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What is Ethics?

- Ethical questions are normative questions
  - Normative questions attempt to address how one should act in a given situation
    - They are not intended to describe or explain how one does act
  - Normative questions or claims are supported by arguments intended to give one sound reasons for acting one way as opposed to another
  - Normative questions cannot be answered objectively or subjectively
Three Types of Questions

- Normative questions cannot be answered objectively or subjectively

- Three Types of Questions
  1. Normative
  2. Objective
  3. Subjective

Objective Questions

- Objective questions are questions seeking to determine some fact, or some past or present aspect of the world
  - What is the boiling point of water?
  - How many moons does Saturn have?
  - How many home runs did Babe Ruth hit?
- Objective questions have a correct, definitive answer, often achieved through observation or appeal to observable evidence
**Subjective Questions**

- Subjective questions are questions seeking to determine someone's preferences or tastes
  - Did you like the movie *Moneyball*?
  - Why are brussels sprouts your favorite food?
  - Would you rather watch baseball or football?
- Subjective questions reflect someone's preferences or tastes
  - There is no one correct and definitive answer
  - It is senseless to ask someone to argue for their tastes and preferences
    - While their preference is true for them, it is not necessarily true for anyone else

**Answering Normative Questions**

- Normative questions are not like objective questions
- Normative questions cannot be answered definitively once and for all
- Normative questions are not like subjective questions
  - Normative questions do have better or worse answers
- Rational arguments help decide whether one normative answer is better or worse than another
  - Arguments rationally justify ethical action and ethical views
Don't Confuse Normative with Subjective

- If normative questions were just subjective questions, then there would be no reason to ask ethical questions or enter into ethical debates.
- Normative debates would just be an expression of various personal preferences.
- Normative questions would lack any means of rationally justifying how one ought to act.
- If normative questions were just subjective questions, then normative questions would be "viciously relative."

"That's Just Your Opinion"

- "Moral debates...are all about offering carefully considered arguments rather than the tossing out of personal opinions.... The retort 'that's just your opinion' is, in fact, an insult, a demeaning barb intended to abort a discussion that at least one person recognizes as worthwhile. Such a retort is a vote of no confidence in the value of the serious exchange of ideas. Often, when someone says 'that's just your opinion' within a normative discussion, he or she is really saying, "I don't want to think about it" or, worse, "I don't think it's worth thinking about."" (xv-xvi)
Why Exercise?

- The answer to this question might reflect two different types of reasons
  - Motivating reasons
  - Normative reasons

Motivating reasons are sets of *psychological beliefs and desires* that explain our intentional actions

- "Why" is understood motivationally
- Examples: I exercise to stay fit. I exercise because I want to eat whatever I want.

Normative reasons are sets of *psychological beliefs and normative values* that provide reasons justifying one's actions

- "Why" is understood normatively
- Examples: I exercise because exercise is important to staying healthy and I value staying healthy. I think being a couch potato is unhealthy and a life not worth living.

Three Types of Normative Values

A. Prudential Values

B. Aesthetic Values

C. Moral Values
A. Prudential Values

- Prudential values reflect what is good for one, what makes life worth living, or what will benefit one
  - "It is prudent to eat a low-fat diet."
  - "Binge drinking is not prudent."
- Prudent values are not necessarily moral values
  - It's not immoral to eat a high-fat diet, even though it is not healthy.

B. Aesthetic Values

- Aesthetic values reflect attitudes toward beauty or artistry and may be about objects, events, or states of affairs
  - "That was a beautiful catch."
  - "The mountains are more beautiful than the plains."
- Aesthetic values can often reflect one's subjective preferences, however beauty may be an objective fact or aspect of some objects, events, or states of affairs
C. Moral Values

- Moral values are those dealing with issues of good and evil, justice, fairness, and how one ought to act in regard to others.

- Morgan thinks that an important feature of moral values and judgements is that these judgements are, to some greater or lesser extent, other-regarding

  - In saying something is morally good or bad, one assumes that it is not just a personal preference but a claim that holds for others as well

  - And, one assumes that others would accept one’s own moral judgements if placed in similar circumstances

- Morality assumes a "we" of moral discourse and not simply an "I"

  - We are social beings who continually evaluate how we should act within a social context

Morality and Community

- Three reasons for why morality should be thought of in communal terms

  1. Moral Community–being a part of a community is moral given that induction into that community entails being accepted as a member worthy of moral consideration

  2. Moral Reasoning and Common View–moral reasoning assumes that one's views and reasons can be seen by others as legitimate moral views and reasons

  3. Moral Behavior and Impacting Others–Moral consideration of our actions involves considering how our actions might affect others. Our ethical considerations often start with those closest and extend to those most distant and unknown to us.
Why Be Moral?

