

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Ethics *in a Hurry*

How to tell right from wrong

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 6

The Core Ideas 8

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 31

Use It 36

Terms 41

Go Deeper 44

Notes and Sources 46

Bibliography 53

The Whole Thing in One Page

Ethics is usually pictured as commandments delivered from above, preferences felt within, or ingenious puzzles involving runaway trolleys. None is large enough. Ethics begins when a person, group or institution must justify what it will do, whom it will burden and why it has the authority to decide.

There is no moral calculator. There are several kinds of reason, each indispensable and each dangerous when allowed to rule alone.

Start with the reaction. Compassion, anger, disgust, guilt and loyalty draw attention to possible wrongs before an argument has formed. They are alarms, not verdicts. Disgust has defended hygiene and persecution. Loyalty has protected families and criminal organisations. A feeling can be perceptive or inherited. It must answer to facts and give reasons to the person it would constrain.

Then draw the circle. Before asking how much good an act produces, ask whose good counts and who has been treated as a full claimant. Enslaved people, women, workers, disabled people, foreigners, animals and future people have all been excluded under rules announced as general. Inclusion did not arrive through one theory or a smooth march of progress. People resisted, testified, organised and forced boundaries into view. An immaculate calculation over a crooked boundary remains crooked.

Consequences matter because people live in what decisions cause. A principle that ignores hunger, injury and fear has mistaken cleanliness for goodness. Yet totals can consume individuals. Five lives do not create an ordinary licence to kill one unwilling patient for spare parts. Rights, duties and consent identify protected claims and the authority people retain over their bodies, promises and choices. Rules can also become cruel when their purpose is forgotten or every emergency is denied.

Character supplies what formulas cannot. The honest, courageous and practically wise person sees relevant detail, resists convenient descriptions

and acts steadily under pressure. Character can still preserve the virtues of a ruling class. Relationships correct the fantasy that moral agents are detached strangers. Parents, friends, carers and professionals have special responsibilities, but care can become favouritism, possession or labour imposed on the powerless.

Justice asks who receives the benefit, who carries the risk, who wrote the rule and who may appeal. Power changes the meaning of consent because agreement from someone unable to refuse is not the same fact as agreement from someone free to leave. Authority matters too. A good aim does not give a manager, doctor, parent, government or machine every power needed to pursue it.

Telling right from wrong therefore means making these claims face one another and ranking them. Name the act and real alternatives. Identify everyone affected. Check the evidence. Trace likely outcomes and their distribution. Test rights, duties, valid consent, character, relationship, justice and decision authority. Severe, non-consensual and irreversible burdens require unusually strong reasons. Under uncertainty, prefer options that can be monitored, challenged, corrected and stopped.

Then decide. State which reasons controlled, which threshold was crossed and what would change the verdict. A justified choice may still leave regret, apology, compensation or repair. Ethics does not make tragic situations clean. It keeps difficulty from becoming an alibi, procedure from becoming innocence and power from deciding without giving an account.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

Consider three hypothetical decisions. A hospital has one intensive-care bed and two patients who may need it. A manager has enough money to make one product safer or to keep twenty people employed. A government can release a policy quickly or wait for evidence while the harm it hopes to prevent continues. In each case, the numbers matter. So do promises, rights, relationships, blame, uncertainty, decision authority and the distribution of risk. The hard part is not caring. It is deciding what caring requires when its demands collide.

The same case can reverse when one hidden fact changes. Scarcity may be genuine or manufactured. Consent may be free or extracted. A benefit may reach everyone or depend on one group absorbing the danger. Ethical judgement begins by finding which description is true.

That collision is ordinary. Every contract permits one person to impose costs on another under stated conditions. Every queue says that earlier arrival, greater urgency, lottery, price or status will decide who waits. Every algorithm turns a judgement into a repeatable rule, including judgements its designers never named. Doing nothing is often a choice to preserve the existing distribution. Silence can protect confidentiality, conceal abuse or avoid embarrassment. The same outward act changes its moral character with purpose, decision authority, alternatives and who must bear it.

You already make these judgements, usually at speed. You decide how much truth a friend is owed, when loyalty becomes complicity, whether a promise survives changed circumstances, how far your responsibility reaches beyond people you know, and whether a benefit was earned or merely captured. Institutions make the same choices with larger consequences and better stationery. The language changes from right and wrong to policy, compliance, efficiency, risk appetite or standard practice. The moral permission remains.

Bad ethical thinking has two common forms. The first is moral certainty without inspection: I know this is wrong because it feels wrong, everyone

knows, it is natural, it is legal, my faith says so, or our policy allows it. The second is moral surrender dressed as sophistication: everything is subjective, every culture differs, nobody can judge, so preference or power must decide. The first turns inherited reactions into authority. The second hands authority to whoever can act without needing agreement.

A better approach will not remove disagreement. It will show what the disagreement is about. One side may be protecting welfare, another agency, another fairness, another loyalty, another a rule whose wider effects are easy to miss. Sometimes one argument defeats the others. Sometimes a protected claim sets a threshold that ordinary gains cannot cross. Sometimes catastrophe changes what a rule can demand, but only under a narrow authority that can be reviewed. Sometimes the honest conclusion is that every available option wrongs someone and the least wrongful choice creates a duty to compensate.

That is why the history matters. Aristotle asks what kind of person can live well. Confucius asks how roles and ritual train character. Kant asks what respect forbids us to do. Bentham asks whose pain has been ignored. Mill asks how liberty and welfare can coexist. Rawls asks which rules we would accept without knowing where we would land. Care ethicists ask who is feeding, cleaning, watching and depending while the independent men discuss universal principles. None finishes the subject. Together they expose its moving parts.

This book will not tell you how to vote on every controversy or settle every private conflict from a distance. It will give you a disciplined way to see the moral structure before you choose: the act, the affected circle, the outcomes, the claims and limits, the character, the relationship, the power, the decision-maker, the alternative and the residue. Once those are visible, disagreement becomes harder but less dishonest. You may still get the answer wrong. You will be less likely to hide the choice from yourself.

The Core Ideas

A Feeling Is an Alarm, Not a Verdict

Before ethics becomes an argument, it is often a bodily event. You see a child struck and anger arrives. You hear that a colleague lied and trust tightens. A stranger collapses and attention moves before calculation. Shame, guilt, disgust, compassion, gratitude and loyalty are part of moral perception. A person who felt none of them would miss much that matters.

The mistake is to treat the first reaction as the final court. Feelings carry information, but the information comes mixed with temperament, upbringing, status, fear and the moral habits of a group. Disgust has attached itself to spoiled food and to innocent people. Anger can detect insult or invent it. Guilt can follow harm done or a harmless refusal to obey. Empathy is vivid for the person in front of us and weak for the statistical stranger, which makes it a poor device for allocating a national health budget. The alarm tells you to look. It does not tell you what you will find.

Custom has the same structure. It stores hard-won experience, coordinates expectations and teaches children before they can reason. It also launders power through repetition. A practice may feel natural because dissent was punished, alternatives were hidden, or the people paying for it were denied a voice. Pointing out that a society approves an act tells you something important about that society. It does not finish the question of whether the act is right.

Authority cannot finish it either. Plato's *Euthyphro* asks whether an act is good because a god commands it, or commanded because it is good. If command creates goodness, cruelty could become right by decree. If command recognises goodness, judgement cannot be reduced to obedience. Religious traditions offer richer accounts through divine character, covenant, natural law and interpretation. The question still blocks the easy claim that "commanded" and "right" mean the same thing.

Reason enters because moral claims reach beyond taste. Saying "I dislike

mushrooms” does not accuse the mushroom eater. Saying “you ought not deceive her” asks the other person to recognise a reason, whether or not deception suits him. Moral language claims some authority over action. That is why reasons must be answerable to facts and to other standpoints. What happened? Who was affected? What did the agent know? What alternatives existed? Which rule would the judgement permit in comparable cases?

Facts alone do not announce the answer. Hume noticed writers moving from statements about what *is* to statements about what *ought* to be without explaining the new relation. Knowing that a policy raises income, reduces liberty or shifts risk does not tell you how those values rank. Yet values without facts are blind. A noble principle attached to a false causal belief can produce organised harm. Ethics requires both: accurate description and a defensible account of why a feature counts.

This does not settle whether moral truths exist independently of human attitudes. Realists, constructivists, expressivists and relativists disagree about what moral judgements are and what could make them true. The practical lesson is narrower. Neither intensity, popularity nor pedigree validates a moral response. Treat your first judgement as evidence with a possible conflict of interest. Ask what it noticed, what it omitted and what reason it can give to the person it would constrain.

Draw the Circle Before You Count

A moral theory can calculate perfectly and still fail before the arithmetic begins. The failure lies in the guest list.

Across many societies, including modern ones, rules announced as general have been applied through ranked statuses. Enslaved people were treated as property, women as dependants, foreigners as enemies, disabled people as burdens and animals as resources. Exclusion did not always appear as open cruelty. Those denied full standing could be refused reasons in their own name, so their pain became a cost of production, discipline, nature or someone else’s private affair.

Moral standing is the status of counting for one’s own sake. Once a being

has it, what happens to that being cannot be dismissed merely because someone else benefits. The difficult question is what grounds the status. Rational agency supports claims to autonomy, consent and responsibility, but infants and people with severe cognitive impairments do not cease to matter. Sentience explains why pain matters across species, but may not capture interests in memory, projects, relationships or self-rule. Membership in the human species is clear to administer and morally vulnerable if offered without an account of why the boundary carries weight. Relationships create special duties but can leave the unattached with no defender.

Jeremy Bentham gave the animal case one of its most influential tests by shifting the question from whether animals can reason or speak to whether they can suffer. The test does not settle every conflict between species. It changes the burden of proof. Once suffering is admitted as morally relevant, convenience is no longer a complete defence of causing it. Peter Singer later used related impartial reasoning to press duties to distant strangers: physical distance does not reduce a preventable harm, though it may alter what one can know and do.

Standing also reaches through time. Future people cannot consent, vote or complain, yet decisions about debt, climate, infrastructure, weapons and technology shape their options. Their identities and number may depend on what we choose. One policy can improve life for everyone who exists under it while another would have produced different people with better lives. Population ethics becomes difficult before the equations.

