaganda were ignorant of what was going on in society. In that case, the propaganda team

would have found those people's scared or disgruntled faces in the long run. If this is the case, then this example does not show that my argument is wrong.

One thing to make clear is that the point of my argument is rather a modest one. I established that a person would have a hard time to unify himself if he does not care about others' opinions and in turn he is most likely to fail to be a person of integrity. Although there could be some extreme cases that a person with a morally vicious principle ends up being psychologically fine with others' disagreement, it is highly unlikely for most people to feel fine. From this argument it does not follow that a person of integrity would always end up with a morally good, or a morally laudable person. What my argument blocks from the category of the group of the person of integrity is the one who ends up with morally vicious principles. Any ordinary person *could* turn out to be a person of integrity as long as his choices of actions do not take him far from how others think of him and he is fine with the way that others recognize him as the one that he has built himself.

There is an interesting thing to notice about the relationship between integrity and morality. The connection between them is not because one conceptually includes the other. In Chapter 1 I made a distinction between the strong sense of moralized view and the weak sense of moralized view. As we

saw before, Korsgaard's view offers the metaphysical equivalence between integrity and morality and it would even be conceptually impossible to imagine one without the other. For her, a person of integrity is always a person with morally right principles or commitments. Such a strong version of the moralized view is not the answer that we obtain here. According to the weak sense of moralized view, which I endorse here, a psychological probability between integrity and morality is what makes the connection of integrity and morality.

From the beginning we assumed that most people believe that integrity is deeply involved with a moral concept. People often say that 'I know that you are a person of integrity, and so I know that you will do the right thing.' Those people's intuition is that a person of integrity would do a morally good thing. On the other hand, we acknowledged other people's intuition that unification itself is what matters for integrity whereas it does not tell what kind of unification it should be and that a person with a morally questionable principle could turn out to be a person of integrity. My view reflects both intuitions well. Since my view holds that a person would most likely fail to be psychologically satisfied with morally vicious principles and commitments, it supports people's intuition that morality is of significant relevance to integrity. On the other hand, some people holding a strongly moralized view may wonder why I even take my answer as 'no' to the moral nature question. If my view is a modest one and it is possible

that an extreme case of the morally vicious commitment could be a person of integrity, it may not be clear to them why it should be regarded as the moralized view of integrity. So, let me explain why I take my view as a moralized view.

I have worked on the assumption that there is a possible way to compromise the two sides of the moralized view and the unmoralized view, and this assumption happens to be along with the integrated-self view after our examination of the most appropriate account of integrity. Because the integrated-self view turns out to be the best possible view out of the promising conceptions of integrity, we cannot ignore the fact that there must be the object of the integration itself, and between the two candidates of reason and emotion/psychology, the weaker one is the latter. Thus, if the conversation or compromise should be possible, a plausible view should incorporate the weaker one. That is why my version of the integrated-self view incorporates the idea that psychological stability is important in a person's integrity.

The next question is why an advocate of the strongly moralized view would be happy with my solution. The answer is that, underneath the emphasis of the psychological unification, the important element of the unification is that one should be unified in the way that other people can see it as a possible way of unification. The debate between the strongly moralized view and the descriptive

psychological view of integrity is reminiscent of the debate between moral objectivism and moral subjectivism or nihilism. One midst between these is moral relativism,¹⁷² and my view is similar to relativism in a certain respect. Presenting his sophisticated version of relativism, Velleman emphasizes that a view needs to explicate the existence of 'local moralities' in order to be regarded as relativism rather than as *a* nihilism.¹⁷³ Since relativism denies universally valid morality, it needs to establish how the mores of a community can be 'fundamental, underived norms.'¹⁷⁴ I have a similar element in my account. I have defended the idea that the psychological unification should be the one that a person can share with others in the sense that he should be able to incorporate or bear other people's disagreements with his decisions for actions. Since one cannot easily arrive at such a psychological unification or stability with morally vicious principles or commitments, the unification or stability is grounded on the sharability with other people. In a sense, a fundamental, underived norm of morality, which cannot be established only on reason, is now moved to the middle ground of the psychological sharability with other people. That is why I regard it as the moralized view of integrity rather than the other psychological extreme view.

¹⁷² For an argument against moral relativism, see James Rachels, "The Challenge of Cultural Relativism," in *The Elements of Moral Philosophy* (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1993), 2nd edition, pp. 15-40.

