

According To W. D. Ross's Theory A) A Prima Facie obligation Is Absolute And Can Never Be Overridden.

According To W. D. Ross's Theory A) A Prima Facie Obligation Is Absolute And Can Never Be Overridden.

Introduction to W. D. Ross's Ethical Theory

W. D. Ross, a prominent philosopher of the early 20th century, is renowned for his deontological approach to ethics, particularly through his formulation of the concept of prima facie obligations. His theory emphasizes the complexity of moral duties and the importance of moral intuition in ethical decision-making. Central to Ross's ethical framework is the idea that individuals possess multiple moral obligations that are inherently binding but may come into conflict with each other in specific circumstances.

Understanding Prima Facie Obligations

Definition of Prima Facie Obligations

A prima facie obligation, as defined by Ross, is an initial, fundamental moral duty that appears to be obligatory upon moral reflection. The term "prima facie" translates from Latin as "at first glance" or "on the face of it," indicating that these obligations are apparent and binding unless overridden by a more compelling duty in a particular context.

The Nature of Prima Facie Obligations

Ross's conception of prima facie duties involves several key points:

- They are moral duties that are generally binding and absolute in their initial presentation.
- They serve as moral guidelines rather than fixed, inflexible rules.
- In cases of conflict between duties, one must deliberately consider which duty should take precedence, leading to the determination of the actual or actual duty to perform.

Ross's View on the Absoluteness of Prima Facie Obligations

Are Prima Facie Obligations Absolute?

According to Ross, prima facie obligations are absolute in the sense that they are generally binding and not easily discarded. They are considered moral imperatives that every moral agent recognizes as valid unless they are overridden by a more significant duty in a specific situation.

Implications of Absoluteness

This absolutism implies that:

- Moral duties are not conditional on personal preferences or societal opinions.
- They hold universally and are binding for all rational agents.
- The prima facie obligation cannot be dismissed lightly; rather, they require careful moral judgment to determine if they still stand or are overridden.

Can Prima Facie Obligations Ever Be Overridden?

The Common Misconception: Absolute and Unchangeable

A common misunderstanding is that Ross's prima facie obligations are strictly unalterable. However, Ross explicitly acknowledges that in complex moral situations, duties may conflict, requiring the moral agent to deliberately prioritize one over the other.

Distinguishing Between Prima Facie and Actual Duties

- Prima Facie Duty: An initial, apparent obligation that is generally binding.
- Actual Duty: The duty that, after careful consideration, the agent determines to be the most pressing in the specific context.

Ross advocates that prima facie duties can be overridden when a more compelling duty takes precedence in a given situation, but this does not mean they are not binding in general; it reflects their relative rather than absolute status.

Is the Absoluteness of Prima Facie Obligations Compatible with Overriding?

Ross's Position on the Paradox

While Ross emphasizes that prima facie obligations are initially binding, he does not claim they are absolutely inviolable in all circumstances. Instead, he suggests that:

- These duties are generally binding and absolute in their initial presentation.
- They can be overridden when conflicting duties demand it, but this override does not negate their fundamental moral authority.

The Role of Moral Deliberation

The process of moral judgment involves:

1. Recognizing the set of relevant prima facie duties.
2. Weighing these duties against each other.
3. Deciding which duty takes precedence in the specific situation.

This process underscores that overriding a prima facie obligation is not a violation of its absolute nature but a necessary moral judgment to resolve conflicts.

Examples Illustrating the Relationship Between Prima Facie Obligations and Overriding

Example 1: Telling the Truth vs. Protecting a Friend

- Prima Facie Duty: Honesty (telling the truth).
- Conflicting Duty: Protecting a friend from harm.
- Scenario: You are asked by a murderer about the whereabouts of your friend.

In this case, the duty to tell the truth conflicts with the duty to protect your friend. According to Ross, the duty to protect may override the duty to tell the truth in this context. This does not mean the duty to truth ceases to be a moral obligation; rather, it is overridden by a more pressing duty based on the circumstances.