Inclusion creates a second danger: treating every claim as equal. Moral standing does not mean identical treatment. A competent adult's refusal can carry a kind of authority that a dog's preference cannot. A parent may rescue her child before a stranger without denying the stranger's value. A minor inconvenience to a million people does not automatically outweigh one person's torture merely because the inconveniences are numerous. What equal consideration demands is that like interests receive like weight unless a relevant difference is named. It is not a command to flatten every relationship and every kind of claim.

Who draws the boundary matters. Institutions tend to recognise those who can complain in their language, meet their deadlines, produce evidence and threaten consequences. The missing party may be a night worker, a child, a future resident, a subcontractor, an animal or a person who signed because refusal meant destitution. Their silence is not consent and their absence is not zero.

So begin every moral judgement by listing the bearers of cost and benefit before ranking the outcomes. Include indirect effects, people outside the room and those with weak power to refuse. Then ask what capacities, relationships and vulnerabilities make their claims different. The calculation comes later. A boundary hidden inside the calculation is where much respectable wrongdoing lives.

Outcomes Matter, and Counting Can Corrupt

Consequentialist approaches begin with an accusation against moral purity: what happens to people matters more than how clean the decision-maker feels. A rule followed into disaster has not earned praise merely by being a rule. Good intentions do not feed someone, reverse an injury or remove a danger. Ethics must look forward.

Utilitarianism gives this thought its sharpest form. In its classical versions, an action is right when its consequences produce the greatest balance of welfare across everyone affected, with each person's welfare counted impartially. Bentham treated pleasures and pains as the common currency. Mill defended a richer account of human happiness and tried to protect liberty as a central condition of it. Later consequentialists have counted preferences, capabilities, knowledge, freedom, equality or several goods rather than pleasure alone. The family is wider than its caricature.

Its demanding question is whose welfare has been left out. It asks the ruler to count the prisoner, the wealthy person to count the poor person, the citizen to count the foreigner and the present beneficiary to count the future victim. It directs attention towards scale, neglected harms and opportunity cost. Spending one million pounds on a visible rescue means not spending

it elsewhere. A safety measure that feels compassionate can consume resources that would prevent more deaths through a duller intervention. Refusing to compare does not prevent trade-offs. It leaves them to habit and publicity.

The difficulty begins when separate lives become entries in one total. Consider a constructed case in which a surgeon can kill one healthy, unwilling patient and use the organs to save five. The arithmetic favours killing, but the patient is being used as a store of parts and the surgeon has no authority over that life. Change the case to a runaway trolley that will kill five unless diverted onto a track where it will kill one. The numbers are unchanged. Agency, threat, intention, rights and the causal use of a person have changed. Whether they change the verdict is the dispute.

The trolley problem is useful because it refuses to stay solved. Philippa Foot introduced the contrast while examining abortion and double effect. Judith Jarvis Thomson altered the cases, then argued in 2008 against the familiar permission for an uninvolved bystander to turn the trolley. These are philosophical constructions, not evidence about railway emergencies or a census of human intuition. They reveal which distinctions a verdict is using when the outcome stays constant and the agency, intention or causal route changes.

Consequences also resist prediction. Acts produce chains, probabilities and feedback rather than labelled totals. A lie may prevent immediate harm and weaken trust if exposed. A punishment may deter, brutalise, incapacitate, stigmatise or do several at once. Expected consequences matter more to choice than outcomes visible only afterwards, but expected by whom, on which evidence and at what confidence? Optimism can disguise self-interest. Institutions are especially skilled at counting measurable benefits and calling the unmeasured remainder negligible.

Distribution matters alongside total. Benefit to someone secure may be less urgent than a smaller gain to someone in danger. A policy can raise average welfare while concentrating severe harm on a minority, or maximise preferences shaped by oppression. It can demand betrayal of a friend or

project whenever a marginally better total appears elsewhere. Making every resource available to impersonal gain risks erasing the person expected to live by the theory.

None of this permits ignoring outcomes. Rights need consequences because a system of rights that reliably destroys the people it protects defeats itself. Character needs consequences because recklessness is not courage. Care needs consequences because warmth without competence can harm. The right correction is to treat consequence as a compulsory question, not the only question: what will this do, how likely is it, to whom, compared with what, over what period, and how are gains and losses distributed?

Counting is morally serious. So is knowing what must not be turned into a number.

Some Things May Not Be Done to People

A promise refers backwards. You gave another person grounds to plan, and that history matters even if breaking the promise now creates a small gain. Consent refers to authority. A patient's body is not available merely because a doctor predicts a benefit. A right marks a protected claim that ordinary social advantage cannot erase. These ideas resist the view that only the final state of the world matters.

Deontological ethics is the broad family that makes duties, permissions and constraints fundamental. Its central insight is that morality governs how agents may pursue goals, not just which goals should exist. There is a difference between nobody dying and my killing an innocent person to produce that result. There is a difference between benefit received and benefit imposed without consent. The person facing the action has a claim on the manner in which she is treated.

Kant gave this approach its most influential structure. A moral principle must be fit for universal use, not a private exemption disguised as principle. A false promise made whenever repayment is inconvenient depends on the practice of promising while authorising conduct that would destroy it. Kant

also demands that humanity be treated as an end and never merely as a means. We use one another's abilities constantly. The wrong lies in arranging another person's agency into a plan she could not share or reject.

Universalisation is stronger than asking whether everyone would enjoy the result. The test concerns the rule of action and whether the practice it uses can survive general adoption. It also requires an honest description of the maxim. "Lie when useful" and "mislead a murderer to protect an intended victim" are different rules. Moral reasoning turns partly on which features are relevant, not on formal logic alone.

That is also where strict rules strain. In a short 1797 essay, Kant argued against a supposed right to lie even to a murderer asking whether his intended victim is inside. The position protects truthfulness from agents who always think their emergency is special. It also appears to hand moral advantage to the attacker. Later deontologists have allowed thresholds, conflicting duties, defeasible rules and distinctions among lying, silence and misdirection. The family contains absolutes, but it is not exhausted by them.

Rights face comparable conflicts. My liberty may expose you to risk. Your privacy may obstruct an investigation. A person's right not to be harmed can collide with several people's rights not to be harmed. Valid consent requires authority over the matter, capacity, adequate information, voluntariness and a practical opportunity to refuse. A signature obtained through deception or a threat is paperwork, not permission. Even valid consent may fail to justify serious harm to third parties. The language of rights identifies the protected claim. It does not remove the need to specify its scope, holder, correlative duty and conditions of defeat.

Intention and agency sharpen the picture. Double effect, developed from Aquinas's discussion of lethal self-defence, distinguishes harm intended as a means or end from harm foreseen as a side effect. It helps explain why bombing civilians to break morale differs from attacking a military target while foreseeing civilian risk. It can also be manipulated by renaming an intended means as collateral. The plan's causal structure and rejected alternatives matter more than a polite statement of intent.

Rules and rights protect the person standing in front of the social total. Their failure mode is moral rigidity and selective description. Apply them well by asking what claim another person holds against your action, whether your role gives you authority to decide, whether consent is valid, which maxim you are licensing and what would justify crossing the constraint. If the only answer is that enough other people benefit, the burden has barely begun.

Character Is a Capacity for Judgement

Rules tell you not to lie. Consequences tell you to reduce harm. Neither tells you, without further judgement, what honesty requires when a frightened patient asks a question you cannot answer with certainty, or when a friend demands a confidence that conceals danger. Ethical life arrives in particulars. Someone must see which features matter, control appetite, choose a proportionate response and act for the right reason. Virtue ethics starts with that someone.

Aristotle's central question is not which isolated acts are permitted but what it is to live well across a whole life. The virtues are stable excellences of character shaped by habit: courage, justice, temperance, generosity, truthfulness and others. Courage is not a midpoint produced by arithmetic. It is the disposition to fear the right things, for the right reasons, in the right way. Too much fear can be cowardice; too little can be rashness. The appropriate response depends on the person, danger, role and end.

That dependence requires *phronesis*, practical wisdom. It is the capacity to deliberate well about action, informed by experience and ordered desire. A clever villain can calculate means but lacks practical wisdom because the ends are corrupt. A well-meaning novice may value the right end and still misread the situation. Virtue joins perception, emotion, judgement and action. The person becomes able to notice what a rulebook user misses.

Confucian ethics also treats character as cultivated through practice, ritual, example and relationships. In the *Analects*, virtues are learned within roles rather than discovered by a detached chooser. Mencius uses alarm at seeing a child near a well as evidence of a beginning of compassion that

must be cultivated. The beginning matters; so does the cultivation. A sprout is not a forest.

The role-based view exposes a gap in universal rules. A good child, parent, friend, judge and doctor may owe different things because the relationships create different responsibilities. Confucius's story of a son concealing his father's theft of a sheep makes the conflict visible: public honesty and family loyalty can both claim the language of uprightness. Modern readers may reject his answer. The case survives because the collision is real.

Moral education cannot be reduced to instruction. People become trustworthy by telling difficult truths, not by memorising that truth matters. Institutions train character through incentives, examples and repetition. A sales target can teach employees to stop seeing customers; a profession can teach restraint through reasons, peer challenge and confession of error. Culture is ethics stored in habits.

The weaknesses are equally real. Lists of virtues can reflect the status order that produced them. Loyalty in a corrupt institution protects corruption. Courage in an unjust cause remains dangerous. Admiring the wise person threatens circularity: the right act is what the virtuous person would do, and the virtuous person is the one who does right acts. Practical wisdom can become a flattering name for intuition when no one explains how judgement is corrected.

Character is also less stable than moral stories imply. Behaviour changes with pressure, fatigue, incentives, audience and opportunity. A person may be generous at home and ruthless at work because each setting cues a different role. That does not prove character is unreal. It means character is partly scaffolded by situations and institutions. Designing the environment is therefore part of cultivating virtue.

Use virtue as a diagnostic question: what would this action train me and others to become? Then make it concrete. Which capacity is required here: honesty, courage, patience, justice, humility, loyalty, mercy or restraint? Which neighbouring vice can imitate it? Brashness dresses as courage.