- “...the ‘non-relational self’ is at best a social fiction, one that many moral philosophers saw fit to turn into a philosophical fiction, and at worst a pernicious denial of our crucial relationships with and mutual dependence on others. That is to say, once we drop this pretense that we are ‘capable of existing independently of any concern for others,’ and concede that much, but of course not all, of what we do in life is bound up with our membership in various communities both small and large in stature, it becomes apparent just how indispensable moral reasons and values are in our life.” (xxiii-xxiv)

Four Ethical Theories

I. Utilitarianism
II. Deontological
III. Social Contract
IV. Virtue Theory
I. Classical Utilitarianism

Three points

1. Actions are judged right or wrong only by appeal to their consequences.

2. When evaluating consequences, all that matters is the amount of happiness or unhappiness that is created.

3. Each person's happiness counts the same.

What is a right action?

• What makes right actions right and wrong actions wrong?
  • Right actions are those that produce the greatest amount of happiness over unhappiness.

• What are wrong actions?
  • Wrong action are those that produce more unhappiness than happiness
  • Called the "Greatest Happiness Principle"
Mill's Qualitative Hedonism

- Mill realized the problems with a theory based purely on hedonism, or pleasure
- So, he thinks there are "higher" and "lower" pleasures, and the higher are better than the lower
- "It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied."
- What does Mill mean by this quote?

We're More than Pleasure Seekers

- A human's pleasures are of a different degree than a pig's
- While a pig might be satisfied hooked up to the Happiness Machine, humans demand more from life and experience than merely the satisfaction of bodily pleasures
- Humans strive to realize their potential as human beings and this means striving to realize uniquely human capacities and potential, not just the satisfaction of bodily pleasures
Consequences Matter

- For Utilitarianism, the motives of one's action do not affect the morality of an action
- Actual consequences of an action determine whether that action is right or wrong
- What if there is more to determining the morality of actions than simply an appeal to the consequences of an action?

Equal Importance

- Each person's happiness counts the same
- Since each person's happiness counts the same, we must treat each person's welfare as equally important
- Mill said we must be, "as strictly impartial as a disinterested and benevolent spectator"
  - Agent-neutrality: which consequences are deemed better is independent of the agent’s perspective
- Utilitarianism endorses a principle of fairness and equality
Objective Ethical Theory

- Utilitarian believes there is a universal, objective ethical principle that everyone ought to follow
- This objective principle is utility
- Can one be wrong about rightness and wrongness?
  - The right action is not necessarily what you might think is right or what you might desire
  - Rather, the right action is determined by the goodness or bad of the action's consequences

Motive to Obey Principle of Utility?

- The motive to obey the principle of utility is both internal and external
- The internal motivation is that we all desire our own happiness
- The external motivation is that we desire and reinforce behavior in others that promotes their own happiness
- The use of external rewards and punishments can promote or prevent an individual's happiness
Runaway Train and Calculating the Right Action

- You are standing at a track switching station and there is a runaway train heading your way. If you don't pull the switch the train will kill two people. If you pull the switch, the train will kill one person. What do you do?

- What if you have to make the choice between two or 20 deaths. What would you do? What does utilitarianism demand?

Possible Problems with Utilitarianism

- Violations of justice
- Violations of rights
What Matters in This Case?

- Case: White cops wrongly arrest and beat a black man. Race riots break out with many deaths. Our utilitarian realizes that his false testimony would result in the arrest and conviction of a particular cop. If the utilitarian knows that his false testimony would end the riots and save lives, then must he bear false testimony against the innocent person for the overall benefit of society?

- Why might we be concerned about this case?

- With what ethical principle is this case inconsistent?

