

cal? Many philosophers have
st fundamental of questions,
whether humans are well served
whether they weigh us down.
etter off if we all gave in to the
our own interests and take the
res whenever we can? The
e, thought that the only rational
ks aiming at increasing personal
pense of someone else's wealth)
s list.

art Mill, to mention a few, have
ore to life than selfishness. In the
defending his philosophy against
ness are only whatever rich and
are. Despite a long and beautiful
s opponents – that we can see
people who have a great life and
ually great manner – seem more
ndedness of the father of

d to reject what he saw as the
ty, where you are good now
ite payoff later, and to establish
tions for morality. Therefore he
ecide if something is ethical or
uld happen if everybody were

However, Kant never explained
ethics is indeed rational. Rand
g double standards, one for
of the universe, makes perfect
stern that he thought that an
moral worth if the agent is getting

Mill also tried to establish ethi
tions, in his case by improving on
utilitarianism. In chapter two of
writes: "Actions are right in propo
promote happiness; wrong as they
of happiness." Leaving aside the
happiness is and the difficulty of a
tions (Bentham's 'hedonic calculu
practical trouble), one still has to
question of why one should care a
degree of happiness instead of jus

Things got worse with the adv
biology. It seemed for a long tim
provide the naturalistic basis for t
nature red in tooth and claw evol
himself,' in pure Randian style. I
popularized the infamous doctrin
(which Darwin himself never espe
wrote *Atlas Shrugged*. Most peop
evolution may be true, but it cert
children. Indeed, it is precisely b
the moral consequences of evolu
percentage of Americans fiercely
Darwin's ideas in public schools.

Recently, however, several scie
been taking a second look at evol
relationship with ethics, and are f
the project of Plato, Kant, and M
tally rational way of being ethical
Sloan Wilson, in their *Unto Other
of Unselfish Behavior*, as well as Pe
Left: Politics, Evolution and Coopera
beings evolved as social animals. n

...it would also provide Ayn
most humans are simply stupid,
the math behind the game.
...ever, simulated the evolution of
...h several players get to interact
...dered a social situation rather
...e players have memory of
...player builds a 'reputation' in the
...egy is to be fair because people are
...proposers, which increases their own
...nages the proposer's reputation for
...at – given the social environment
...toward your neighbors.

The same idea is offered by the now
...ers' Dilemma introduced by
...ert Axelrod in the early 1980s.
...riants, the common feature
...viduals have a choice of cooper-
...all cost) or of defecting. The
...of the two players does it, but
...f they both do. Axelrod demon-
...called tit-for-tat, always wins
...as the players interact with each
...lding a 'reputation' for their
...y based on the idea that you
...unter, but after that you adjust
...partner: if he cooperates, you
...s, you retaliate. Axelrod actually
...hich tit-for-tat, implemented in a
...ay against a variety of other
...ng conditionally nice was the
...lfish strategy was able to
...ter Singer when he says (in *How*
...significance of Axelrod's result is



You can enrol for a Pathways d
at any time. For further detail
Klempner, Director of Studies,
of England, Dept of Philosophy
Sheffield S10 2TN or e-mail G.K.

Clinamen

Philosophy's L
by Andrew B

*"A provocative and lucid book destined
one of thinking's earliest riddles." D.*

This work takes up and elaborates the
previous books. *Philosophy's Literature*
from earlier work in a systematic way
Philosophy and Psychoanalysis. Adopt
a critically distanced approach, Benja
through the cultural possibilities of the
respect to each discipline. In the proce
of a broad diversity of thinkers, includin
Holderlin and Celan, Aristotle and Quint

Available now in all good bookshops

Our Ser