Submission dresses as loyalty. Indifference dresses as objectivity. The mature virtue is the capacity to tell the difference under pressure.

Relationships and Power Change What Is Owed

Much moral philosophy begins with adults who are independent, informed and free to choose. Much moral life begins with a person who cannot feed, clean, protect, transport, teach or speak for herself. Babies, patients, disabled people, older people and anyone temporarily injured make dependency visible. The rest of us conceal it through wages, families, institutions and luck.

Care ethics grew from the objection that moral theories treated this work as background. Carol Gilligan challenged Lawrence Kohlberg's evidence and developmental ranking, which often treated care-oriented reasoning as deficient. Her work was flattened into a fixed contrast between women and men, but Gilligan later described care as a human voice. The larger field examines relationship, dependency, care labour, material conditions and power rather than leaving them as private residue after the principles have spoken.

Care is not kindness added to a completed decision. It changes what can be seen. A hospital protocol may distribute treatment impartially while ignoring that one patient cannot follow it without transport or unpaid help. An employer may offer the same hours to everyone while imposing unequal burdens on workers who care for children or relatives. A contract may record consent while economic dependence makes refusal fictional. Abstract equality can preserve practical inequality.

Relationships also create valid partiality. You should not treat your child as one anonymous unit of welfare among billions. Friendship includes attention that cannot be auctioned to the greatest global gain each evening. Promises, shared history and trust create reasons that strangers do not possess. An ethics unable to explain these reasons is too thin for human life.

Partiality has limits. A parent cannot buy an examination result. A manager

cannot promote an unqualified friend. A government cannot reserve justice for citizens and call every outsider irrelevant. Care can become control when the carer defines another person's good and silences refusal. It can become exploitation when women, relatives or low-paid workers are expected to absorb unlimited need because caring is described as love rather than labour. The language of relationship must be tested against agency and power.

Justice brings the structure into view. It asks how institutions distribute rights, opportunities, income, risk and status. Rawls's original position imagines people choosing principles for society without knowing their place within it. The veil of ignorance does not erase identity. It stops the rule-maker tailoring principles to the position he expects to occupy, turning fairness into a reversal test at institutional scale.

But a clean starting choice can still miss history. A rule applied equally after land, wealth, education and voice have been distributed unequally may preserve the result. Feminist, critical race, disability and postcolonial thinkers have pressed ethics to examine whose experience supplied the supposedly neutral person, which injuries count as private, and which background conditions are treated as nature. Power shapes choices before anyone signs a form.

This matters in close relationships too. Consent between equals differs from acquiescence under threat of poverty, exclusion, violence or abandonment. A person may choose the best option available and still face an unjust set of options. Respecting the choice does not require blessing the conditions. Nor does identifying power cancel agency. People act within constraints; the ethical task is to see both.

So ask two sets of questions together. What does this particular relationship require, given need, trust, history and responsibility? And what structure surrounds it, given authority, dependence, exit, voice and distribution? Care without justice can trap people in unequal roles. Justice without care can distribute formal rights to people who lack the support to use them. A defensible judgement must know whether it is meeting a need, preserving a

bond or asking the least powerful person to make the system work.

Give a Verdict Without Pretending It Is Pure

The attraction of a master rule is obvious. Consequences, rights, character, care and justice can point in different directions. One theory promises to rank them and end the argument, but must translate every rival concern into its own currency. Rights become useful consequences, friendship a welfare-producing practice, virtue reliable rule-following. That translation can clarify one case and distort another.

Pluralism accepts that moral reasons can be irreducibly different. W. D. Ross described several *prima facie* duties, including fidelity, reparation, gratitude, justice, beneficence and non-maleficence. They are duties with force that may be outweighed, rather than apparent duties that vanish. The view fits experience: an emergency can defeat a promise while leaving an explanation or repair due.

Pluralism does not mean making a list and choosing your favourite. Judgement begins with description and authority. What is being done, compared with which real alternatives? Who is entitled and competent to decide, for whom, under what role, and with what route of appeal? A worthy aim cannot supply a missing mandate. Legal authority is relevant but not sufficient; moral legitimacy can also require consent, fair procedure, expertise, accountability and limits on the power granted.

Then rank the reasons. Some function as constraints or thresholds. Ordinary convenience and modest gain rarely defeat bodily integrity, a valid refusal or protection against severe abuse. Severe, non-consensual and irreversible burdens demand unusually strong evidence and justification. Catastrophe can change what a rule permits, but an emergency exception should be narrow, proportionate, authorised, time-limited and reviewable. Consequences compare the remaining options and test whether a constraint defeats its own purpose. Special duties arise from promises, roles, relationships and risks the agent created. Justice asks whether the rule preserves an unfair starting point or concentrates sacrifice on those with

least power.

Convergence across several approaches can make a decision more robust, but this is not voting among theories. One decisive right can outweigh modest benefits. One disastrous consequence can expose a rule as self-defeating. A relationship can create a duty without cancelling a stranger's standing. The task is to state which reason controls, why it has that status and what would defeat it.

Reflective equilibrium supplies one discipline. Test considered judgements and broader principles against each other, facts, counterexamples and alternative theories. Revise a judgement when fear, self-interest or bad description distorts it. Revise a principle when it produces an indefensible result. Widen the process to include people and evidence excluded by the initial moral world. Coherence is useful only after the materials have been challenged.

Uncertainty remains at two levels. Facts may be unclear: whether treatment will work, a warning is credible or a policy will displace harm. Morality may be unclear: whether a right is absolute, how much partiality friendship permits or which account of welfare is correct. Prefer reversible and monitorable options when evidence is weak. Do not impose catastrophic harm merely because one contested theory offers permission against the others.

Choice also sits under luck and residue. Two equally reckless drivers may be judged differently because one happens to kill a pedestrian. The outcome matters, yet the difference depends on what neither controlled. Some justified decisions still damage a serious claim. Regret, apology, compensation, redesign or restraint can remain due without proving the verdict wrong.

A verdict therefore states the action, authority and alternative; names who bears each cost; gives the controlling reasons and threshold; records uncertainty and disconfirming evidence; and explains safeguards, review and repair. A committee, policy or algorithm can distribute work. It cannot

dissolve responsibility.

Core Idea 1 began with the absence of an oracle. That absence creates a task. Right and wrong are told apart by reasons tested against reality, rival standpoints, protected claims, consequences, relationships, power and the rule a decision licenses. Purity is unavailable. Responsibility is not.

How It Actually Works

Moral life before a separate discipline

Surviving sources place moral reasoning in ordinary roles: a Babylonian judge deciding a debt case, an Egyptian official expected to uphold *Maat*, an Israelite community hearing covenantal law and a South Asian householder reasoning about *dharma*. These are representative settings, not reconstructed individual scenes. Conduct was joined to law, ritual, religion, honour, kinship and political rank. People still argued about hard cases, interpreted inherited norms and accused rulers of injustice. They did not need a modern academic category in order to give reasons.

The surviving sources show offices and social positions more readily than private hesitation. Ordinary ethics lived in household bargaining, work, hospitality, punishment, mourning and care, much of which left no record. The absence of a treatise is not an absence of reflection. It may be the absence of a surviving genre or of a literate class interested in recording it.

The joining performed necessary work. A society cannot reopen every rule each morning. It needs expectations about violence, property, family, truth, debt, strangers and authority. Stories and practices train attention before a child can defend a principle. Offices assign responsibility before an emergency begins. Ritual makes some obligations visible through repetition.

The same inheritance can protect and imprison. A code can restrain a ruler and place his rank beyond question. A role can require care and demand obedience from the person doing it. A customary settlement can embody experience while silencing those denied the status to speak. The first

recurring problem of ethics is therefore older than ethical theory: when does an inherited order deserve loyalty, and when is loyalty the mechanism of the wrong?

Several centres of argument

Across the first millennium BCE, surviving texts from several intellectual centres made moral disagreement unusually explicit. They did not ask one question in different accents, and they did not form a relay race towards modern Europe. Each worked within its own institutions, concepts and inherited problems.

In Athens, Socrates made confidence answer questions in public. Plato's *Euthyphro* places a man reputed to understand piety on his way to prosecute his father, then tests definitions until the confidence collapses. Plato linked justice to order in the person and city. Aristotle began from the goods people pursue and asked what makes a life choiceworthy as a whole. His answer, *eudaimonia*, involved living and acting well through virtue, practical wisdom, friendship and enough external goods to exercise human capacities. Later Epicureans, Stoics and Sceptics turned ethics into disciplines of desire, judgement and daily practice.

South Asian traditions developed different structures. The *Mahabharata* places duty inside a war where kinship, justice, role and consequence pull apart. In the *Bhagavad Gita*, Arjuna's refusal to fight is answered through disciplined action, knowledge, devotion and competing accounts of duty. The text has supported sharply different readings because its battlefield never becomes morally tidy. Buddhist traditions organise conduct around suffering, intention, craving, compassion and liberation. Jain traditions press non-violence into demanding disciplines of action and attention. Neither can be reduced to a western rule, virtue or outcome theory without losing its account of the person and the goal of practice.

In late Zhou China, the breakdown of political order produced rival programmes rather than one "Chinese ethic". Confucius placed cultivated character, ritual, family roles and exemplary government near the centre.

Mencius described beginnings of compassion, shame, respect and judgement that require cultivation. Xunzi gave education and ritual more work to do, regarding untrained desire as a poor guide. Mozi attacked costly ritual and partial concern, defending *jian ai*, translated variously as inclusive care or impartial concern, alongside tests of social benefit. Legalist thinkers trusted offices, incentives and punishment more than cultivated goodness.

A different archive complicates any list of centres. In many African traditions, moral thought was carried through proverbs, oral teaching and customary institutions rather than an ancient canon arranged around named authors; modern philosophical reconstruction adds another layer. No continental formula follows from that history. Modern Akan debates offer one bounded example. Kwasi Wiredu and Kwame Gyekye disagree over how far full personhood is achieved through moral participation in community or possessed through common humanity. Both connect character and responsibility to social relations, but their disagreement blocks a lazy equation of African ethics with one communitarian doctrine.

These traditions supply no single birth certificate for ethics. They reveal several enduring questions: whether right action fits a role or criticises it, whether desire should be satisfied or trained, how far care should extend, what makes authority legitimate, and whether good judgement belongs mainly to persons, practices or institutions.