¹⁷³ J. David Velleman, *Foundations for Moral Relativism* (Open Book Publishers, 2013), p. 46.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 47-53.

My view reflects the other intuition, too. According to my account, although it is most likely to be that a person's possession of integrity means that he does not possess morally obnoxious commitments, one's possession of integrity does not guarantee one's possession of morally right commitments. This is in line with people's intuition that it is *possible* to be unified even if a person possesses morally questionable principles. After all, it is possible that a person is integrated psychologically even with morally wrong principles. One thing to be careful about, though, is that this emphasis of the psychological aspect does not mean that we cannot tell if a person lives an integrated life. On the contrary, we will be able to make use of the claim that integrity is related to psychological stability. It is true that a person's psychological aspect is deeply personal. Nonetheless, it is also true that you can tell if a person is psychologically stable with a simple glimpse of the person's look. According to my account, if someone is a person of integrity or a psychologically stable person in this specific context, then it means that the person is most likely to have acted morally. Then, we would know who we can trust as moral guidance or who we can turn to when we have difficult problems in our life, which presumably are moral questions.

Before finishing this project, I need to explain the value of integrity. I explained already in Chapter 2 why it is less attractive to associate integrity with

a virtue. I also suggested we leave the issue aside only by accepting that it is a good thing to possess integrity. Now, it would be necessary to explain in what sense it is a good thing to possess integrity. It should be clear that there is no need to attribute integrity to a kind of virtue. According to my account, an important aspect of integrity is a psychological easiness when you think of the fact that other people agree with your choice of action or at least you are okay with their disagreement. And this is different from a virtue, which is understood as a disposition to do the right thing at the right moment. It may not be clear, then, how it is a good thing for an agent to possess integrity. As I said, my view does not build the case of the metaphysical equivalence between integrity and morality, which is that simply because one possesses integrity he or she has integrated himself in a morally good way. For both the position of associating integrity with virtue and Korsgaard's position, it is obvious why integrity is a good thing to possess. They can say that it is good to possess integrity because it is good to be moral. Nonetheless, this explanation is unavailable to my account.

The relationship between integrity and morality is only a high probability in my account. An important part of the possession of integrity is, though, having a satisfied feeling about the agreement of who he is and who others think he is, and such satisfaction would make an agent feel better about himself and allow him to move forward to what he plans to do with his life. And moving

forward with psychological satisfaction or confidence of course benefits the agent. Although we cannot say that it will always benefit society or promote the objective goodness, it will certainly benefit the agent. In that sense, possessing integrity is a good thing in general according to my account.

The integrated-self view that I offer in this project is schematic. The main focus of this project has been the moral nature question rather than the theories of the conception of integrity. As a part of the procedure to find an answer to the moral nature question, I focused on the integrated-self view. And in order to address some problems of the representative versions of the integrated-self view, I offered my version of the conception of integrity. Since we have our answer to the moral nature question, one could wonder what would be the full-blown version of this new account of the integrated-self view.¹⁷⁵ It would be interesting to see if this new version would face objections that are commonly brought up against different conceptions of integrity and turn out to be a solid theory of the conception of integrity. The task of providing those arguments lies beyond the scope of this project.

¹⁷⁵ One may wonder whether an institution or even an abstract organization's integrity would be the same. For instance, it would be interesting to see if a legal system requires to have a morally right sort of principles as well in order to be regarded as possessing integrity. In his famous book, *Law's Empire* Dworkin argues that integrity has its intrinsic value rather than an instrumental value in law. See Ronald Dworkin, *Law's Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).

What I can provide is, though, one consideration of the objection that is commonly raised against different concepts of integrity. While John Bigelow and Robert Pargetter defend their theory of integrity as the capacity to exercise strength of will, they emphasize that their understanding has strength in terms of being close to a natural kind. This strength comes from that they did not ‘inject an evaluative constituent within the very definition of’ integrity. According to them, “[i]n general, it is explanatorily unsatisfactory to say that something is worth rewarding because it is reward-worthy. It does not fix matters if you verbally conceal “reward-worthy” under a label that simply means “is reward-worthy and has such-and-such other characteristics.”¹⁷⁶ For them, their understanding of integrity does not need to say that integrity is always a good thing and it is enough to say that it is good in general simply because it is what might be called a natural kind. I am not sure if it is only a good thing to say that integrity is a natural kind that we already have the idea of what it is, considering that it could make the term banal or redundant. After all, if integrity is the same as the strength of will, it would be meaningless to say that a person showed integrity throughout his life when we could simply say that he has exercised a great strength of will throughout his life. Nonetheless, if we take their point of being close to a natural kind seriously, my suggestion can face their objection as

