Theoretical underpinnings of Ethics

* ~~The hallmark of ethical thinking: “recognition that there are appropriate interests other than your own, that should act as constraints on unbridled pursuit of self-interest”. Ethics costs, it’s giving up something that can benefit you for someone else.~~
* ~~What should I do? (the central question of ethics)~~
* ~~There is a winner and a loser in almost every ethical problem. If you can turn it into a non-ethical problem (not unethical) then it could be a win-win. If benefits can be mutual, then there is no longer an ethical problem.~~
* ~~Honesty, integrity, fairness, compassion, openness: everybody around the world picks these core values/virtues. This dispels ethical relativism (values being different from time to time, place to place, culture to culture, i.e. contextual)~~
* ~~Relativism: values are contextual (as above).~~
* ~~Descriptive relativism: this is just what happens in this place~~
* ~~Normative relativism: all the different views are equally correct, and we shouldn’t interfere or judge other cultures values. WRONG: slavery was deemed okay in America and that’s just because it was deemed okay by the people in power. Just because something is so, doesn’t mean it is okay.~~
* ~~What kind of person should I be? (virtues) What should I do? (prescriptions)~~
* ~~Descriptive ethics: investigates what people think is okay (matter of fact). This is anthropology and sociology, a study of what actually happens.~~
* ~~Prescriptive ethics: reaches a view about what should be done, how we should behave~~
  + ~~Normative ethics and General principles (do unto others as you would have them do to you, act to produce the most happiness/utility)~~
  + ~~Normative Issues (specific issues like abortion, less generality)~~
  + ~~Moralizing (yes/no answer to an actual ethical situation, most specific)~~
  + ~~An example: He should~~ **~~not~~** ~~have taken the money (moralizing), because it was stealing and~~ **~~stealing is bad~~** ~~(issue), and stealing causes~~ **~~unhappiness~~** ~~(general principle is to maximize happiness)~~
  + ~~You must be able to supply each of these for an ethical argument. When you make an ethical standpoint, you imply you have the answers to each of these steps. You cannot just say “it just is/isn’t ethical”.~~
  + ~~A viewpoint is also only considered ethical if it is not prudential (not just related to the self), political (it cannot be negotiable), a preference (I like chocolate more than vanilla because I do), artistic etc.~~
  + ~~A ethical viewpoint is non-negotiable. You don’t hold a referendum to decide if a group of people have human rights, they just do. This doesn’t mean you cannot change your ethical viewpoint; it just means you wont because of negotiation i.e. a moral issue is too important to negotiate and reach a middle ground about, it MUST be the one way, the moral way.~~
* Rules vs consequences (outcomes) – answer to the question: what should I do?
* Public vs private morality (what you should do as an individual normally vs what you do as an individual who is filling a role e.g. lawyer must maintain confidentiality, someone who overhears lawyer’s conversation doesn’t)
* Virtues: answer to the question: what type of person should I be?
* Consequential: forwards looking, what will happen/be produced?
* Non-consequential: backwards or present looking. I should do x because I made a promise to, or because it is fair/right/my duty/I’m contractually obligated to.
* The big 3 are consequential (Mills), non-consequential (Kant), and virtue
* Kant
  + ~~Morals must not be about consequences. The only good thing is a thing that was done out of good will, it cannot be a mistake or unintentional. This doesn’t mean a good will is the only important thing, because the road to hell is paved with good intentions, but rather, the act must be good and intended to have happened. It’s the difference between: were your intentions good? Vs was the act good and intentional?~~
  + If you do something instinctually (because of inner values) then it wasn’t a moral decision, you were always going to do that. A moral decision must be intentionally willed to fruition. This is called **agent autonomy**.
  + **Duty** is the **central notion of morality** is his view. Everything can be related back to a principle or moral.
  + If you are allowed to break **promises**, then the whole notion of promises collapses, hence you cannot break a promise (in Kant’s view). This is known as **a perfect duty**, It must be held up, if you can break it in any case, you can break it in all cases. Other duties are imperfect, and there is some leeway.
  + Kant’s argument is that if you want to say it is okay in one case, it must be okay in the general case e.g. is it okay to not help someone in dire need? If not, then it must be okay to never help anyone in dire need.
  + Maxim or general principle is always involved. It is the **why** someone did something. If you keep asking why, it will eventually reveal one of these maxims. E.g. why did you run for the bus? Because I want to get to work? Why do you want to get to work? Because I need money? Why do you need money? Because I need to feed my family? Why? So they live? Why? So I’m happy. Happiness is the maxim.
  + First formulation: act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that is should become a universal law. i.e. only follow general principles that you want to be universally applied.
  + Second formulation: Act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only. This is a requirement to respect people and recognize they are a person. Other people should be the end (the reason for doing things), and not only a means (don’t just use people). It is okay for people to be part of the means though.
* Mills
  + “actions are right in proportions as they tend to promote happiness; wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness”. This is the utilitarian perspective.
  + This is the polar opposite to Kant. All that Mills considers when deciding if something is ethical or not is the outcome/consequences. If pleasure/happiness is maximized, then that is the ethical decision.
* Ross (middle-man, has a crossover of both Mills and Kant)
  + Prima facie duties (on the surface)
* Moral pluralism
  + There is no single moral theory or principle that should be accepted as correct or accepted over others. There are many equally valid theories.
  + This is not moral relativism! This is saying combine the outcomes of considering it from a duties and consequences perspective to come to an answer.
* Contractual ethics
  + Ethics only exist in a society, not in normal nature. The power is removed from the individual and given to a third party.
  + Minmax: minimize your maximum loss i.e. any benefits in society should benefit the people down the bottom the most.
* Procedural justice
  + Perfect procedural justice: there is a known way to guarantee a just outcome
  + Imperfect procedural justice: there is an outcome that is deemed just, but there is no known way to guarantee it. There is a just a close as you can get procedure.
  + Pure procedural justice: whether it is just or not doesn’t depend on the outcome, but rather the procedure. If the procedure is just, then all outcomes are taken as just e.g. flipping a coin, I could win every time, but because it was equal chance that is a just outcome (Even though you never won).
* Everything up until here was “what should I do?”, now we will cover who should I be? In other words, virtue-based ethics.
  + Virtues are those things that enable us to function well as humans.
  + Plato: focus on being a good individual, a good society will come naturally from this if everyone follows it
  + Aristotle: all virtues are concerned with feelings. What are the virtues we should develop in ourselves to arrive at happiness? The golden mean is about not feeling too much, and not feeling too little. You should feel the right amount e.g. you should be courageous (feeling the right amount), not rash (too much) or cowardly (too little). Also, don’t feel too much pride (egomaniac) but you should be proud of things you should be proud of by an appropriate amount.
    - Basic idea is: there are ways you feel about the things that you do as an individual. You don’t want to feel too much or too little about these things. i.e. if you win a contest, don’t become a cocky prick, but you should be proud of yourself.
    - Then you should act in the way that the person who feels the right amount should. Once you do it enough it will become a habit and part of your character, then you will do it by default.
* Moral issue are not problems that can be solved. It is not the same at 8+4=12 where there is an exact precise answer. They are dilemmas that we can navigate through, and the outcomes of such navigations will be better or worse. They way we navigate is by using the equally valid ethical strategies outlined above. You can come up with an answer that you argue is better than any other answer, but you cannot argue it is actually correct.