Revelation, law and interpretation

Jewish, Christian and Islamic traditions joined moral obligation to revelation while producing extensive arguments about reason, character, intention, law and human welfare. Command never removed interpretation. A text had to be read, cases compared, authorities ranked and apparent conflicts reconciled. Disagreement occurred within each tradition as well as between them.

Maimonides brought Jewish law and Aristotelian philosophy into sustained conversation without making either disappear into the other. Christian thinkers developed accounts of conscience, virtue, natural law, grace and

the ends of human life. Aquinas's synthesis treated practical reason and virtue as genuine sources of moral understanding within a theological order. His discussion of lethal self-defence distinguished saving one's life from intending an attacker's death; later thinkers developed the more formal doctrine of double effect from this passage.

Islamic ethics cannot be reduced to legal rules. Philosophers such as Miskawayh developed accounts of virtue from Greek and Islamic materials. Al-Ghazali joined law, character and spiritual discipline. Jurists and theologians disputed the relations among revelation, reason, intention, welfare and divine justice. Across these traditions, inherited authority gave content and motivation that abstract theory can lack. It also generated a permanent question about who may interpret the source, by which methods and with what answer to a cruel reading.

Practical judgement often appeared through commentary, legal reasoning, counsel, confession and comparison of cases rather than one abstract system. The form matters. A shared command can acquire different implications when intention, necessity, capacity, precedent and social role are specified, and the authority of an interpreter can become part of the moral dispute.

The modern theories divide the field

Several influential early modern European theories arose amid religious conflict, stronger central states, commercial society, colonial expansion and new accounts of nature. Their imagined moral agent became more individual and their search for common standards less able to assume one church or inherited rank.

This was not the world moving from tradition to reason. It was one regional reorganisation, later amplified by European empire and universities. Older concepts survived inside the new arguments: natural law within rights, religious equality within abolition and virtue within accounts of citizenship. The clean textbook break helps compare theories and distorts the larger history if mistaken for a civilisational staircase.

Hobbes began from vulnerable people whose roughly equal ability to threaten one another makes common authority necessary. Obligation became tied to peace, agreement and political order. Hume attacked another target. Reason discovers relations and facts, but motives and sentiments move action. Moral approval grows from human responses, including sympathy corrected towards a more general standpoint. His warning about moving from *is* to *ought* exposed a missing bridge in many arguments. It did not make facts irrelevant; Hume's own ethics depends on claims about needs, motives and social usefulness.

Kant resisted morality founded on variable desire or predicted happiness. For Kant, a moral principle had to survive universal adoption, and rational persons had to be treated as ends rather than arranged into plans they could not share. Autonomy meant giving law to oneself as a rational agent, not doing whatever one preferred. The account defended dignity and freedom with unusual severity, then exposed its own strain in Kant's refusal to recognise a right to lie even to a would-be murderer.

Bentham made the opposing accusation. Appeals to natural rights, rank and purity can conceal avoidable suffering. Each person's pleasure and pain count without extra weight for social position. Utilitarianism promised public comparison, legal reform and attention to neglected harms. Mill complicated the inheritance by defending liberty, individuality and higher forms of human development. By the nineteenth century, duty and consequence had become rival architectures, each revealing what the other could excuse and each containing more internal variation than the classroom opposition suggests.

Universal claims meet excluded people

The new theories spoke of persons, rational beings and everyone. Their societies distributed standing by sex, property, race, empire and legal status. This gap did not repair itself through logic. Excluded people used universal principles as one weapon among testimony, resistance, organisation, religious argument, war, economic change and state action.

Mary Wollstonecraft turned Enlightenment claims about reason against the education and dependence imposed on women. If rational agency grounds dignity, a society cannot train women for charm and obedience and then cite the resulting inequality as natural proof. Abolitionists used several moral languages at once. Natural-rights arguments denied that one person could own another. Religious arguments appealed to shared creation and judgement. Utilitarians counted suffering across a boundary treated as property. Formerly enslaved writers such as Frederick Douglass changed the evidence by describing hunger, violence, family separation and stolen time from inside the institution.

The relevant change was contested membership, not a circle gliding outwards. Slaveholders, imperial officials and opponents of women's equality also used moral language. Institutions conceded, delayed, narrowed and reversed reforms. Resistance by the people carrying the burden was causal, not an illustration added to ideas generated elsewhere.

The argument from inconsistency was powerful but incomplete. A society could narrow the universal, deny an excluded group the relevant capacity or declare domination necessary for order. Change required altered evidence, organised pressure and authorities capable of rewriting institutions, not only a premise applied more carefully. Moral progress was fought over, partial and reversible.

The boundary also came under pressure beyond humanity. Bentham asked why reasoning or speech should decide whether animal suffering matters. Darwin's account challenged a picture of humans as a separate creation, though evolution itself supplies no moral verdict. Later animal welfare and animal-rights arguments divided over suffering, life, agency and species membership. Anti-colonial thinkers exposed a related hypocrisy in claims of civilisation: domination was described as tutelage, extraction as development and resistance as disorder. A principle proves universal through whom it can recognise as a judge, not through the breadth of its nouns.

Suspicion, language and organised harm

Nietzsche changed the target by asking what histories, needs and power relations had made particular values appear self-evident. Genealogy treated moral concepts as products with a past. It did not show that every moral claim reduces to domination or that criticism is exempt from criticism. It made origin, function and character part of the examination.

G. E. Moore pressed a different question: what do moral words such as *good* mean, and can goodness be identified with pleasure, desire or any other natural property? His open-question argument helped establish metaethics as a distinct project. Ayer, Stevenson and Hare then analysed moral language through expression, persuasion, prescription and consistency rather than treating every moral sentence as an ordinary report of fact. Their theories differed, but each clarified why moral disagreement motivates action and resists simple empirical verification.

The analysis also exposed a limit. Understanding what moral language does cannot by itself explain why protest deserves authority over prejudice, or how professional routines, loyalty and bureaucratic obedience can organise harm. Fascism, total war and genocide were not counterexamples to careful conceptual work. They made institutions, victims, responsibility and the uses of moral vocabulary impossible to treat as peripheral.

The 1947 Doctors' Trial judgement set out the Nuremberg Code as standards for permissible medical experiments. Voluntary consent came first, joined by scientific necessity, proportional risk, qualified investigators and rights to end participation. The code became an influential prototype rather than a complete worldwide enforcement system. Its force lay partly in making decision authority visible. The code denied professional confidence alone as a sufficient public justification for exposing subjects.

The code addressed a specific record of coerced and murderous experimentation, but its questions travelled: who can authorise exposure, what counts as informed and voluntary agreement, and which risks no professional purpose can licence? Later regulation answered those

questions differently across jurisdictions. The need for them did not disappear.

In mid-century Anglophone philosophy, attention also returned to character and action. Anscombe's 1958 essay criticised thin modern obligation language and called for a better philosophy of psychology. Philippa Foot, Iris Murdoch and later virtue ethicists developed different responses. Foot's runaway trolley began within an argument about abortion, intention and doing harm. The case travelled because an artificial situation can isolate a distinction, though it cannot supply the texture or authority structure of the institutions where real decisions occur.

Institutions, care and applied ethics

Rawls moved the focus from isolated acts to the basic structure of society. His original position asks people to choose principles without knowing their eventual class, talents or social position. The veil of ignorance does not eliminate self-interest; it deprives self-interest of an address. Critics then asked which assumptions entered before the veil descended, including independence, ability, family structure, historical ownership and the borders of the society being designed.

Feminist ethics deepened that criticism. Simone de Beauvoir showed how a supposedly universal human subject could carry a male biography. Gilligan challenged Kohlberg's evidence and a developmental ranking that treated care-oriented reasoning as deficient. She later described care as a human rather than female voice. Held, Tronto and others made dependency, care labour and power public subjects. Black feminist, critical race, disability and postcolonial thinkers showed how equal rules can misdescribe institutions formed through domination and how material conditions shape the ability to choose, refuse and use formal rights.

Bioethics translated several of these concerns into professional practice. The Belmont Report of 1979 organised United States human-subject research ethics around respect for persons, beneficence and justice. Beauchamp and Childress's influential four-principle approach uses

autonomy, non-maleficence, beneficence and justice. Neither is a universal algorithm. Their importance is procedural as well as conceptual: identify who decides, obtain valid consent, compare benefit and harm, justify selection, record reasons and provide oversight.

The institutional turn also revealed that authority has a moral shape. Expertise may justify control over a technical method without granting ownership of another person's values. Democratic mandate may authorise a policy without making every burden fair. A role can create duties and powers, but the role itself remains answerable to competence, scope, appeal and abuse.

Applied ethics multiplied as institutions and technologies multiplied decisions. Dialysis and transplantation required allocation rules and definitions of death. Nuclear weapons stretched intention, deterrence and risk across populations. Industrial farming separated consumers from animal suffering. Climate change joined distant strangers, future people and uncertain causal chains. Digital systems now classify, recommend, exclude and expose at a scale where one design choice becomes a repeated moral policy.

Singer's drowning-child argument asks why physical distance should excuse failing to prevent serious suffering at modest cost. Williams objected that an impersonal theory can estrange agents from commitments central to their lives. Nagel and Williams showed how luck enters judgement despite the appeal of assessing only what people control. Scanlon recast wrongness around principles that affected individuals could reasonably reject rather than one social total. These arguments do not converge. They sharpen the reasons a verdict must rank.

The present argument

Psychology and neuroscience now study moral judgement through experiments and observation. Researchers examine framing, intention, emotion, identity, causal structure and cultural variation. The findings can expose instability, bias and the limits of character claims. They cannot establish that a response is wrong because one neural process produced it, or right because it is common in one sample.

Ethics therefore has no uncontested final theory and no empty field. It has inherited commands, practices, virtues, consequences, rights, contracts, relationships and critiques of power. Its operating problem is to make these insights answer the same decision while keeping their differences visible, then to state who may act, which reason controls and what remains due after the choice.

No neutral synthesis waits above the disagreement. The choice of which facts to investigate, which burdens require a threshold and which person may decide is already ethical. The aim is therefore disciplined judgement that can be inspected, challenged and revised, rather than a formula protected from the people who must live under it.