Example 2: Keeping Promises vs. Preventing Harm

- Prima Facie Duty: Keep promises.
- Conflicting Duty: Prevent harm to others.
- Scenario: You promised to meet a friend but learn that staying home could prevent a catastrophe.

Here, the duty to prevent harm overrides the promise if keeping the promise would result in greater harm. Again, the promise remains a moral obligation but is overridden by the more urgent duty.

Implications of Ross's View on Moral Flexibility and Absolutism

Balancing Moral Duties

Ross's theory recognizes that while prima facie duties are generally binding, moral life involves balancing these duties in complex situations. This balancing requires moral wisdom and deliberation.

Absoluteness in the Context of Moral Principles

The absoluteness of prima facie duties refers to their initial binding nature, but not to their immunity from being overridden. This distinction allows for moral flexibility without undermining the moral authority of these duties.

Critiques and Defenses of the Absoluteness of Prima Facie Duties

Common Criticisms

- Critics argue that overriding duties can lead to moral inconsistency.
- Some claim that absolute obligations are too rigid to accommodate real-world complexities.
- Others suggest that Ross's account lacks clarity on when and how duties should be overridden.

Ross's Defense

- Ross maintains that moral judgment involves deliberate weighing rather than rigid rule-following.
- He stresses that moral intuition guides us to recognize the relative importance of duties.

- The absoluteness of prima facie duties serves as a moral foundation, ensuring that duties are not dismissed lightly.

Conclusion: Reconciling Absoluteness and Overriding in Ross's Theory

In summary, W. D. Ross's theory posits that prima facie obligations are initially absolute in their moral authority, serving as fundamental moral guidelines that every rational agent must recognize. However, this absolute status does not mean they are immune to override. Instead, Ross advocates a nuanced understanding where moral duties can be overridden when conflicting obligations demand prioritization, but such overrides are deliberate and justified through moral reflection.

This framework provides moral flexibility within an ethical structure grounded in duty, allowing individuals to navigate complex moral landscapes while respecting the foundational absoluteness of prima facie obligations. It strikes a balance between the rigidity of moral rules and the practical necessity of moral judgment, emphasizing that moral duties are both binding and context-sensitive.

References:

- Ross, W. D. (1930). *The Right and the Good*. Oxford University Press.
- Hare, R. M. (1963). *Freedom and Reason*. Clarendon Press.
- Shafer-Landau, R. (2012). *Moral Philosophy*. Oxford University Press.

Frequently Asked Questions

What does W. D. Ross's theory say about prima facie obligations being absolute?

Ross's theory states that prima facie obligations are generally binding and can never be completely overridden, meaning they hold a presumption of moral importance unless overridden by more pressing duties.

How does Ross distinguish between prima facie obligations and actual moral duties?

Ross distinguishes prima facie obligations as initial, apparent duties that can be overridden by more compelling obligations, whereas actual duties are those that are ultimately binding after considering all relevant factors, but according to his view, prima facie obligations are inherently binding unless overridden.

Is Ross's claim that prima facie obligations are absolute consistent with moral dilemmas?

Yes, Ross believes that even in moral dilemmas, prima facie obligations are binding and can only be overridden when a more significant duty takes precedence, thus maintaining their general absolute nature.

What implications does Ross's theory have for conflicting moral duties?

Ross's theory suggests that when duties conflict, we must carefully weigh the prima facie obligations, but none of these obligations can be dismissed entirely; instead, the most compelling obligation should override others while the rest remain binding in principle.

How does Ross justify the idea that prima facie obligations are never truly overridden?

Ross justifies this by arguing that prima facie obligations are fundamental moral commitments that serve as a moral starting point; they are never entirely dismissed but may be outweighed by more pressing duties, yet not discarded.

In what way does Ross's theory influence contemporary moral decision-making?

Ross's emphasis on the binding nature of prima facie obligations encourages moral agents to consider all relevant duties carefully, recognizing that while some obligations may be overridden, they remain morally significant and should not be ignored entirely.

