

Ray

Hudson Valley, NY [July 29, 2010](#)

Spinoza offers some insight to this dilemma, he was a 'materialist' who believed we were pre-determined but still found a place in his ethics for human free will. For Spinoza whilst the universe is material and determined, but we have an ability to choose 'spiritual' over physical responses. Spinoza's spiritual and physical are not separate like Descartes dualism but both in every object. We might want to update our definition of spiritual and physical but it seems that there are various levels of consciousness within people that we can use.

The monkey may react predictably, but might the monkey stop his (or her) action or upon reflection think of a different way to react?

- Recommend

Jane Shevtsov

Los Angeles, CA [July 29, 2010](#)

A pretty good essay, but I take issue with two things. First, why is there always such a heavy emphasis on altruism in discussions of evolution and social behavior? Some of this interest is purely scientific, but I'll bet most of it comes from having an eye to our own behavior -- and mistakenly so, I believe.

Exploitation is formally represented as a (+,-) interaction; altruism is (-,+). Both have their place in a healthy society (as does some spiteful, (-,-) behavior), but I wouldn't want to live in a society based on altruism any more than I'd want to live in one based on exploitation. Cooperation, (+,+), is the really important interaction. That's the one you want to base your society on.

Second, being conscious of the well-being of those distant from you doesn't necessarily require moving from "us-selfishness" to unselfishness. It only requires you to redefine "us". Several quotations from astronauts come to mind:

"The first day or so we all pointed to our countries. The third or fourth day we were pointing to our continents. By the fifth day, we were aware of only one Earth." --Sultan bin Salman Al-Saud

"When you're finally up on the moon, looking back at the earth, all these differences and nationalistic traits are pretty well going to blend and you're going to get a concept that maybe this is really one world and why the hell can't we learn to live together like decent people?" --Frank Borman

"[Viewing the Earth from space,] you see a singleness and unity to it all that we never perceive in the press of daily life. It seems such a vivid unity that surely it must be rooted some reality, and you wonder why this unity isn't more the reality of everyday human life on earth. You wonder if it could ever be so unified, and you return determined to do whatever you can to make it so -- even a bit." --Kathryn Sullivan

"In outer space you develop an instant global consciousness, a people orientation, an intense dissatisfaction with the state of the world, and a compulsion to do something about it. From out there on the moon, international politics look so petty. You want to grab a politician by the scruff of the neck and drag him a quarter of a million miles out and say, "Look at that, you son of a bitch." --Edgar Mitchell

Such sentiments aren't limited to astronauts. Think of the common phrases "human family" or "global community". Think of the Baha'i statement, "The earth is but one country and mankind its citizens". The sociologist and game theorist Anatol Rapoport put the matter very simply: "The moral development of a civilization is measured by the breadth of its sense of community". "Us-selfishness" IS moral -- for a sufficiently broad definition of "us".

- 3Recommend

DummySean

Fredericksburg, VA [July 26, 2010](#)

Railton doesn't come out and say it but the end game here is: social progress must be decoupled from moral progress. And moral decision making should be completely avoided.

Instead of improving morals, progress is made by synchronizing everyone's self interest via zero sum

games, which preempt moral situations altogether because moral choices are those made out of duty alone independent of self interest. By Kant's definition then, there is no reason to suspect we have progressed morally. Indeed Kant would say moral choices are undetectable anyway because actions are judged on their *intended* rather than actual consequences, and *intentions* are inaccessible to outside observers -- they can only be inductively guessed at. So the "camouflage" dilemma is insoluble and should be ignored. And morality is just a red herring. It is unreliable when interests conflict and unknowable when interests correlate.

Yet we have progressed tremendously. But if not morally, then how? Railton gives us the answer but uses the wrong word, while borrowing from various intellectuals along the way: morality, he says, grows up by nonmoral cranes (Dennett), from amoral selfish genes (Dawkins) to apparently moral actions in nonzero sum games (Wright). Moral niches develop (Haidt) where in-group loyalty expands to fairness through concentric moral circles (Singer). Meanwhile an arms race of deception vs. detection ends in actual morality because the best way to appear moral is to be moral (Pinker). Thus self interest allies with moral ends to improve the global moral quotient, which is the ratio of moral to immoral decisions.

But as we have seen this is not "actual" morality at all because self interest poisons the well from the start. Rather let's call it progress in "goodness". And goodness is achievable if we all learn to play those nonzero sum games well enough, because everyone is naturally interested in their own self interest. Moral situations are therefore undesirable, even unnecessary, and we should seek ways to better society such that no one ever has to make a moral decision. That's progress.