How we know

This history is reconstructed from an unequal archive. Some traditions preserved named authors and dated texts. Others worked through oral teaching, customary practice, anonymous compilation or commentaries formed across centuries. Climate, conquest, patronage, script, translation and later curricula determined what survived. The resulting route underrepresents African, Indigenous, Pacific and many local traditions, and gives textual elites more space than ordinary moral life.

Translation adds another filter. *Dharma*, *eudaimonia*, *ren*, *li*, *jian ai*, natural law and covenant do not divide experience at the same joints as modern English terms such as duty, virtue and consequence. Comparison is necessary for a one-hour book, but equivalence is not assumed. Similar ideas are not treated as proof of contact or influence.

Later labels create a third risk. Aristotle did not call himself a virtue ethicist, Aquinas did not publish the modern formula of double effect, and Bentham did not speak for every consequentialist. Empirical moral psychology adds experiments and surveys whose results vary with sample, wording, language and design. Such work can describe judgement and test psychological assumptions. It cannot by itself decide what anyone ought to do. Every account here should therefore be read as a bounded map, not the neutral view from nowhere.

What People Get Wrong

“Ethics is just personal opinion”

Taste and morality behave differently. You may prefer tea to coffee without asking anyone else to change breakfast. A moral judgement claims that an act may be required, permitted or forbidden for reasons that bear on other people too. The claim can be mistaken, biased or impossible to prove with mathematical certainty. It still reaches beyond preference.

Calling ethics subjective often bundles several ideas together. People disagree. Judgements are shaped by culture and emotion. Moral facts cannot be weighed in a laboratory. None entails that every answer is equally defensible. People disagree about economics, diagnosis and history without turning them into taste. Cultural formation can explain a belief without vindicating it. Measurement is one route to knowledge, not the definition of all knowledge.

The corrective is neither easy realism nor surrender. Ask whether the judgement fits the facts, applies consistently, survives reversal of roles, includes those affected, and can answer serious objections without changing the description. A preference needs no such defence. A moral claim does. Power benefits when the difference is blurred, because “everyone has their view” often means that the person able to act gets the final one.

“If it is legal, it is moral”

Law tells you what an authorised institution will permit, require or punish within a jurisdiction. Ethics asks what anyone is justified in doing. The two need one another and cannot be identified.

Good law gives moral reasons a stable public form. It protects expectations, coordinates strangers, restrains private revenge and supplies procedures for disputes. Yet laws have authorised slavery, marital domination, racial exclusion, forced sterilisation and persecution. A rule can be valid law because officials made and enforce it while remaining a grave wrong. The existence of legal reform depends on that distinction.

The reverse mistake is assuming every moral fault should become illegal. Law uses coercion and must be administrable. It may tolerate ingratitude, betrayal, cruelty in friendship and reckless selfishness because policing them would create worse intrusion or arbitrary power. Some acts are wrong yet should remain beyond criminal punishment. Some regulations are justified because they coordinate conduct even when no matching private vice exists.

So “legally approved” is one fact in the case. Ask what the law protects, who shaped it, how it distributes power, whether compliance defeats its purpose, and whether conscientious breach is justified. Breaking a bad law still has consequences for others. Obedience is not innocence, and disobedience is not automatically virtue.

“Good intentions make an action good”

Intention matters because an accident, a negligent risk and a planned injury are different acts. It helps reveal what the agent was trying to do, which reasons guided the choice and whether another person was treated as a means. Motive also matters to character. Rescue for praise can still save a life, but it reveals something different from rescue because another person is in danger.

Good intention is not a warranty. A parent can harm a child through

possessive protection. A charity can waste resources while congratulating itself on compassion. A manager can impose an untested policy “for everyone’s benefit” after excluding the people who understand its costs. Moral vanity often appears as certainty that benevolent purpose makes criticism ungrateful.

Outcomes do not replace intention either. A careful driver can cause an unforeseeable death; a reckless driver can arrive safely through luck. Judging only the result confuses fortune with fault. The proper assessment separates what was intended, what was foreseen, what should have been known, which precautions were available, what happened, and what repair is now owed.

A decent motive may reduce blame or explain a mistake. It cannot convert avoidable ignorance, coercion or repeated failure into goodness. Care must become competent enough to survive contact with the person being cared for.

“The greatest good settles every case”

Consequences are compulsory evidence. The slogan becomes dangerous when it hides every choice made before the total appears: what counts as good, whose welfare enters, how uncertainty is handled, whether benefits can compensate for severe losses, and who may be sacrificed without consent.

Aggregation makes scale visible. It can expose wasteful prestige projects, neglected prevention and harms dispersed across people who receive little attention. Refusing to count often protects familiar beneficiaries. Yet one total can also erase the separateness of persons. Five people receiving a benefit does not by itself grant ownership of a sixth person’s body. A majority’s satisfaction cannot make persecution acceptable by being numerous.

Defenders of consequentialism have sophisticated replies. Rules, rights and reliable institutions may produce better outcomes over time. Welfare can include freedom, knowledge and relationships. Distribution and priority can

be built into the account. Those replies show that the theory is a family, not a crude pleasure sum. They also show how much moral structure must be specified before “greatest good” decides anything.

Use the question for what it does best: compare alternatives, include opportunity cost, examine probability, trace second-order effects and reveal concentrated losses. Then ask which claims should constrain the comparison. Arithmetic disciplines compassion. It does not acquire moral authority merely by being arithmetic.

“A moral rule should never bend”

Rules protect people from convenient exceptions. The liar sees one useful deception. The torturer sees one urgent emergency. The corrupt official sees one deserving friend. A firm rule prevents the agent from becoming judge in a case where appetite has already hired the lawyer.

That is why exceptions need a high burden. It is also why absolute rules can fail. Truthfulness normally protects agency and trust. Telling an attacker where a victim is hiding recruits truth into violence. Promise-keeping lets others plan. Keeping a promise after learning that it enables abuse may preserve the form while betraying the reason that gave the promise force.

The alternative is not casual flexibility. Specify the rule’s purpose, the competing duty, the threshold crossed and the narrowest exception. Ask whether the exception could be announced publicly without destroying the practice. Record who decides, what evidence is needed and how misuse will be reviewed. An emergency permission with no stopping condition becomes ordinary power.

Some ethicists defend absolute constraints; others allow thresholds or conflicts among duties. The disagreement is serious because both fear a real failure: rigidity that assists harm and discretion that excuses it. “Never” deserves suspicion when it blinds. “This case is special” deserves more.

“Disagreement proves there is no truth”

Moral disagreement is evidence, but its target must be named. It may show that a question is difficult, that facts are disputed, that values conflict, that language conceals different acts, or that one party benefits from the conclusion. It does not by itself show that no answer is better.

Relativism also comes in several forms. Descriptive relativism says societies differ. Metaethical relativism makes moral truth relative to a framework. Normative toleration says outsiders should often refrain from interference. These claims do not entail one another. A society can disagree internally. A local norm can be cruel to some members. Toleration itself needs limits and reasons. Treating every culture as one voice often hands authority to its most powerful interpreters.

The opposite error is using “objective” as a substitute for argument. Confidence, scripture, nature and universality language can all conceal a local hierarchy. A defensible judgement must still state its reasons and accept examination from those it governs.

Disagreement should slow arrogance and widen inquiry. Compare the factual beliefs, the people counted, the goods protected, the powers involved and the cost each position assigns. Sometimes the conflict narrows. Sometimes rival values remain. Uncertainty can justify caution. It does not require moral paralysis.

“The right choice leaves no regret”

Some choices are hard because information is poor. Others are hard because every available option damages something that matters. Treating all distress as evidence of error misunderstands moral conflict.

A doctor may allocate the final bed by a defensible rule and still grieve for the patient denied it. A friend may reveal a confidence to prevent serious harm and still owe an explanation for the betrayal. A public body may close an unsafe service while recognising the people who lose access. The act can be justified without making the loss unreal.

This residue matters. Regret can acknowledge the claim that was outweighed. Apology can be owed without confessing that the decision was wrong. Compensation can recognise that a fair policy imposed a concentrated burden. Review can stop an emergency measure becoming routine. Mourning can be the proper response to a choice nobody should celebrate.

Clean-conscience stories are attractive because they convert a tragic decision into proof of the chooser's virtue. They can also erase the person who paid. The aim of ethics is a defensible verdict, not emotional sterilisation. After choosing, ask what remains due: repair, explanation, gratitude, restraint, redesign or memory. Sometimes the discomfort is the evidence that the whole case stayed visible.

Use It

Ethical judgement improves when the case is made harder to hide. The following lenses do not replace knowledge, law or affected people. They expose the moral structure so that a decision can be argued, challenged and repaired.

Name the act without euphemism

Begin with a plain description of what someone will do. Institutions prefer nouns that remove the agent: restructuring, optimisation, collateral damage, data sharing, service withdrawal, non-compliance. Ask for the verb, object and authority. Who will close what, disclose whose information, expose whom to which risk, or withhold which benefit?

Then write the strongest rival description. "We are improving efficiency" may also be "we are transferring unpaid work to customers". "We are protecting standards" may be "we are excluding applicants who lacked access to our preferred signal". The hostile version may be unfair; the official one may be anaesthetic. Comparing them reveals which facts each selects.

Do the same with inaction. "We decided not to intervene" can mean that an

existing harm continues under an inherited permission. Restraint may still be right, especially where authority is weak or intervention risks worse damage. It must be described as a choice among consequences rather than absence from the case.

Draw the moral map

List everyone materially affected before ranking claims. Include the decision-maker, direct recipient, people carrying indirect costs, workers implementing the choice, those unable to complain, and people outside the current time horizon. Mark who has information, who has voice, who can refuse and who can leave.

Now distinguish interests. One person faces inconvenience, another humiliation, another physical danger, another loss of livelihood. Equal moral standing does not make unlike stakes identical. Nor should a large number of small preferences silently overwhelm one severe and irreversible harm. Name the kind, size, duration, probability and distribution of each effect.