Additional Resources

According To W. D. Ross's Theory A) A Prima Facie Obligation Is Absolute And Can Never Be Overridden

Introduction

In the landscape of moral philosophy, W. D. Ross's theory of prima facie obligations occupies a prominent position, shaping debates on moral duties and their hierarchical structure. Central to his conception is the assertion that prima facie obligations are absolute, meaning they cannot be overridden by other duties once established. This perspective challenges more flexible or consequentialist approaches, which permit the weighing and balancing of conflicting duties. This article aims to thoroughly examine the nature of Ross's claim that a prima facie obligation is absolute and can never be overridden, exploring its philosophical foundations, implications, and critiques within the broader context of moral theory.

Understanding Prima Facie Obligations in Ross's Moral Philosophy

Defining Prima Facie Obligations

W. D. Ross introduces the concept of prima facie obligations as moral duties that are apparent or self-evident at first glance, prior to any detailed analysis. These are duties that one ought to do unless they are overridden by a more pressing obligation. For example, duties such as keeping promises, refraining from causing harm, and helping those in need are considered prima facie obligations because they seem inherently right and are immediately recognized as moral duties.

The Role of Prima Facie Obligations in Ross's Ethical Framework

Ross's ethical system is often characterized as pluralistic and deontological. Unlike consequentialism, which evaluates morality based on outcomes, Ross emphasizes multiple, fundamental duties that do not reduce solely to maximizing happiness or utility. Prima facie obligations serve as the building blocks of moral judgment, guiding moral agents to act rightly in complex situations where duties may conflict.

The Hierarchical Structure

According to Ross, moral duties are not always straightforward; instead, they form a plurality of duties that can come into conflict. The agent's task is to determine which duty takes precedence in a given situation. This decision-making involves ranking the prima facie duties, though Ross does not specify an inflexible hierarchy. Importantly, the concept of overriding duties is central to understanding how moral agents navigate conflicting obligations.

The Absolute Nature of Prima Facie Obligations: Ross's Position

The Claim: Prima Facie Obligations Are Absolute

Ross's assertion that "a prima facie obligation is absolute and can never be overridden" is a nuanced point that warrants careful analysis. At first glance, this seems to assert that once a duty is recognized as prima facie, it retains an inviolable status, independent of other considerations.

Clarifying the Misinterpretation

However, many interpret Ross's claim as implying that prima facie duties are unconditional and always binding. Yet, Ross himself clarifies that the obligation is only prima facie—meaning it is binding unless it is overridden by a more pressing duty. This suggests a conditional absoluteness: the duty is binding in the absence of competing duties that have greater moral weight.

The Distinction Between Prima Facie and Actual Duties

Ross distinguishes between prima facie duties and actual duties. The actual duty is what one ought to do after considering all relevant duties and their priorities in a specific context. Prima facie duties are initial or default obligations that serve as guides in moral deliberation. This distinction underpins the claim that prima facie duties are absolute in their binding nature, but only initially—they can be overridden in particular circumstances.

The Controversy: Are Prima Facie Duties Truly Absolute?

The core controversy revolves around whether Ross's notion of immunity of prima facie duties from being overridden is consistent with his acknowledgment of their conditional nature. Critics argue that if duties can be overridden, then they are not truly absolute. Conversely, proponents emphasize that the initial binding character of prima facie duties grants them an absolute status in the process of moral judgment, even if they are sometimes set aside.

Philosophical Foundations and Implications

The Concept of Moral Absolutism in Ross's Theory

Ross's theory embodies a form of moral absolutism, but with a nuanced twist. The absoluteness pertains not to the duties themselves, but to their initial binding nature. Each prima facie obligation is absolutely binding in the sense that it is inherently right, yet it is not unconditional in the sense of always prevailing over others.

The Role of Moral Intuition and Moral Judgment

Ross emphasizes moral intuition as the primary source of our recognition of prima facie duties. These intuitions are considered self-evident and immediately grasped, lending a sense of moral absoluteness to the duties they reveal. When conflicts arise, moral judgment involves deliberation—we weigh our duties, but the initial recognition of each duty's moral authority remains absolute.