Utilitarianism and Justice

- We should be concerned with this case because it appears that utilitarianism is incompatible with ideals of justice

- Justice requires treating people fairly
  - treat people according to their needs
  - treat people according to their merit

- What does the conflict with justice say about utilitarianism?
Case of the Peeping Tom

- Suppose someone has been photographing the most intimate details of your life. You have not know about this and are not likely to find out. Suppose further that the photographs have been distributed to a dozen of the photographer's friends for their enjoyment.

- Is this act morally permissible?

- What has been violated?

Revise the Theory

- If at first you don’t succeed, revise the theory....

- This attempt to save Utilitarianism admits there’s a problem with assuming that each individual action is evaluated by the principle of utility.

- What causes problems in the bearing-false-witness case is the theory’s assumption that whether the action is right or wrong depends on the consequences of that particular lie.

- The assumption that the consequences of a particular action determine the rightness of wrongness of action is what leads the theory into trouble.
Rule Utilitarianism

• Revise the theory so that it is not individual actions that matter, but a set of rules

• What set of rules would lead to the best society and benefit society most? What general rules would promote the greatest happiness?

• Individual acts are judged right or wrong with reference to these set of rules. Once the principle of utility determines which set of rules will promote the greatest amount of happiness, then we no longer need to consult the principle of utility for particular actions

• Bearing false witness is wrong because it violates the rule, One Should not Lie

II. Deontological Theory

• Kant’s theory is the prototype for deontological ethics
Motivated by Duty

- Kant compares motivation by duty with other kinds of motives
  - If one is motivated by happiness alone, then one would do one's duty only if one's duty coincides with one's happiness
  - If one is motivated by a motive of duty, then the morality of the action would express one's intent to act according to duty regardless of the circumstances
  - While some actions may be motivated by self-interest or self-preservation, these actions may be praiseworthy but do not express a good will
  - Motivation of duty is to have priority over all other motivations

Merchant and Acting from Duty

- The merchant charges the same price for both experienced and inexperienced customers
  - Why does he do it?
    - Is it so that he maintains a good reputation?
    - Is it so that he doesn't get arrested?
    - Is it because it is the right thing to do?
    - Which is Kant's preferred motivation?
Deontological Ethics

- An action's moral value is determined by the nature of the action itself and the agent's motive
- DE contrasts with Utilitarianism which says that the goal or consequences of an action determine its moral value
- An agent’s moral motive should be to act out of reverence for the moral law

Rational Agents

- As rational agents, we are capable of guiding our behavior based on rational principles
- When we act morally, we act on principles that any rational agent in our situation would act upon
Can We Ignore Our Moral Reasoning?

- Regardless of the circumstances or of the consequences of an action, we cannot ignore the force of our moral reasoning.

Why?

- Because our moral reasoning is based on universal principles of rationality; we cannot escape our duty.
- The principle which motivates a good will is the same principle that is fundamental to all of morality.
- That principle is the Categorical Imperative.

How Do We Figure Out the Moral Law?

- Imperatives
  - Hypothetical: applies conditionally
  - Categorical: applies unconditionally

- Each of these tells us what we ought to do.
- Each is an imperative because it is a command; a command to use our wills in a certain way.
Hypothetical Imperatives

• Definition: a rule that tells us what means to use to achieve a desired end

• Tell us what we ought to do given we have the relevant desires or have willed certain ends
  • If you want to be a physician, then you ought to go to med school
  • The degree to which the "ought" binds one to a certain action depends on the desire--if you don't want to be bound to do something then just give up the desire

Categorical Imperatives

• Definition: a moral law that tells us what we ought to do and (i) does not depend on any prior conditions or subjective wants and wishes and (ii) contains no qualifications
  • "We ought not torture babies for fun" carries with it a moral obligation independent of our desires
  • Moral obligation has the form: "You ought not to do such-and-such, period."
  • The moral force of a categorical imperative applies to us unconditionally simply because we possess rational wills
Conformity to a Universal Law

- **First formulation**: “act only in accordance with that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law.”

- This first maxim gives a procedure for determining whether an action is morally permissible

- Procedure:
  1. State the rule (maxim) you are following for some particular action
  2. Would you will that everyone all the time follow this rule?
  3. Follow that rule that can be universalizable

Money Lender Example

- Suppose a man needs to borrow money and he knows that he cannot repay the money. He also knows that no one will lend him money if he cannot repay the loan.

- If he were to promise to repay the debt, what maxim/rule would he be following?