Finally, inspect the boundary. Why is this person, animal, community or future interest inside or outside? Administrative convenience is sometimes necessary, but it is not a moral reason by itself. The party absent from the spreadsheet may be the person whose labour, exposure or silence makes the preferred option look cheap.

Separate harm, wrong and unfairness

These categories overlap and should not be collapsed. Surgery harms tissue with consent for a therapeutic purpose. A betrayal can wrong someone without causing a measurable loss. A fair lottery can impose a terrible outcome on the loser without anyone selecting that person for sacrifice. A profitable policy can improve every measured average while allocating its risks unfairly.

Ask three questions. What bad states may result? Which claims does the action violate, including consent, promise, privacy, ownership or bodily authority? How are benefits, burdens, opportunities and decision power

distributed? A case may pass one test and fail another.

The separation prevents two evasions. “No one was harmed” cannot excuse deception when the person was denied control over a decision that belonged to her. “The process was fair” cannot end concern when the process repeatedly leaves one group carrying avoidable injury. The remedy may differ too: prevent harm, apologise for a wrong, compensate a burden, or redesign an unfair rule.

Reverse positions and test the rule

State the principle that permits the act without using names or flattering details. Then move yourself through the positions. Would you accept the rule as the person burdened by it, as a stranger deciding before knowing where he would land, or as the official required to apply it to an unpopular case?

Reversal catches private exemptions. It does not prove that everyone should receive the same treatment. A patient and doctor have different roles; a child and parent possess different powers and needs. The test asks whether those differences are relevant and whether the rule can be explained to the person placed below them.

Next test repetition. A one-off mercy may become favouritism when generalised. A narrow security exception may create an institution that lives by exceptions. Ask what practice your decision depends on and what happens when others use the same permission for their own urgent cases. If the principle survives only while you control it, it is probably a preference wearing a uniform.

Stress-test certainty and scale

Separate uncertainty about facts from uncertainty about values. For facts, write the best estimate, the range, the source and what new evidence would change the choice. Distinguish what is known before the act from what became visible afterwards. A bad outcome does not prove the original decision reckless; a lucky outcome does not make it sound.

For moral uncertainty, identify which credible theories support or oppose the act. An option favoured by one narrow calculation but condemned by welfare, rights, fairness and care deserves a stronger burden than an option on which several approaches converge. This is not voting among theories. It is protection against betting another person's life on your least secure premise.

Classify the reasons by force rather than placing them in one pile. Ordinary benefits and convenience are compared directly. Protected claims such as bodily authority, valid refusal and freedom from severe abuse set thresholds that ordinary gains do not cross. Emergency reasons may defeat a threshold, but should require stronger evidence, proper authority, narrow scope and review. The classification is contestable; leaving it implicit is worse.

Then change scale and time. A compassionate exception for one employee may be impossible for ten thousand. A harmless data point can become intrusive when linked and retained. A benefit now may create dependency, precedent or risk later. Look for irreversibility, feedback and concentrated downside. Under uncertainty, prefer choices that can be monitored, corrected and stopped before the cost becomes permanent.

Decide, mitigate and leave a record

Endless reflection can become a way to avoid responsibility. Set a stopping rule proportionate to the stakes: which facts must be checked, who must be heard, what authority is required and when delay becomes its own harm. Compare real alternatives, including doing less, delaying, running a reversible trial or changing who decides.

State the verdict in full. "We chose A over B because these reasons controlled, despite these objections, under these factual assumptions." Name the decision-maker's authority, the people carrying serious burdens and the threshold that justified them. Do not hide behind consensus. A committee can improve judgement, but responsibility still belongs to identifiable people.

Then reduce the remainder. Obtain consent where possible. Narrow the intrusion. Share benefit. Compensate concentrated loss. Protect appeal and exit. Set a review date. Record evidence that would trigger reversal. Explain the decision in language the affected person can contest. Ethical quality often lies in these conditions after the headline choice.

The limits

No framework rescues a decision made from false facts, missing expertise or deliberate exclusion. Ethical fluency can make rationalisation more polished. A skilled person can describe self-interest as duty, count preferred outcomes, invoke rights selectively and announce tragic necessity after refusing better alternatives.

The lenses also demand time and voice that emergencies may not supply. Roles and law sometimes allocate authority before agreement is possible. In medicine, engineering, finance, war and public administration, sound judgement requires current technical standards, local knowledge and competent oversight. Philosophy cannot replace them.

Nor does a defensible process guarantee agreement or innocence. Values may remain in conflict. Powerful actors can comply procedurally while shaping the options offered. The person harmed may reject the explanation. That rejection is evidence to hear, not a magical veto or a nuisance to manage.

The one thing to keep

Keep the burden visible.

Every decision places it somewhere: pain, risk, restraint, work, uncertainty, lost opportunity, exposure, guilt or the duty to act. Bad ethics makes the burden disappear from the description. It calls coerced labour efficiency, inherited advantage merit, preventable suffering unfortunate, and a cost imposed on strangers no cost at all.

So ask one question before the answer hardens: **who is being asked to carry what, and why may I ask it of them?**

The question joins the whole book. Feeling tells you where to look but cannot answer for the person constrained. The moral circle identifies who counts. Consequences reveal what the burden may do. Rights and consent test whether it may be imposed. Character asks what kind of chooser can see it honestly. Care and justice expose dependency and power. Judgement compares the claims and decides without erasing what was lost.

A right choice may still leave someone carrying too much. Then the answer continues as mitigation, compensation, apology, review or reform. The permanent change is this: no benefit appears free merely because its cost has been moved outside the room. Right and wrong become easier to distinguish when the person paying remains in view.

Terms

Ethics. The reasoned study of how people should act, what kinds of lives and institutions are good, and which claims people and other beings hold against one another.

Morality. The norms, practices, judgements and expectations through which a person or group distinguishes permitted, required and forbidden conduct. The term often overlaps with ethics, though morality can also name lived social practice.

Metaethics. Inquiry into what moral judgements mean, whether they can be true, what could make them true, and how moral knowledge, disagreement or motivation is possible.

Normative ethics. Theories and arguments about the standards of right action, good character, valuable outcomes and just institutions. Consequentialism, deontology and virtue ethics are major families, though none has one uncontested form.

Applied ethics. The examination of particular fields and decisions, such as medicine, business, war, technology, animals or climate, using relevant facts, institutional context and normative reasoning together.

Decision authority. The role-bounded power to choose or authorise an act for other people. Expertise, office, consent, democratic mandate and emergency responsibility can support authority, but its competence, scope, accountability and routes of appeal still require justification.

Moral standing. The status that makes a being's interests matter in their own right. A being with moral standing cannot be treated as relevant only through its usefulness to someone else.

Consequentialism. The family of views that assesses choices by consequences or by outcome-related properties. Versions differ over what is valuable, whose value counts, which alternatives matter and whether acts or rules are assessed.

Utilitarianism. A consequentialist tradition that gives each person's welfare impartial weight and seeks the greatest overall balance. Classical versions centred pleasure and pain; later versions vary.

Deontology. The family of views that makes duties, permissions, rights or constraints fundamental. How an outcome is produced can matter independently of how good the outcome is.

Categorical imperative. Kant's name for the unconditional requirement of morality. Its formulations test whether a maxim can be universal law and whether persons are treated as ends.

Right. A protected claim, liberty, power or immunity held by someone. Rights normally imply duties in others, but their scope, strength, holder and possible conflicts require specification.

Duty. A moral requirement attached to an act, role, relationship or principle. Duties may be absolute, conditional or capable of being outweighed by stronger competing duties.

Consent. A person's valid authorisation of an act affecting matters over which that person has authority. Understanding, relevant information, decision-making capacity, freedom from coercion and a usable chance to decline all matter. Consent cannot confer powers the person does not

possess or erase serious harms to others.

Supererogation. Conduct that is morally admirable but beyond duty, such as an exceptional sacrifice that may be praised without condemning every person who declines to make it.

Virtue. An excellence of character, perception, emotion and action, such as courage, justice or honesty. A virtue is a trained disposition expressed across situations, not one isolated successful performance.

Practical wisdom. The capacity to recognise morally relevant features of a particular situation, deliberate well about them and choose a fitting action for defensible reasons.

Care ethics. Approaches that place relationship, dependency, emotion and the labour of meeting needs near the centre of moral thought, while examining how care can sustain life or conceal unequal power.

Contractualism. The view that wrongness is tied to principles people could not reasonably accept or reject under suitable conditions. It focuses on justifiability to individuals rather than one impersonal total, though reasonable rejection needs its own account.

Justice. Fair terms of social life, including rights, opportunity, status, distribution and procedure. Competing theories disagree about equality, priority, desert, sufficiency, procedure and historical repair.

Distributive justice. The part of justice concerned with how benefits and burdens are allocated. It asks what should be equal, what differences are relevant and who bears disadvantage.

Desert. The idea that a person merits a benefit, burden, praise or blame because of conduct, effort, contribution or character. Luck and unequal opportunity complicate every desert claim.

Double effect. A doctrine that distinguishes a harmful result chosen as part of the plan from one predicted but not chosen. Proportionality, alternatives, causal structure and honest intention remain necessary.

Doing and allowing. The proposed moral distinction between causing harm and failing to prevent it. Its force depends on agency, responsibility, available alternatives and the baseline used.

Moral luck. The problem that blame and judgement often depend on outcomes, circumstances or character shaped by factors beyond an agent's control, despite the appeal of a control principle.

Moral relativism. A family of views making moral truth or justification relative to a culture, framework or standpoint. It differs from observing disagreement, explaining cultural variation and recommending toleration.

Moral realism. The view that at least some moral claims are true independently of anyone's approval. Realists disagree about the nature of moral facts and how people know them.

Reflective equilibrium. A method of adjusting considered judgements, principles, background theories and facts until they support one another under criticism. Wider versions include more standpoints, background theories and relevant evidence.

Moral uncertainty. Uncertainty about which moral theory, principle or value is correct, distinct from uncertainty about facts. It can support caution, robust choices across theories and resistance to irreversible harm.

Moral remainder. What remains morally due after a justified choice defeats another serious claim: regret, apology, compensation, repair, restraint, review or recognition of an unavoidable loss.

Go Deeper

Four routes into the argument.