Summarize 4-5 key aspects. No analysis. 4-5 paragraphs.

Key points

* What is and isn’t ethics
  + What should I do? What kind of person should I be?
  + The key to ethical thinking is considering the interests of others
  + Optimally you turn it into a non-ethical situation
  + Different types of ethics, and what isn’t ethics
    - Relativism is not ethics
  + Ethical issues are not problems. They cannot be solved in the same way equations can be i.e. there is no correct answer. Instead they are dilemmas that we can navigate through, where some paths are better than others.
* Kant – the deontological viewpoint
  + Answers the question, what should I do?
* Mills – the teleological viewpoint
  + Also answers the question, what should I do? But from a different perspective.
* Values – the virtue viewpoint
  + Answer a different question, what type of person should I be?
* Other

Lecture 1 – Theoretical underpinnings of ethics

**Key point 1: What is, and what is not, ethics?**

Ethics, specifically prescriptive ethics, is the philosophy of deciding right from wrong. It aims to answer the questions “What should I do?” and “What kind of person should I be?”. The key in answering these questions is considering the interests of others, rather than acting purely out of self-interest. This is not to be confused with descriptive ethics which investigates what people **think** is okay.

Ethics is also not moral relativism. Moral relativism argues that ethics are contextual to time and place. The problem with relativism is it either simply describes what happened (descriptive) or it accepts all different views as equally correct (normative), which isn’t ethical because it isn’t actually distinguishing right from wrong e.g. just because slavery was once tolerated, doesn’t mean it should have been - it was always morally wrong.