- 1Recommend

cdbaylac

Argentina [July 26, 2010](#)

As we are genetically engineered to learn a language - a capacity filled with the language spoken at home- so we are genetically engineered to learn social morality that prevails in our tribe. There is a moral instinct, as there is a language instinct (Chomsky-Pinker). Both language and moral instincts are essential survival tools thus ensuring genetic transmission.

- Recommend

Bee

Massachusetts [July 23, 2010](#)

Never follow a monkey in the dark, especially if that monkey assumes you are someone who you are not. The morales of the monkey are misunderstood and mistaken for something they are not.

- 1Recommend

Paul Dorell

Evanston, IL [July 23, 2010](#)

To Daniel Perez:

We're agreed that Peter Railton hasn't shed much light on the subject of morality in relation to neo-Darwinism. What I find is that professional philosophers tend to drag their verbiage into other disciplines without adding any new understanding. For example, why do Russell and Kant come up in this article? Russell's comment really has nothing to do with Kant or neo-Darwinism. And Kant's views on morality are expressed by the categorical imperative, which Railton doesn't even mention.

I think the article is trying to address the issue of whether memes can supersede genes in order to continue and perhaps improve our moral tendencies in our evolutionary future, but Railton never clarifies his objective to that extent.

I disagree with you about Richard Dawkins and the selfish gene theory. There is science behind what Dawkins says, based on research by John Maynard Smith, W.D. Hamilton and others. Whether or not Dawkins's formulation is exactly right, his perspective has merit and represents an important refinement of earlier Darwinism as Darwin understood it. I would go as far as to say that many of the comments here reflect an incomplete understanding of neo-Darwinism, and Professor Railton seems only to be adding to their confusion.

- Recommend

BH

MA [July 22, 2010](#)

Prof Railton

thanks for this stimulating piece. I read it a couple of times, filed it away mentally for a few days, but I still don't quite get the gist of it. Do we have a strawman in the mist? Or maybe a few short paragraphs are not enough to cover such a vast topic encompassing so many disciplines.

I mean, to begin with, morality and social mores are not the same. And even if our genes are a governor of sort, there are so many steps to the end results of human conduct. Where should we begin? And what with two or more sets of genes have different agenda? Psychologists have told us there are several stages of human developments and level of needs of actualizations, how do we factor them into the equation? And why would the animal kingdom exhibit variant behaviour. Say, a dog willing to guard the body of its (dead) master in face of adversity and peril? Shouldn't it be hard wired from for self preservation?

And of course, what is the point if one is to accept Ayer's POV that moral language is really that of emotional ejaculation? Personally, I am not an adherent of that, even though sometimes I find the prescription model is interesting. Rather, I really want to know what makes right right. And like Pascal, I do feel small under the starry night but I applaud people like Chardin who attempt to build a bridge between their profession and their vocation, wherever it takes them, sometime at their peril

So I am hopeful there will be a follow-up post to illuminate us further

Thanks

- 1Recommend

AdMan

Michigan [July 22, 2010](#)

It's great to discuss the implications of evolution, but the exact same shortcomings appear in this article that appear in every article about evolution. Proximal proximal psychological mechanisms "emerge," selection selection "occurs," genes "give rise." There is once again not a single theory as to how these mechanisms, selections, and genes emerged, occurred, and gave rise in the first place. If you want to truly understand the complexities of life and the failure of Darwinian evolution to explain how complex systems (like blood clotting and our immune system) developed in a step-by-step process, you need to study life at the biochemical level. There is simply no other way.

<http://actionad.wordpress.com/>

- 3Recommend

Daniel Perez

Wilton, NH [July 22, 2010](#)

To Paul Dorell,

I agree! I was amazed that the writer of this article was a philosophy professor, because there are no original or creative ideas in it. Now this may not be a criteria for an article or a criteria for being a professor, but why do they then make believe they are bringing something novel? What I object to are the leaps over presuppositions, and the introduction of political opinions into what is supposedly a philosophical argument. The "selfish gene" idea has been around a long time and in my opinion was DOA.

- 1Recommend

Joseph John Amato

New York, New York [July 21, 2010](#)

July 21, 2010

Whose camouflage whom?

The question implies Mother Nature may or may not control the deck on the great debate of being human:

God knows?