The clearest overview

James Rachels and Stuart Rachels, *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*, 10th edition (McGraw Hill, 2026). This is the best next step for a reader who wants the main arguments without entering a specialist debate unprepared. It moves through cultural relativism, religion, egoism, utilitarianism, Kant, social contract theory, care and virtue with short cases and clear objections. Its strength is orientation: you can see why each theory attracts intelligent defenders and where the pressure falls. The warning is that its map remains centred on the standard Anglophone introductory curriculum. Use it as a disciplined beginning, not a census of the world's moral thought.

The primary text on character

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, translated by Terence Irwin, 3rd edition (Hackett, 2019). Read this for the question modern dilemmas often push aside: what kind of person can judge and live well over a complete life? Aristotle connects habit, emotion, friendship, pleasure, justice and practical wisdom rather than supplying one decision rule. Irwin's translation is precise and supported by notes, glossary and interpretative material. The book is demanding because Aristotle assumes a social world built around free male citizens and accepts exclusions the reader should not excuse. Its architecture survives that criticism; its membership does not.

What one person may demand of another

T. M. Scanlon, *What We Owe to Each Other* (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998). Scanlon asks whether an act is allowed under principles that affected individuals could reasonably reject. The shift from a social total to justifiability between persons gives rights, distribution and the separateness of lives a clear structure. It is the most difficult recommendation here, with sustained argument and carefully engineered examples. Read the opening account of reasons and the chapters on wrongness before attempting the whole. The approach is powerful, though it does not by itself settle every question about animals, institutions or impersonal value.

Care, dependency and power

Virginia Held, *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global* (Oxford University Press, 2006). Held explains why dependency, emotion, relationship and care labour belong inside moral theory rather than beneath it as private maintenance. She also refuses to confine care to families, asking how it should shape institutions, markets and international relations. The book corrects the fiction of the permanently independent chooser while confronting care's dangers: paternalism, partiality and unequal burdens. Pair it with Aristotle and Scanlon. The contrast shows why good character and fair principles remain incomplete when nobody asks who performs the work that keeps another person able to choose.

Notes and Sources

Ethics spans several millennia, many languages and arguments that remain unsettled. These notes identify the sources behind the book's main distinctions, bound setting-specific claims and mark where a familiar label can distort its source. They do not suggest that one surviving canon contains the history of moral thought. Current scholarly reference entries, institutional documents and publisher metadata were rechecked on 4 September 2026.

The Core Ideas

Feeling, reason and moral claims. The treatment of emotion as moral attention rather than final verdict draws on David Hume's account of sentiment and later moral psychology. Hume's warning about an unexplained move from *is* to *ought* appears in *A Treatise of Human Nature*, book III, part I, section 1. It does not establish that facts are irrelevant to judgement. Plato's *Euthyphro* supplies the command-and-goodness problem. The dialogue does not disprove theism, and later divine-command theories offer substantial replies. The text uses the dilemma for the narrower claim that naming an authority does not remove the need to explain how command and goodness are related.

Moral standing and the circle. Bentham's question about animal suffering appears in a note to chapter XVII of *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Singer's argument about duties to distant strangers is from "Famine, Affluence, and Morality" (1972). The future-person problem is associated with Derek Parfit's non-identity discussion in *Reasons and Persons*. Moral standing does not entail identical treatment. It means that an entity's interests, claims or value require morally relevant consideration rather than automatic exclusion.

Consequences and aggregation. Consequentialism is a family of theories, not one instruction to maximise pleasure. Bentham and Mill supply distinct classical utilitarian positions; Walter Sinnott-Armstrong's reference entry was used for the wider map. Rawls develops the separateness-of-persons objection to aggregating gains and losses across different lives. Bernard Williams's integrity objection appears in *Utilitarianism: For and Against*, written with J. J. C. Smart. The organ-transplant case is a philosophical construction rather than a reported event.

Trolleys and doing harm. Philippa Foot introduced the runaway tram in "The Problem of Abortion and the Doctrine of the Double Effect" (1967). Judith Jarvis Thomson developed the bystander case in "Killing, Letting Die, and the Trolley Problem" (1976), then argued against the standard permission in "Turning the Trolley" (2008). The literature contains no single accepted trolley verdict. The cases test distinctions among doing and allowing, intending and foreseeing, redirecting a threat, using a person and possessing authority to choose for others.

Duties, rights and consent. The Kant discussion follows the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Treating humanity as an end does not prohibit every use of another person's services; it rejects treatment that bypasses or subordinates rational agency in the relevant way. Kant's refusal to recognise a right to lie to a would-be murderer appears in his 1797 essay "On a Supposed Right to Lie from Philanthropy". Deontological theories include agent-centred, patient-centred and contractualist forms, and differ over thresholds and conflicting duties.

Consent is treated as a change in moral relations, not a magic word. Validity depends on decision-making capacity, adequate information, understanding, voluntariness, relevant scope and the continuing option to refuse or withdraw where the practice permits it. Law and professional regulation specify these conditions differently. The manuscript states a moral structure, not a universal legal test.

Double effect. Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*, II-II, question 64, article 7, discusses lethal self-defence through one act with two effects. The familiar multi-condition doctrine was developed later and should not be placed whole in Aquinas's text. Alison McIntyre's reference entry was used to check the modern formulations and disputes. Intention cannot be established by the agent's preferred description alone; causal structure, means, alternatives and proportionality remain material.

Virtue and practical wisdom. Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* is the main source for *eudaimonia*, habituated virtue and *phronesis*. *Eudaimonia* concerns living and acting well across a life, not a passing mood. The doctrine of the mean is not a recommendation to choose the arithmetic midpoint. The contemporary virtue-ethics map follows Rosalind Hursthouse and Glen Pettigrove. Situationist pressure on stable character draws on John Doris's *Lack of Character* and the debate it prompted. The text retains character while treating institutions and circumstances as part of its formation and expression.

Confucian character and role. The *Analects* supplies the role-centred account of cultivation. The sheep-theft exchange is at 13.18: Confucius contrasts public accusation with uprightness understood through family concealment. Its interpretation is contested, so it is used to expose a conflict among loyalty, truth and public justice rather than as a final Confucian rule. Mencius's child-near-a-well example at 2A6 supports the image of moral beginnings that require cultivation. The translations by Edward Slingerland and Bryan Van Norden were used for checking.

Care, dependency and power. Gilligan's *In a Different Voice* challenged Lawrence Kohlberg's evidence and developmental ranking. The manuscript

does not turn that critique into a fixed claim that women possess one moral voice and men another. Gilligan later described care as a human voice. Virginia Held and Joan Tronto develop care as a moral and political practice involving dependency, labour and institutions. The wider feminist-ethics account was checked against Kathryn Norlock and Jordan Pascoe. Rawls supplies the original position and veil of ignorance. Charles Mills, Martha Nussbaum and feminist critics support the challenges concerning racial domination, disability, care and inherited social structure.

Pluralism, authority and judgement. W. D. Ross's *The Right and the Good* gives the list of *prima facie* duties. In Ross, the phrase means duties with genuine force unless outweighed, not duties that only appear real. Reflective equilibrium begins in Rawls and has broader forms that test judgements and principles against evidence and background theories; Carl Knight's reference entry was used for the current map. William MacAskill, Krister Bykvist and Toby Ord develop methods for moral uncertainty. Bernard Williams and Thomas Nagel introduced the modern moral-luck debate in paired essays from 1976.

The manuscript's hierarchy of ordinary benefits, protected claims, exceptional thresholds, decision authority, reversibility, review and moral remainder is an authorial synthesis. It is not attributed to one philosopher and does not claim universal agreement about which rights are absolute or which emergency crosses a threshold. Its function is to prevent a flat checklist from disguising the reason that controlled the verdict.

Historical and operating spine

Representative early settings. The opening references a Babylonian debt case, Egyptian *Maat*, Israelite covenantal law and South Asian *dharma* as representative settings, not reconstructed individual scenes. Martha Roth's edition of Mesopotamian law collections, Miriam Lichtheim's translations of Egyptian texts, *The Jewish Study Bible* and Patrick Olivelle's critical edition of the *Manava-Dharmasastra* support the bounded comparison. The texts differ in genre, theology, date and social organisation. The claim is that moral reasoning was often embedded in law, ritual, office, kinship and cosmic or social order, not that these traditions shared one moral system or moved through one sequence.

Greek ethics. Plato and Aristotle are treated through central ethical questions rather than as founders of moral reflection. The Hellenistic schools are included only to the depth needed for the sequence; *Stoicism in a Hurry* and *Epicureanism in a Hurry* own fuller treatment. Ancient Greek theories were formed within unequal societies and often addressed free male citizens. Their later philosophical reach should not erase that institutional setting.

South Asian traditions. The *Bhagavad Gita* is read within the *Mahabharata*, where Arjuna's crisis joins kinship, role, violence and consequence. It has supported sharply different interpretations and is not treated as one unambiguous command. Buddhist ethics varies across traditions and works within accounts of intention, karma, mental cultivation, compassion and liberation. Jain non-violence also contains distinct disciplines and interpretations. Paul Dundas and Charles Goodman support the introductory limits placed on the Jain and Buddhist comparisons.

Chinese traditions. The discussion uses the *Analects*, *Mencius*, *Mozi* and *Xunzi*, checked against David Wong's reference entry on Chinese ethics. It presents rivalry among Confucian, Mohist and Legalist programmes rather than one harmonious national view. *Ren*, *li* and *jian ai* are retained in transliteration because English renderings such as benevolence, ritual, inclusive care and impartial concern carry different implications.

Akan example and African scope. Statements about oral teaching, proverbs and customary institutions describe recurring forms found in many African traditions, not a uniform continental essence. Kwame Gyekye's survey was read cautiously because its broad synthesis has a specific philosophical and historical standpoint. The account of Akan personhood is narrower and follows Ajume Wingo's revised 2024 entry, which presents the disagreement between Kwasi Wiredu and Kwame Gyekye over achieved social personhood and moral status grounded in common humanity. The example is not used as a proxy for African ethics as a whole.

