A moral philosophy chart

Lo Min Choong Julian | 27 March 2023 Written for the partial completion of NTU's HY1002 Symbolic Logic





Note: Prof Kahn argues that maxims are not abstract, instead is prescribed directly to each individual. This is supported with Kant's use of "your" in "through your will".

Table: Properties of ethical theories

Theory	Normative	Complete	Consistent	Enumerativ e	Evaluative	Intrinsic reason	Gap: deontic, decision	Agents	Includes animal agents	Considers animals	Promote intrinsic reason
Confucius virtue ethics	1	0	1	1	1	?	1	Humans	0	0	1
Consequentia lism	1	1	1	1	1	the Good	1	Humans only?	0	1	1
Deontology	1	1	1	1	1	Criteria	1	Humans?	?	1	0
Indian philosophy	1	1	1	1	1	?	1	Humans?	0	1	1
Kant's ethics	1	1	1	1	1	Rationality	1	Rational agents	0	0	0
Kantism	1	1	1	1	1	Rationality	1	Rational agents	0	1	0
Potential alien theory	1	1	1	1	1	Alien intrinsic reason	1	Aliens	0	0	0
Potential crazy theory	1	1	1	1	1	?	0	?	1	1	?
Utilitarianis m	1	1	1	1	1	Maximum utility	1	Things: capacity suffer	0	1	1
Virtue ethics	1	0	1	1	1	Virtues, vices	1	Humans	0	1	1
Welfarism	1	1	1	1	1	Maximum welfare	1	Things: capacity welfare	0	1	1

Note: This table shows (1) the gap in my understanding regarding ethical theories, and (2) the limits of these categories. These categories do not neatly classify Chinese and Indian philosophy's approach and understanding. Confucius asked various questions from ethics to political philosophy and the state of human nature. His philosophy is all encompassing. The attempt to distill his teaching into just ethics loses vital information and context. Similarly, Indian philosophy's main goal is to escape the cycle of rebirth, to detach oneself from material possessions, and that is guided by kharma. Furthermore, "Chinese" and "Indian" Philosophy groups different philosophers into one group, even though they each have incompatible thoughts.

Objections

9	Utilitarianism	Kantianism	Virtue ethics	
	No agent favouring options Morality holding agents hostage	Totalisation leads to the inability to resolve dilemmas	Incomplete	

Stance

I am a Kantian because I have pre-philosophical intuitions and dispositions that aligns most closely to Kantianism. I agree with the underlying Kantian meta-ethical truths, such as there is one moral principle, and that we can discover said moral principle. Furthermore, Kantianism accurately represents the nature of moral dilemmas. There is no solution. Kantianism provides a satisfactory explanation as to why — the totalising disrespect of victims.

While there are problems with rationality predicating who and what is available for deontic assessment, I take it to be sensible as rationality empowers one to understand morality and to be moral.

However, I suspect there are problems with rationality as the underlying differentiator. Kantianism relies on rationality, which is currently ontologically ambiguous to me. How does rationality arise? When does it arise? Are there degrees of rationality? At what point is one rational enough to be up for deontic assessment? Are people with diminished capacity really off the hook, morally?