¹⁷⁶ John Bigelow and Robert Pargetter, “Integrity and Autonomy,” *American Philosophical Quarterly* 44, no. 1 (2007): 39-49, p. 48.

much as they do. I suggested that integrity is understood as a certain psychological state that is mostly positive. And this state is not something that is made up only in a theory. Although my brief analysis should end here, there is a clear sense in which my suggested view can face some general objection against a theory-driven analysis of integrity.

In addition, this project is based on the assumption that our theories of the conception of integrity exhaust all the plausible theories and we could find our answer to the moral nature question only from those theories. There could be other more plausible views in the future, and one may think that this could jeopardize the soundness of the entire system of this project. Still, even in that case it would not jeopardize the soundness or plausibility of the concept of integrity that I offered. I suggested that integrity could be understood as psychological stability that comes from the knowledge that his choice of action will bring his best alternative of himself that both he and others agree or otherwise he can bear the disagreement. Such a suggested view would not be easily defeated considering that it is close to a natural kind as well as that it can explain our intuition about the relationship between integrity and morality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Terence Irwin (tran). Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1999.
- Besser-Jones, Lorraine. "Hume on Pride-in-Virtue: A Reliable Motive?" *Hume Studies* 36, no. 2 (2010): 171-192.
- Bigelow, John and Pargetter, Robert. "Integrity and Autonomy." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 44, no. 1 (2007): 39-49.
- Blustein, Jeffrey. *Care and commitment: taking the personal point of view*. New York; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Bransen, Jan. "Identification and the Idea of an Alternative of Oneself." *European Journal of Philosophy* 4, no 1 (1996): 1-16.
- Burch, Robert W. "Hume on Pride and Humility." *New Scholasticism* 49, no. 2 (1975): 177-188.
- Burrow, Sylvia. "Protecting One's Commitments: Integrity and Self-Defense." *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 26, no. 1 (2012): 49-66.
- Calhoun, Cheshire. "Standing for Something." *The Journal of Philosophy* 92, no. 5 (1995): 235-260.
- Cottingham, John. "Integrity and Fragmentation." *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 27, no. 1 (2010): 2-14.
- Cox, Damian., La Caze, Marguerite. and Levine, Michael P. *Integrity and the Fragile Self*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Davidson, Donald. "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride." *Journal of Philosophy* 73 (1976): 744-757.

Dworkin, Ronald. *Law's Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Flanagan, Owen. *Varieties of Moral Personality: Ethics and Psychological Realism*. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Foot, Philippa. "Virtues and Vices." in *Virtues and Vices and Other Essays in Moral Philosophy*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1978.

Frankfurt, Harry. "Identification and Wholeheartedness." in F. Schoeman (ed). *Responsibility, character, and the emotions: new essays in moral psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

———. "Autonomy, Necessity, and Love." in *Necessity, Volition, and Love*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999a.

———. "On the Necessity of Ideals," in *Necessity, Volition, and Love*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999b.

———. "Reply to Gary Watson." in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds). *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002a.

———. "Reply to Susan Wolf." in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds). *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002b.

———. "Reply to T. M. Scanlon." in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds). *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002c.

Freud, Sigmund. "Notes Upon a Case of Obsessional Neurosis." in J. Strachey et al. (eds), *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-

Analysis, 1953-1974. Vol. X: 153-249.

Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. New York: Vintage Books, 1997.

Graham, Jody L. "Does Integrity Require Moral Goodness?" *Ratio* XIV, no 3 (2001): 234-251.

Gunnarsson, Logi. "In Defense of Ambivalence and Alienation." *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 17 (2014): 13-26.

Halfon, Mark. *Integrity: A Philosophical Inquiry*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989.

Hume, David (1739). *Treatise of Human Nature*. D.F. Norton & M.J. Norton (eds). New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

— — — (1748). *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. P. Millican (ed). New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hurley, Paul. *Beyond Consequentialism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Hutto, Daniel D. *Folk Psychological Narratives: The Sociocultural Basis of Understanding Reasons*. Cambridge, London: The MIT Press, 2008.