- Could this maxim/rule become a universal law?
Universalize This

- Can you universalize the following maxims? Would the principle undermine itself if followed without exception by everyone?
  - Never say “I love you” to someone unless that person says it to you first
  - Always pay your debts on time
  - When running a business, always charge less for your product than your competitor
  - Never help someone out unless you get something in return
  - Share some of your wealth with those less fortunate
  - Cheat on your tests whenever possible
  - Never cheat on a test

Moral Agent

- Being a moral agent means acting according to a universal law or rule
- A universal moral law is one that holds in all circumstances for all individuals--there are no exceptions
- An example of a universal moral law is, Do not tell a lie.
Lying

• Lying in any circumstance is the “obliteration of one’s dignity as a human being”

• Why think the prohibition against lying is so bad?

• Kant offers two arguments:
  • Prohibition on lying follows from the Categorical Imperative
  • Prohibition on lying is universal because we can never know the consequences

Prohibition on Lying Follows from the Categorical Imperative

• If lying were a universal law, then it would be self-defeating.

• It would be self-defeating because if every one were telling a lie, no one would believe you.

• For a lie to be successful means that there is a presumption of truth; generally, people need to believe that others are telling the truth if lying is to work

• So, if lying were a universal law, then no one would believe you were telling the truth
Categorical Imperative

- First Formulation: “act only in accordance with that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law.”

- What makes an action right or wrong is the maxim’s (for that action) fitness to be a universal law of nature

- Second Formulation: “act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never as a means but always at the same time as an end”

- Treating other people as an end in themselves means taking on the ends of the other person

Conflicts Between Rules

- The main argument against Kant’s claim that there are absolute moral rules arises in cases where rules conflict.

- Suppose actions A and B are both wrong in any situation. What happens if you are faced with the choice of either doing A or B and there are no alternatives available?

- This case of conflicting rules makes it seem as if Kant’s appeal to absolute rules is unsupportable

- Are there really cases where rules conflict?
Kant’s Possible Response to Conflicting Rules Argument

- There wouldn’t be conflicting rules and duties if one were to specify the maxims correctly
  - Either (i) one would have exceptions built into the maxims
  - or (ii) the maxims would be a little more general
- The trick is knowing how to specify the maxims correctly

Kant’s Critique of Utilitarianism

- Utilitarianism says that the morally right action is that action which maximizes happiness over unhappiness given all the relevant alternatives
- Kant thinks utilitarian theories devalue the individual
  - If utility is to motivate one’s actions, then we treat others as means to an end; solely for what good they can be used for
  - It would be possible to justify sacrificing one person for the benefit of others
- Utilitarianism embraces our base, hedonistic instincts and rejects the role of reason in guiding behavior
Kant & Mill: Common Ground

• Both extremist Utilitarianism and Kantianism appear to alienate agents
  • Utilitarianism alienates agents from morality in that it seems to justify immoral actions in the name of impartiality
  • Kantianism alienates agents from relationships and projects in that one acts out of duty and not from care or love for one’s family, friends, or interests.

III. Social Contract
Social Contract Theory

- Ethics derives from the rules necessary for having a peaceful, cooperative social order
- If there were no social order, then there would be no system in which humans could flourish and in which ethical rules could operate
- How does this social order arise? What is it's structure?

Suppose . . .

- Suppose you have the task of creating a new social contract. How would you do it fairly?
- You can't eliminate your biases completely. However, you would want to try to minimize them as much as possible.
- You know nothing of your place in society, your economic status, your natural abilities, your gender, race, etc.
- You assume that you and everyone else in society is an equal moral being, free, rational, and with basic human needs.
- What are the principles for this new contract and new social order?
Rawl’s Veil of Ignorance

- Rawl’s thought experiment
  - Principles of justice are selected behind this veil of ignorance
  - Selecting principles of justice behind this veil guarantees that no one is advantaged or disadvantaged in the choice of principles of justice
  - The principles of justice are the result of a fair agreement or bargain
  - "Justice as fairness" is the idea that the principles of justice are arrived at by rational humans in an initial situation that is fair

Original Position as State of Nature

- From this original position, it seems that the rational agent would want a social contract that was as just/fair as possible:
  - protecting individual liberties, and
  - distributing benefits and burdens in such a way that the least well-off are in as good a position as possible
- Only if it is rational for one to choose or contract into this society behind the "veil of ignorance" does that system meet the requirements of justice
Guiding Idea

- "The guiding idea is that the principles of justice for the basic structure of society are the object of the original agreement. They are the principles that free and rational persons concerned to further their own interests would accept in an initial position of equality as defining the fundamental terms of their association."