Or is it God Knows!

Or if God knows, or wants to know?

Etc....

Many of great moralist have had, or are having encounters with this force in the morality field of ones life's journey that are in fact an ancient lineage of universal behavior type that promote; as bloggerheads herewith their perennial variety of metamorphic orchids to enjoy.

Yet this is the best debate in this Stone series that one can imagine. Here in the 'science' of moralistic interpretations via humanism and Darwinian material deterministic given by the academic enriching authors, Mr. Wright and Mr. Railton as esteemed thinkers in this field, and among others in journalism, authoring ideas.

Crucial to this discussion is the how we define our 'natural' tool of language, as employed; and, if we are to undertake, and debate moral purity in human activation for life's journey. Implying and employing ones self imagination that must mitigate the dynamics in the balancing appetites / hungers for: survival, progeny, developmental intellectual tool making (including language,) and ethical cultural behaviors.

I would prefer, withstanding (as mentioned in the video link to this blog,) Professor Ludwig Wittgenstein's Philosophical investigations and his axiom of the limits of language – the word, that then one would infer the archetypal symbolic vital human need in constructive definition that is both for both moral tautology and teleology in individual achievements toward wisdom's discipline yielding utilizations in our selected chosen human behaviors.

It's necessary in all levels of ones life expressions for coping with individual juxtaposed to demanding collective authorities that one embraces refining the discrete cultural higher levels of standard developmental for living successfully – and enjoyment of this blog series the Stone – thanks to all at the New York Times, words fiteverywher...indeed.

Joseph Amato
Manhattan, N. Y.

- 1Recommend

Mark

Sheffield UK [July 21, 2010](#)

We are Body/Mind/Spirit Homosapiens. Morality originates mostly from the mind and spirit. On a body level you might notice some tit for tat moral behaviour in body language such as men backing off aggressive stances. I think Kropotkin and Dawkins were more important than Darwin on this subject as they concentrate more on Mutual Aid and Co-operation.

- Recommend

Michael Shenefelt

Paris [July 21, 2010](#)

One of the most difficult aspects of scientific explanation is to distinguish clearly the thing to be explained. Evolutionary biologists can try to explain moral behavior, but they can also try to explain moral motivation—and these two sorts of explanation aren't the same.

People often sacrifice for others—which is a form of behavior. But they can do so from a variety of different motives, sometimes out of feelings of sympathy and on other occasions from a sense of duty. Much recent work in evolutionary biology aims at showing how Darwinian mechanisms might explain a human instinct for sympathy. But this isn't the same as explaining sacrifice from duty—even though the

resulting behaviors are often identical.

We feel the difference between the two sorts of motivation most strongly when the resulting behaviors are different—as when we are morally obligated to leave somebody disappointed even though we sympathize with that person’s predicament. The motive of duty is sometimes likened to higher sorts of sympathy, like sympathy for the community or sympathy for a larger, abstract cause. But the motive of duty is still different, because it can conflict with almost any sort of sympathy we might imagine. This becomes obvious when a person’s sense of duty is in some way misplaced.

For example, people sometimes do great harm to their communities out of a misguided sense of duty, and they can also do great harm to large, worthy causes. The sense of duty is therefore a different trait of character—different from mere feelings of sympathy.

Duty is also different from an instinctive desire for the esteem of others—since people sometimes sacrifice that esteem for the sake of what they believe (rightly or wrongly) to be morally right. Nevertheless, a sense of duty is bound up with what we normally mean when we call a person moral.

We don’t just mean that the person does the right thing. We mean the person strives to do right conscientiously, and to be conscientious, in most cases, is to be at least partly reflective. A conscientious person tries to verify which course of action is truly right. But to be sympathetic, all a person needs to do is feel.

Duty also involves a sense of power over one’s feelings to the extent that, when we act from duty, we place something above our feelings. We act in the conviction that our merely personal feelings are somehow less important than a point of moral principle. But even if this attitude is dismissed as superstitious, the attitude still exists, and we can still ask whether anyone really has a good explanation for it.

Immanuel Kant’s view, for better or worse, was that the very idea of duty assumes that we are somehow free from whatever factors a scientist might invoke as the causes of our actions. (No one says, “I do this because it is my duty—but only because my genetic endowment forces it on me.”) In Kant’s view, to summon the willpower required for an act of conscience is to act in the conviction that we are free to defy whatever might seem to be forcing our behavior.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau was driving at a similar point when he wrote, “To be governed by appetite alone is slavery, while obedience to a law that one prescribes to oneself is freedom.”