Irwin, Terry. "Disunity in the Aristotelian Virtues." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, Supp. Vol (1988): 61-78.

Kant, Immanuel (1785). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. in Mary J. Gregor (tran & ed). *Practical Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

— — — (1788). *Critique of Practical Reason*. in Mary J. Gregor (tran & ed). *Practical Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

King, James. "Pride and Hume's Sensible Knave," *Hume Studies* 25, no. 1 & 2

(1999): 123-137.

Korsgaard, Christine M. *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996a.

— — —. *The Sources of Normativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996b.

— — —. *Self-Constitution: Agency, Identity, and Integrity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

McFall, Lynne. "Integrity." *Ethics* 98 (1987): 5-20. (reprinted in J. Deigh (ed). *Ethics and Personality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992: 79-94.)

Miller, Christian B. *Moral character: an empirical theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Onishi, K., & Baillargeon, R. "Do 15-month-old infants understand false beliefs?" *Science* 308 (2005): 255–258.

Oxford English Dictionary, Second edition, 1989.

Plato. *Republic*. E. Hamilton & H. Cairns (eds). Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Price, A. W. *Virtue and Reason in Plato and Aristotle*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Prior, William J. "Eudaimonism and Virtue." *The Journal of Value Inquiry* 35 (2001): 325–342.

Rachels, James. "The Challenge of Cultural Relativism." in *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1993. 2nd edition.

Railton, Peter. "Alienation, Consequentialism, and the Demands of Morality." in S. Scheffler (ed). *Consequentialism and Its Critics*. Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 1988.

Ramsay, Hayden. *Beyond virtue: integrity and morality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.

Rivera, Lisa. "Sacrifices, Aspirations and Morality: Williams Reconsidered." *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 10 (2007): 69-87.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Russell, Daniel. "Agent-based virtue ethics and the fundamentality of virtue." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 45, no. 4 (2008): 329-347.

———. *Practical Intelligence and the Virtues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Sandler, Ronald. "What Makes a Character Trait a Virtue?" *The Journal of Value Inquiry* 39 (2005): 383-397.

Schauber, Nancy. "Integrity, Commitment and the Concept of a Person." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (1996): 119-129.

———. "Complexities of Character: Hume on Love and Responsibility." *Hume Studies* 35, no. 1&2 (2009): 29-55.

Scherkoske, Greg. "Could Integrity Be An Epistemic Virtue?" *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 20, no. 2 (2012): 185-215.

———. *Leading a Convincing Life: Integrity and the Virtues of Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013a.

———. "Whither Integrity I: Recent Faces of Integrity." *Philosophy Compass* 8, no. 1 (2013b): 28-39.

Schramme, Thomas. "On being wholeheartedly ambivalent: indecisive will, unity of the self, and integration by narration." *Ethical Theory and Moral*

Practice 17, no. 1 (2014): 27-40.

Shields, Christopher. "Plato's Challenge: the Case against Justice in *Republic* II." in G. Santas (ed). *The Blackwell Guide to Plato's Republic*. Malden, Oxford, and Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Singpurwalla, Rachel G. K. "Plato's Defense of Justice in the *Republic*." in G. Santas (ed). *The Blackwell Guide to Plato's Republic*. Malden, Oxford, and Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (entry: The Definition of Morality)
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/morality-definition/>.

Tollefsen, Christopher O. "Institutional Integrity." *Institutional Integrity in Health Care/ Philosophy and Medicine* 79 (2003): 121-137.

Velleman, J. David. "Identification and Identity." in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds). *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002.

— — —. *Foundations for Moral Relativism*. Open Book Publishers, 2013.

Jonathan Webber, "Integrity and Practical Wisdom" (an unpublished conference paper for the 5th Annual Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues conference at Oriel College, Oxford University, Thursday 5th – Saturday 7th January 2017).

Watson, Gary. "Volitional Necessities." in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds). *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002.

Williams, Bernard. "Integrity." in J.J.C. Smart and B. Williams, *Utilitarianism: For and Against*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

— — —. "Utilitarianism and Moral Self-Indulgence." in *Moral Luck: Philosophical Papers 1973-1980*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Wolf, Susan. "The true, the Good, and the Lovable." in S. Buss & L. Overton (eds). *Contours of agency: Essays on themes from Harry Frankfurt*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002.