**Key point 2: Ethical arguments and their considerations**

Ethical issues are not problems. They cannot be solved in the same way equations can. Instead they are dilemmas that we can navigate through, where some paths are better than others.It should be noted, however, that if it is possible to turn an ethical situation into a non-ethical (not unethical) situation, then this should be done as this essentially means turning it into a no-loss situation (no one’s interests are violated). All valid ethical arguments must moralize an actual yes or no answer that relates back to a normative issue, which in turn relates back to a general principle. For example, “he should **not** have taken the money (moralizing), because it was **stealing, which is bad** (issue), and stealing **minimizes happiness** (general principle)”. On top of these requirements, they must not be political, prudential, artistic, preferential, or negotiable.

**Key point 3: Kant, the deontological perspective**

This perspective aims to answer the question, “what should I do?”. It argues that the only good acts are acts that are done out of a good will. It’s the difference between “were your intentions good?” and “was the act good and intentional?”.

* Kant
  + ~~Morals must not be about consequences. The only good thing is a thing that was done out of good will, it cannot be a mistake or unintentional. This doesn’t mean a good will is the only important thing, because the road to hell is paved with good intentions, but rather, the act must be good and intended to have happened. It’s the difference between: were your intentions good? Vs was the act good and intentional?~~
  + If you do something instinctually (because of inner values) then it wasn’t a moral decision, you were always going to do that. A moral decision must be intentionally willed to fruition. This is called **agent autonomy**.
  + **Duty** is the **central notion of morality** is his view. Everything can be related back to a principle or moral.
  + If you are allowed to break **promises**, then the whole notion of promises collapses, hence you cannot break a promise (in Kant’s view). This is known as **a perfect duty**, It must be held up, if you can break it in any case, you can break it in all cases. Other duties are imperfect, and there is some leeway.
  + Kant’s argument is that if you want to say it is okay in one case, it must be okay in the general case e.g. is it okay to not help someone in dire need? If not, then it must be okay to never help anyone in dire need.
  + Maxim or general principle is always involved. It is the **why** someone did something. If you keep asking why, it will eventually reveal one of these maxims. E.g. why did you run for the bus? Because I want to get to work? Why do you want to get to work? Because I need money? Why do you need money? Because I need to feed my family? Why? So they live? Why? So I’m happy. Happiness is the maxim.
  + First formulation: act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that is should become a universal law. i.e. only follow general principles that you want to be universally applied.
  + Second formulation: Act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only. This is a requirement to respect people and recognize they are a person. Other people should be the end (the reason for doing things), and not only a means (don’t just use people). It is okay for people to be part of the means though.

**Key point 4: Mills, the teleological perspective**

Ethics, specifically prescriptive ethics, is the philosophy of deciding right from wrong. It aims to answer the questions “What should I do?” and “What kind of person should I be?”. The key in answering these questions is considering the interests of others, rather than acting purely out of self-interest. This is not to be confused with descriptive ethics which investigates what people **think** is okay and is actually closer to anthropology and sociology.

Ethics is also not moral relativism. Moral relativism essentially argues that ethics are contextual to time and place. The problem with relativism is it either simply describes what happened (descriptive) or it accepts all different views as equally correct (normative), which isn’t ethical because it isn’t actually distinguishing right from wrong e.g. just because slavery was once tolerated, doesn’t mean it should have been, it was always morally wrong.

**Key point 5: Values, the virtuous perspective**

Honesty, integrity, fairness, compassion, and openness are universal core values.

Ethics, specifically prescriptive ethics, is the philosophy of deciding right from wrong. It aims to answer the questions “What should I do?” and “What kind of person should I be?”. The key in answering these questions is considering the interests of others, rather than acting purely out of self-interest. This is not to be confused with descriptive ethics which investigates what people **think** is okay and is actually closer to anthropology and sociology.

Ethics is also not moral relativism. Moral relativism essentially argues that ethics are contextual to time and place. The problem with relativism is it either simply describes what happened (descriptive) or it accepts all different views as equally correct (normative), which isn’t ethical because it isn’t actually distinguishing right from wrong e.g. just because slavery was once tolerated, doesn’t mean it should have been, it was always morally wrong.

There was also some talk of … but it was not as key to the lecture.

Lecture 2 – todo