Explaining sympathy is one thing, but explaining all that we call “morality” is harder.

- 2Recommend

Blue Sun

Stockton, NJ [July 21, 2010](#)

It is interesting to consider that one of the core definitions of both the psychopath and his close cousin, the sociopath, is the inability to experience empathy toward others. Given the recent contemptuous and derisive attack on empathy by Republicans during the Sotomayor confirmation hearings, it is not hard to conclude that the entire GOP and Conservative movement - whether political or 'fundamentalist' religious - is a group of clinically psychopathic people. Since empathy is such an important element of morality and ethics, it is also difficult to believe that all of the Right's talk about morals and values is just a disguise of their amorality and lack of ethics (psychopaths and sociopaths are often very good at faking empathy as camouflage, and even believe that everybody else also fakes emotions of compassion, empathy, and community, as they do). Perhaps this explains the heartlessness, coarsening, and rising cruelty and selfishness we see in American politics - particularly from the Right.

- Recommend

John Locke

New Hope, PA [July 21, 2010](#)

I think that the development of a mind capable of empathy is a strong factor in the development of 'morality' over and above its advantage as an evolutionary survival strategy.

When the human brain first evolved enough for humans to have a true sense of self, and, unlike other animals, to understand that, at some point they will die, the first foundation for morality was laid. They understood that, in a sense, they were a universe of one.

Built upon this was further development of the human cerebral cortex - to the point where humans acquired the capability to grasp that others also had the same self-awareness and were equally "universes of one." A sense of empathy grew out of this understanding that others were just as self-aware, and capable of wants and desires, of feeling joy and pain and fear, as they themselves did.

This leads inexorably to an identification with other human 'universes,' which, in turn, leads to the conception of some variation of the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Or, at the very early stages, "Don't do unto others what you would not want them doing unto you."

When you think about it, all of human moral systems are essentially this rule, although often laden with superstitious or religious taboos and ritual requirements.

This is not yet a perfected evolutionary development. Limited empathy that only encompasses the family, tribe, or nation-state can be as damaging as, or even more damaging, than no empathy at all. Only, some time in our future evolution, when we realize there are no artificial limits to the other humans we should feel empathy for, will we finally transcend nationalism, hatred, and war.

Unfortunately, the development of human intelligence and abilities has also had an anti-evolutionary effect, since nature no longer 'culls the herd,' and we have few mechanisms for preserving the true survival traits (individual, family, and species) and many for bypassing empathy.

But don't underestimate the evolutionary advances in human ability for abstract thought and self-awareness (and 'other-awareness') in the development of a core morality that can be found throughout the peoples of the planet.

- 1Recommend

f4ri

Gothenburg, Sweden [July 21, 2010](#)

Ideas, as far as I know, are not subject to natural evolution other than in the minds of those it touches. They may evolve per se but only in the minds of those capable grasping the concept that is an intellectual message. Those ideas do not become transferrable through time with procreation because the next generation would need to learn it through experience. The same goes with such concepts as empathy, love, hatred etc as they are not something each of us have built in but more constructs to help us function in a human society dependant on such things.

We are taught that feeling empathy towards others is the way to go, even if that diminishes in time, and we are taught that love is something every person should feel, even though in reality, it might be nothing more than a sense of prolonged attachment.

I'm afraid your hopes and wishes that empathy and sympathy would simply increase with natural selection and a continued human evolution seem dim, especially if one considers the state of our world today.

- 2Recommend

skeptonomist

Tennessee [July 21, 2010](#)

The critical issue for humans and even for the entire earth is not camouflage of selfish genes by morality, it is the way "us" versus "them" has come to encompass entire nations, rather than small kin groups, to the point where civilization is in danger. Our morality is for kin groups - "us", and those outside the group are "them", subhumans and not worthy of survival. Reciprocal altruism on the level of nations is not genetic, it is something that has to be learned.

- 1Recommend

Paul Dorell

Evanston, IL [July 21, 2010](#)

I would add to my previous comment (No. 22), after reading the other comments, that the philosophy practiced by Peter Railton does not seem to enlighten a wide swath of readers, perhaps because of language that tends to obfuscate. As a former philosophy student, I'm glad today that I left a field that has been taken over by academics with a love for the arcane. It seems to me that Darwin is the real thinker here, and the philosophers are like dolphins getting a free ride in his wake.