- The decision humans would make in a hypothetical state of equal liberty determines the principles of justice

The Social Contract

- Social Contract is an agreement to which every citizen is a party
- Social Contract explains the purpose of the state
  - Purpose of the state is to enforce the set of rules necessary for social living
  - Social Contract also explains the nature of morality
    - Morality consists in the set of rules which make social living possible
Contract and Human Interests

- Morality, politics, and society are created to serve humanity's interests
- Prior to the contract, there is no justice or injustice, good or bad
- After contract, justice serves to prevent a reversal into a State of Nature
- Social Contract is the foundation for all that is good and the basis for living well

In a Nutshell

- The Social Contract's conception of morality consists in
  - a set of rules
  - that govern how people act and treat one another
  - that is accepted by rational people seeking their self interests
  - and is entered into with the understanding that others will follow the set of rules for basically the same reasons
Advantages of Social Contract Morality, 1

1. Social Contract theory tells us what rules we are to follow and why those rules are justified

   - Morality consists in those rules that are necessary for social living
     - Common rules in which all societies depend include: prohibitions on murder, lying, fraud, breaking promises, assault, etc.
     - These rules are justified simply because they enable social living
     - Some rules are not justifiable in the same way and are not part of the morality-based social contract
       - E.g., prohibition of prostitution, sodomy, gay marriage, etc.
       - These rules do not threaten any person in living a safe, secure life within the society
       - These rules are not derived from the social contract and are not under the umbrella of social contract morality

Advantages of Social Contract Morality, 2

2. Social Contract theory tells us why it is reasonable to follow these rules

   - It is to our own advantage to follow these rules because we personally benefit from living in a society in which these rules are in effect
   - We want a contract that demands that people adhere to the rules except in extraordinary circumstances
   - Only by living in a system in which the rules are in effect and obedience is demanded will we feel safe
Advantages of Social Contract Morality, 3

3. Social Contract tells us the circumstances in which we are allowed to break the rules

- We agree to obey the rules on the conditions that others obey the same rules
- If one fails to obey the rules, then we are freed from our obligation (to some extent) from following the rules with respect to that person
- Social Contract requires that rule breakers be punished. Why is it permissible to punish?
  - Permissible to punish because the rule breaker has violated the rule of reciprocity: we abide by the rules that restrict our freedoms under the agreement that others accept the same restrictions
  - Once one breaks the rules, we are no longer obligated to treat them according to the rules—we can punish them for their violation of the rules

Advantages of Social Contract Morality, 4

4. Social Contract tells us about the objective basis of morality

- Objective basis of morality is simply the rules that rational people would agree to accept for their mutual benefit
- Rational investigation tells us what those rules are
- An act is moral if it conforms to the rationally determined set of rules necessary for beneficial social living
Problems with the Social Contract

1. How should we act toward those who are not in the contract
2. Civil disobedience

Virtue Theory

- Aristotle is considered the “father” of Virtue Theory
Outside the Ethical Theory Boundaries

- One of the problems with Utilitarianism and Kantian ethics is that each addresses how one ought to act in certain cases, but leaves open questions about how one ought to act in many other cases.
- The question in ethics is, “How ought one to live one’s life?”
- Utilitarianism, Kant’s Deontology, and other ethical theories can be understood as *Theories of Right*, where it is the principles of obligation (and prohibition) that determine one’s actions.
- A *Theory of the Good* is concerned with describing the good life.

Living The Good Life

- Theory of the Good is concerned with living the good life.
  - *Eudaimonia* – *eu* (well being/good) & *daimon* (spirit, referring to one’s fortune or lot in life).
- Living the good life is not concerned only with one’s obligations and duties.
- “Be good” is not the same thing as “Do the right thing” or “Follow this rule.”
- Imagine one who did the right thing but lived a secluded life, monotonously pursuing the same task every day, and spends all one’s time playing video games.
- Might one convincingly say of this person that s/he leads a good life?
General Principle of the Good Life

• What makes for the Good Life?
  • Aristotle appeals to humanity’s common biological heritage to specify what constitutes the good life
  • The good life is understood in terms of the ideal of human nature
• What is a good human being?
  • To answer this question one needs to understand what is meant by saying something is good

What Makes a Virtuous Human Being?