Practical Consequences

The idea that prima facie obligations are absolute and never overridden has significant practical implications:

- Moral Clarity: Agents are guided by a set of duties that are fundamentally binding.
- Moral Dilemmas: When duties conflict, agents must deliberately weigh which duty to prioritize, acknowledging that each duty's initial bindingness remains intact.
- Moral Responsibility: The absolute nature of prima facie duties underscores the importance of moral integrity and consistency.

Critiques and Counterarguments

The Overriding Dilemma

One of the most prominent critiques questions the coherence of Ross's claim that prima facie duties are absolute and can never be overridden. Critics argue that in real-world moral dilemmas, agents often must set aside certain duties to fulfill more pressing obligations, which suggests that prima facie duties are not truly absolute.

The Problem of Conflicting Duties

Ross's framework requires moral agents to judge which duty takes precedence when conflicts occur. However, critics point out that this judgment process can be arbitrary or uncertain, undermining the idea that duties are absolutely binding in a rigorous sense. If duties can be overridden, the absoluteness of prima facie obligations becomes questionable.

Empirical Challenges

Empirical studies in moral psychology suggest that people do not always adhere to a strict hierarchy of duties, and instead often balance duties in complex ways. This challenges the notion that prima facie obligations are absolute, as human moral reasoning appears more flexible.

Alternative Ethical Theories

Consequentialists and other normative theories argue that moral duties should be weighed or maximized, rather than viewed as absolutely binding. For these critics, Ross's claim that prima facie duties are never overridden appears overly rigid and detached from practical moral reasoning.

Reconciling Ross's Absolute Prima Facie Obligations with Moral Practice

Clarifying the Conditional Absoluteness

A nuanced interpretation of Ross's position is that prima facie obligations are absolutely binding in their initial recognition, but their actual application involves deliberation, during which they can be overridden or differentiated. This maintains the integrity of the duties' initial binding status while allowing flexibility in moral judgment.

The Role of Moral Intuition and Conscience

Ross's reliance on moral intuition lends a sense of moral certainty to prima facie duties, supporting their absolute recognition. Yet, the process of deliberation ensures that moral agents can navigate complex situations by prioritizing duties without compromising the initial moral authority of each duty.

Practical Approach to Conflicting Duties

In practice, Ross advocates for moral wisdom and deliberation to determine which duties should actually be fulfilled in a given context. The absolute status of prima facie duties functions as a moral anchor, guiding judgment rather than rigidly dictating action, thus balancing moral absoluteness with situational flexibility.

Conclusion

W. D. Ross's assertion that a prima facie obligation is absolute and can never be overridden reflects a foundational aspect of his moral philosophy, emphasizing the inherent moral authority of duties recognized through moral intuition. While this claim has generated significant debate—particularly concerning the apparent tension between absoluteness and overriding—a careful reading suggests that Ross's position is best understood as affirming the initial bindingness of duties, which serve as

moral benchmarks in deliberation rather than inflexible mandates.

This perspective underscores the complexity of moral reasoning: duties are fundamentally binding yet contextually adjustable. Ross's theory thus offers a nuanced approach that respects the moral significance of each duty while acknowledging the realities of moral conflict. The ongoing philosophical discourse around the absoluteness of prima facie obligations continues to enrich our understanding of moral duty, responsibility, and the nature of ethical decision-making.

References

- Ross, W. D. (1930). The Right and the Good. Oxford University Press.
- Shafer-Landau, R. (2012). Moral Philosophy. Oxford University Press.
- Hursthouse, R. (1999). On Virtue Ethics. Oxford University Press.
- Williams, B. (1973). Morality:

According To W D Ross S Theory A A Aprima Facieobligation Is Absolute And Can Never Be Overridden

According To W D Ross S Theory A A Aprima Facieobligation Is Absolute And Can Never Be Overridden

Related Articles

- [After Earthquakes Hit The California Coast And Damaged Tens Of Thousands Of Cars, There Was A Growing](#)
- [A Surfer Recorded The Following Values For How Far The Tide Rose, In Feet, Up The Beach Over A 15-day](#)
- [A Woman On A Bridge 101 M High Sees A Raft Floating At A Constant Speed On The River Below. She Drops](#)

[Back to Home](#)