- 1Recommend

Amy

Lawrenceville, NJ [July 20, 2010](#)

How do we overcome us-ishness? I think there might be only two ways: either expand those we consider "us," or eradicate those we consider "them." The latter appears to be more appealing to most people.

- 2Recommend

epaburke

Philadelphia [July 20, 2010](#)

Now we are all genetically predestined automatons, which is so much more scientific than being controlled by the will of God (or the devil), and so much more rational than being a mere mass of emotional reactions. "My genes made me do it" will replace both religion and Freud. Where, please, is education in any of this? And where is human will? Free will, that is.

Now we are merely heeding genetic impulses when we misbehave--or behave. What is, must be right, as it once must have been the will of God, or else there was no omnipotent God, or that God would have put a stop to wrong-doing. Unless, of course, that God permitted wrong-doing in order to work out the cosmic morality, etc. A well-known example from history-- the perpetrators of the Spanish Inquisition thought they were being 'moral'--saving souls by torturing bodies--and saving souls was a good thing. The people who had to torture other people to accomplish this wonder were deserving of sympathy and respect--for what perpetrating torture put them through. (I think some of them are still saints). Their victims were, and are, deserving of our resentment. Present-day violent criminals believe that they are also working out cosmic justice or the will of God--and many other people believe it with them. These criminals believe that they have the same claim on our sympathy. Why should they suffer because they are working out the will of God? Why should they be 'led before councils'? If they were wrong, surely God would strike them dead, and God has not done that. Their victims are dead, proving that they must have been wrong. The same philosophical thread runs through modern warfare--if we become involved in a war, we have to win it, or we may believe be forced to conclude that we have not acted in concert with the will of God. We cannot fight a merely pragmatic war--drop a few bombs until our enemy makes a desired concession. This would not fit in with our notions of ourselves as moral beings.

Again, where is education in all of this? We are educated to this--we have not evolved into it--and we cannot wait to evolve out of it. We are back to 'if evolution is true (and it's science, after all), then whatever we are doing must be the will of genetics, and for the best, even though we cannot fathom the reason for it, any more than we can fathom the ineffable will of God'. Where is human will? If we don't have free will we cannot err. If we do, we are responsible for our decisions, and for their effects on our own lives and the lives of others.

Darwin was talking about physical traits--the beaks of finches, for a start. He noted how wonderfully they were adapted to different environments. His theory of natural selection is an explanation of this, not a plan for human living. For that you want what is commonly referred to as 'social Darwinism'--a theory advanced to explain why some people are poor or oppressed--obviously merely science--poverty as proof that they were less fit to survive--a replacement, in part, of the original sin/will of God theory. The name Sumner properly belongs on this theory--not Darwin.

Back to human education and human will. The problem most people don't want to face is that our/their children learn precisely what they are taught. Anti-social behavior is a product of human teaching--mainly by parents, but also by the broader philosophy. It is not evidence that people cannot be taught to behave, or that crime is the will of God, nature, or evolution. It is proof that education works. We need to agree to educate children differently in order to change this. One might presume that this is already being effected by schools, social workers, etc.--not so. Many of the lessons of sociopathy are taught long before children are of an age to enter school. The 'unconscious' many are seeking is just this education. When it is really brought to light, much of what psychologists accept as 'normal psychology' will be swept away. People teach their children, as babies, to believe in magic, among other things--as

in performing sleight-of-hand tricks. The same parents set up a seemingly irrational system of rewards and punishments, so that parental approval becomes the be-all and end-all. No commandments--no rules to live by which will win approval if followed. It is mainly an appeal to emotion--some cleverness in the art of emotional manipulation, but no room for intelligence. Many of these children never attend school. When they do, their parents' philosophy is already well-instilled in them. The 'greater society' needs to take more of an interest in philosophy, at least to assure that we are teaching it, or attempting to teach it, to people who have lived with these false philosophies for generations. We should certainly not be learning philosophy from them.

- 2Recommend

DP

NYC [July 20, 2010](#)

Inevitably on this blog someone complains about the lack of an Eastern Philosophical perspective. These complaints would be more coherent if specific philosophical texts were cited instead of traditions.

The Stone seems, reasonably, to be devoted to philosophy gleaned from books, written AS philosophy. The Bible, the Koran, the Bhagatvat Gita, the Upanishads are not works of philosophy despite there being some content that can be construed as of philosophical merit. They are primarily religious archeological finds. The Ten Commandments is not a work of philosophy.