Jewish, Christian and Islamic traditions. Aquinas is one major Christian synthesis rather than the Christian position. Maimonides represents one major Jewish engagement among law, scripture and Aristotelian philosophy. Miskawayh and al-Ghazali represent distinct philosophical and religious approaches in Islamic ethics. Majid Fakhry's historical synthesis supports the brief Islamic sequence. The manuscript does not make covenant, natural law, *sharia*, virtue, intention and welfare interchangeable, or imply that interpretation within any tradition is uniform.

Hobbes, Hume, Kant, Bentham and Mill. Hobbes's political argument begins from vulnerability, conflict and the need for common authority, though interpretations of his moral theory differ. Hume grounds moral approval in sentiment informed by social usefulness and a more general standpoint. Kant's autonomy is rational self-legislation, not preference. Bentham's impartial calculus and Mill's treatment of happiness, liberty and human development differ enough that "classical utilitarianism" should not erase the distinction. This is a history of one influential European reorganisation, not the moment the world moved from tradition to reason.

Universal claims and excluded people. Wollstonecraft's argument was checked against *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. The abolition discussion joins natural-rights, religious, utilitarian and first-person arguments, including Frederick Douglass's narrative. It does not attribute abolition to moral philosophy alone. Resistance by enslaved people, political organisation, war, economic change and state action were causal. The text

therefore rejects an automatic widening-circle story. Reform was contested, incomplete and reversible.

Genealogy and metaethics. Nietzsche's *On the Genealogy of Morality* investigates the historical formation and psychological uses of values. Calling this a reduction of all morality to power would overstate it. Moore's open-question argument comes from *Principia Ethica*. Ayer, Stevenson and Hare offer different non-cognitivist or prescriptivist accounts. Grouping them together is useful only at introductory depth. Contemporary metaethics contains realist, naturalist, constructivist, expressivist and relativist positions that the one-hour history cannot survey fully.

Research ethics. The ten principles known as the Nuremberg Code appeared in the 1947 judgement in the Doctors' Trial as standards for permissible medical experiments. Voluntary consent came first, alongside scientific necessity, proportional risk, qualified investigators and rights to end participation. The code was an influential prototype, not a complete worldwide enforcement system. The Belmont Report, published in 1979 by a United States national commission, organised US human-subject research ethics around respect for persons, beneficence and justice. Its principles have wider influence, but the report itself is not a global code. Beauchamp and Childress's four-principle approach concerns biomedical ethics and remains open to interpretation and conflict.

The twentieth-century institutional turn. Anscombe's "Modern Moral Philosophy" called for a better philosophy of psychology and criticised modern obligation language. It did not create one unified virtue-ethics movement. Iris Murdoch and Philippa Foot developed different recoveries of character, attention and action. Rawls's theory concerns the basic structure of society, not a general algorithm for private conduct. Gilligan, Held, Tronto, Mills and Nussbaum appear because they expose different omissions in models of equal, independent choosers.

Applied ethics and empirical moral psychology. Singer's drowning-child comparison appears in his 1972 article, although the familiar shallow-pond wording has several later forms. Scanlon's contractualism asks whether

principles could be reasonably rejected by affected individuals. Empirical moral psychology studies framing, intention, causal structure, emotion, identity, character and cultural variation. The reference entry by John Doris, Stephen Stich, Jonathan Phillips and Lachlan Walmsley was used for orientation. Experimental findings describe patterns in specified samples and tasks. They do not establish normative authority, and no result from one country, language or experimental design is presented as a universal moral census.

What People Get Wrong and Use It

The seven corrections synthesise the arguments above. The distinction among descriptive relativism, metaethical relativism and toleration follows Chris Gowans's current reference entry. The distinction among harm, wrong and unfairness draws on rights, justice and consent rather than one settled taxonomy. Named historical episodes are documented. Trolley switches, organ transplants, hospital allocations, workplace cases, family choices and public-body examples are hypothetical or illustrative unless a named source marks them otherwise.

The practical method combines pluralist reasoning, reflective equilibrium, moral uncertainty, risk control and procedural fairness. It is a discipline for identifying the act, affected parties, evidence, protected claims, decision authority, alternatives, thresholds, uncertainty, review and remaining obligations. It does not replace law, professional standards, democratic mandate, local knowledge or subject expertise.

Bibliography

Primary and classical works

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae*. Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947.

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by Terence Irwin. 3rd ed. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2019.

Bentham, Jeremy. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Edited by J. H. Burns and H. L. A. Hart. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

The Bhagavad Gita. Translated by Laurie L. Patton. London: Penguin Classics, 2008.

Confucius. *Analects: With Selections from Traditional Commentaries*. Translated by Edward Slingerland. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2003.

Douglass, Frederick. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave, Written by Himself*. Critical ed. Edited by John R. McKivigan, Peter P. Hinks and Heather L. Kaufman. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by Richard Tuck. Revised student ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Edited by David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

The Jewish Study Bible. 2nd ed. Edited by Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated and edited by Mary Gregor and Jens Timmermann. Revised ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Kant, Immanuel. "On a Supposed Right to Lie from Philanthropy." In *Practical Philosophy*, translated and edited by Mary J. Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Lichtheim, Miriam. *Ancient Egyptian Literature, Volume II: The New Kingdom*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006. First published 1976.

Maimonides, Moses. *The Guide of the Perplexed*. Translated by Shlomo Pines. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Mencius. *Mengzi: With Selections from Traditional Commentaries*. Translated by Bryan W. Van Norden. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2008.

Mill, John Stuart. *Utilitarianism*. Edited by Roger Crisp. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Mozi. *The Mozi: A Complete Translation*. Translated by Ian Johnston. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2010.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morality*. Edited by Keith Ansell-Pearson. Translated by Carol Diethe. Revised student ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Olivelle, Patrick, trans. *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Manava-Dharmasastra*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Plato. *Five Dialogues: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Meno, Phaedo*. Translated by G. M. A. Grube. Revised by John M. Cooper. 2nd ed. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2002.

Roth, Martha T. *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor*. 2nd ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Men and A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Edited by Sylvana Tomaselli. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Xunzi. *Xunzi: The Complete Text*. Translated by Eric L. Hutton. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.

Modern works

Anscombe, G. E. M. "Modern Moral Philosophy." *Philosophy* 33, no. 124 (1958): 1-19.

Ayer, A. J. *Language, Truth and Logic*. 2nd ed. London: Victor Gollancz, 1946.

Beauchamp, Tom L., and James F. Childress. *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. 8th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. London: Vintage, 2011.

Darwin, Charles. *The Descent of Man*. London: Penguin Classics, 2004.

Doris, John M. *Lack of Character: Personality and Moral Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Dundas, Paul. *The Jains*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2002.

Fakhry, Majid. *Ethical Theories in Islam*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Foot, Philippa. "The Problem of Abortion and the Doctrine of the Double Effect." *Oxford Review* 5 (1967): 5-15.

Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Gilligan, Carol. *In a Human Voice*. Cambridge: Polity, 2023.

Goodman, Charles. *Consequences of Compassion: An Interpretation and Defense of Buddhist Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Hare, R. M. *The Language of Morals*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.

Held, Virginia. *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Hursthouse, Rosalind. *On Virtue Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

MacAskill, William, Krister Bykvist, and Toby Ord. *Moral Uncertainty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Mills, Charles W. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Moore, G. E. *Principia Ethica*. Revised ed., edited by Thomas Baldwin.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Murdoch, Iris. *The Sovereignty of Good*. London: Routledge, 2001. First published 1970.

Nagel, Thomas. "Moral Luck." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volumes* 50 (1976): 137-151.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.

Parfit, Derek. *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Rachels, James, and Stuart Rachels. *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*. 10th ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 2026.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Revised ed. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999.

Ross, W. D. *The Right and the Good*. Edited by Philip Stratton-Lake. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002. First published 1930.

Scanlon, T. M. *What We Owe to Each Other*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998.

Singer, Peter. "Famine, Affluence, and Morality." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 1, no. 3 (1972): 229-243.

Smart, J. J. C., and Bernard Williams. *Utilitarianism: For and Against*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Stevenson, Charles L. *Ethics and Language*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944.

Thomson, Judith Jarvis. "Killing, Letting Die, and the Trolley Problem." *The Monist* 59, no. 2 (1976): 204-217.

Thomson, Judith Jarvis. "Turning the Trolley." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 36, no. 4 (2008): 359-374.

Tronto, Joan C. *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Williams, Bernard. "Moral Luck." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volumes* 50 (1976): 115-135.

Scholarly reference and institutional sources

Alexander, Larry, and Michael Moore. "Deontological Ethics." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Revised 11 December 2024. Checked 4 September 2026.

Ashford, Elizabeth, and Tim Mulgan. "Contractualism." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Revised 20 April 2018. Checked 4 September 2026.

Doris, John, Stephen Stich, Jonathan Phillips, and Lachlan Walmsley. "Moral Psychology: Empirical Approaches." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Revised 6 January 2020. Checked 4 September 2026.

Gowans, Chris. "Moral Relativism." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Revised 28 June 2026. Checked 4 September 2026.

Gyekye, Kwame. "African Ethics." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Modified 20 September 2011. Checked 4 September 2026.

Hursthouse, Rosalind, and Glen Pettigrove. "Virtue Ethics." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Revised 3 May 2026. Checked 4 September 2026.

Knight, Carl. "Reflective Equilibrium." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. First published 27 November 2023. Checked 4 September 2026.

Kraut, Richard. "Aristotle's Ethics." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Current version checked 4 September 2026.

McIntyre, Alison. "Doctrine of Double Effect." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Revised 17 July 2023. Checked 4 September 2026.

Nelkin, Dana K. "Moral Luck." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Revised 20 January 2025. Checked 4 September 2026.

Norlock, Kathryn, and Jordan Pascoe. "Feminist Ethics." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Revised 22 August 2025. Checked 4 September 2026.

Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter. "Consequentialism." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Revised 4 October 2023. Checked 4 September 2026.

Wingo, Ajume. "Akan Philosophy of the Person." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Revised 15 April 2024. Checked 4 September 2026.

Wong, David. "Chinese Ethics." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Revised 10 August 2023. Checked 4 September 2026.

United States National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. *The Belmont Report*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1979.

United States v. Brandt et al. "Permissible Medical Experiments." In *Trials of War Criminals before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals under Control Council Law No. 10*, vol. 2. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1949.