• Aristotle thinks a good human being is rational and that rationality is good for humans
• Aristotle also thinks that good people will display certain traits in dealings with other human beings
• One can see these virtues as necessary conditions for human flourishing and well-being
• To understand moral rules and ethics, we must understand what makes someone a virtuous person
Components of Virtue Theory

1. An explanation of the nature of a virtue
2. A list of virtuous character traits
3. An explanation of what these virtues consist in
4. An explanation of why these character traits are good ones to have
5. An explanation of whether the virtues are the same for all people or whether they vary between individuals and cultures

What is a Virtue?

- A virtue is a character trait manifested in habitual action
  - If one only occasionally tells the truth, that person does not have the virtue of honesty
- Possessing a virtue requires that it be a habitual action, that it is ingrained in the individual’s behavior
  - What makes a habitual character trait a virtue is that it is good for the individual
  - Vices are also habitual but are not good for the individual
Virtues Are More Fundamental

- Virtues are thought to be more fundamental than moral rules
- Virtue ethics does not attempt to supplement moral rules but to maintain that virtue, a virtuous character, is a fundamental moral category
- Considerations of virtue will often lead to the same conclusions as utilitarianism and Kantian ethics
- But, considerations of virtue can trump duty or utility

What Are the Virtues? (a very short list)

- Compassion
- Cooperativeness
- Courage
- Fairness
- Self-discipline
- Civility
- Dependability
- Honesty
- Generosity
- Friendliness
- Patience
- Moderation
- Benevolence
- Reasonableness
- Tolerance
- Thoughtfulness
- Loyalty
- Self-reliance
**Doctrine of the Mean**

- Aristotle thinks that one can understand these virtues within a single theoretical framework
- The Doctrine of the Mean says that the virtues can be found along a continuum between the extremes of excess and deficiency
- Virtuous traits are not to be understood as a mathematical average between the two extremes
  - Rather, the “correct” amount is somewhere in between what is too little and too much
- What is the mean for each virtue will vary for each person and for each virtue

---

**Virtues a Balance Between Extremes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Vice (excess)</th>
<th>Virtue (mean)</th>
<th>Vice (deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in Facing Danger</td>
<td>Rashness</td>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Cowardice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying Pleasure</td>
<td>Self-indulgence</td>
<td>Temperance</td>
<td>Being puritanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving of Money</td>
<td>Vulgarity</td>
<td>Generosity</td>
<td>Stinginess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth Telling about Oneself</td>
<td>Boastfulness</td>
<td>Self-honesty</td>
<td>Self-deprecation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why Are the Virtues Important?

- Why are the virtues desirable in the first place? Why is it a good thing for a person to be generous or honest?
  - Being generous is a good thing because _______________.
  - Being honest is a good thing because _________________.
- Each virtue may be valuable for different reasons. But, each reason seems to point to a common reason
- According to Aristotle, the virtues are important because the virtuous person will live a better life, will fare better in life, will live well

Are the Virtues the Same for All?

- We all live different lives and have different interests. So in one sense, virtues appear to differ from individual to individual.
- But, it appears there are virtues which are essential to all people in all times
  - Everyone needs courage to face life's challenges
  - Honesty in speech and deed is essential to trust and relationships
  - Everyone needs friends and having friends requires being a friend--so, loyalty appears essential to friendship
  - Aristotle thought that there are some virtues that all people need at all times
Advantages of Virtue Ethics

- **Moral Motivation**: moral behavior is motivated by a characteristic of the individual
  
  - Moral motivation in Virtue Ethics is concerned with the whole person; virtuous character is imbued in one’s being/nature
  
  - Moral motivation in Kant is concerned with the person only to the extent that person performs an action for certain reasons
    
    - Kant’s theory is only concerned with moral action in cases where there is moral decision making
    
    - Leads to “moral minimalism”: How can one avoid being blameworthy for the way one acted?

- Virtue Ethics does not divide life into moral situations and nonmoral situations--all of one’s life should reflect virtuous character traits