If one cites Buddhism, please cite a work and page numbers!

- 3Recommend

chainsaw49

FtWorth, TX [July 20, 2010](#)

Morality described from who's point of view?

- Recommend

Daniel Perez

Wilton, NH [July 20, 2010](#)

JW puts out the most traditional leftist stereotypes, "As you point out, a more inclusive morality has begun to develop -- including things like the Geneva Conventions as well as 'shared inquiry, experimental procedures, technologies and norms of logic and evidence that have resulted in genuine scientific knowledge and responsiveness to the force of logic.'" If any of this were true, then he would be "inclusive" of other world views, which he is not. Yet he describes himself as "more evolved" than "big corporations." There is no logical, philosophical basis, or epistemological source to such a biased and unscientific approach. There is no description for the source of the "Geneva Conventions", which spring from human moral intuition, or an alternative source given. Just like the writer of the article, there is too much propaganda and not much substance. If we are scientific in approach, then we need to point out our presuppositions and assumptions. Stating I am "more evolved" or "superior" is just what was done to minorities earlier in our Nations history. It is meaningless to use the argument of "superiority" as an epistemological foundation. This is just what OBama does regularly. He uses elitist arrogance to impose his mediocre and short-sighted moral code on others., without any logical or moral basis given by the facts. - All I ask is that we stick to what we know, and don't make statements that have no logical foundation.

- 1Recommend

CL Walter

KS [July 20, 2010](#)

People easily twist morality to suit their own agendas. I've seen a few of the "sermons" of Joel Osteen and they're always the same. His main emphasis is to have a good attitude and keep begging, and you'll get what you want. I've never heard him say a word about helping others, about stewardship to people or the planet, or as a strategy to help further mankind. He has an arena full of "sheep" that he tells exactly what they want to hear. Whatever the moral bent, the religious affiliation, or political party, people gather in flocks to assert they're common belief to validate themselves and their moral outlook.

They don't seem to recognize that they're doing nothing but preaching to the choir. Another example is Sarah Palin. I feel pity for anyone that thinks that woman is viable for anything but shutting her mouth and spreading her legs. She's a self-promoting, vacuous douche bag that thinks she's cornered the market on morality and is in a position to impose it on everyone else, (but it helps her political agenda). Yet, there are so many willing to turn over their individuality to someone professing to have their best interests in mind. To you I say, "baa,baa,baaaaaa".

- Recommend

john head

Ha Noi Vn. [July 20, 2010](#)

Mr Railton is not giving Henry K sufficient credit for HK's observation vis-a-vis power. Having spent all of my working life in Show Business, and accepting that Politics is just Show Business for ugly people, I am certain HK got it right. Alongside HK's remark, and as a corollary to it, is the French expression "Beau comme Croesus," a highly insightful switch on our "rich as Croesus" simile. So if we agree that Power and Cash arouse people sexually my question is: can this arousal be characterised as lust, or is it some deeper evolutionary motivation disguised as lust? And this question follows: is all lust just Nature's way of keeping the population growing irrespective of how we, the participants see it? You may think you have a fascination for long-legged redheads who attended Roman Catholic schools but if they were in short supply you might find yourself stuck on brunettes who wear glasses. At least Nature is kind and allows us our idiosyncratic delusions.

Libido seems to me to vary quite a lot from person to person of both genders. Is Evolution just playing the percentages here and "saying" we really need these rampant types to make up for those less interested in sex, and that gene, if it is a gene, is present, in the hope that other, maybe more important genetic information is in there as well and will be passed on with the Big Libido.

My final question: why do all the Big Libido people have to live in Los Angeles?

- 1Recommend

Santosh Kalwar

Finland [July 20, 2010](#)

Thank you very much for very insightful topic.

"Moral Camouflage or Moral Monkeys?"

I would rather go for Moral Camouflage and with Kant idea of moral instincts build within each individual. We were not moral monkeys and we are not moral monkeys and we will not be moral monkeys. Evolution is a big joke played by evolutionists. Creation is another big joke played by creationists. Neither evolution nor creation can induce moral judgment one individual to another individuality.

I think morality is the key and morality lies in each of our species from generation to generation. We all are aware of good stuffs and bad stuffs and if we increase our good stuffs, we will be all good.

- Recommend

173 COMMENTS

The comments section is closed. To submit a letter to the editor for publication, write to letters@nytimes.com.