Workable Ethical Theories (consequentialist) based on Quinn's discussion in "Ethics for the In	nformation Age"
--	-----------------

	Workable Ethical Theories (consequentialist) based on Quinn's discussion in "Ethics for the Information Age"					
	<u>Kantianism</u>	<u>Act Utilitarianism</u>	<u>Rule Utilitarianism</u>	Social Contract	Virtu	
Motivation	 People should be guided by universal moral laws of good will and duties and obligations. Categorical Imperative (2nd Formulation): Treat yourself and others as an end in themselves, never as the means to an end. (p. 73) 	 An action is good if it benefits someone; causes greatest benefit for the greatest amount of people. An action is bad if it harms someone; minimizes harm to the most people. Produces happiness or prevents unhappiness for an individual or a community. Greatest Happiness Principle. (p. 76) Benefits and harms can be calculated by these factors: intensity, duration, certainty, propinquity, fecundity, purity, extent. Allows direct comparison of different actions to see if the benefits outweigh the harms. (p. 79) 	 Analysis relies upon evaluation of benefits and harms. Provides a set of rules, which when followed, lead to the greatest increase in total happiness. Individuals and groups choose to follow the rules because it produces the greatest good. Applies the Principle of Utility to individual actions and moral rules. (p. 76, 82) Evaluates the consequences of an action. 	 is above the rules. We implicitly accept a social contract (rules) when we become part of a group (such as a country). Government can enforce the rules. Rawls's Principles of Justice. (p. 87) Difference Principle: strives for the greatest benefit of the least- 		
Criteria are	Based on rules derived by the reasoning process.	Based on actions derived by calculating the factors (see above).	Based on rules of a majority of the culture, religion, government.	Based on rules of government.	Based	
Focus audience is	the individual	the individual	groups; everyone in a society.	the individual	the ir	
Cases for	 It is rational. Produces universal moral guidelines. Treats everyone as moral equals. 	 Comprehensive in evaluation of actions. Does not distinguish between individuals; works for everyone. Practical and easy to understand. Focuses on happiness. 	 Simpler to evaluate/calculate harms/benefits because it focuses on long term outcomes rather than individual actions. Rules are set, so not every action needs to be evaluated; consequences are already understood. Rules survive exceptional situations. Does not rely on moral luck. Appeals to the majority of a society. 	 Based on rights. Explains why people act in self- interest without common agreement. Provides clear analysis of certain citizen/government problems 	•	
Cases against	 Sometimes no single rule adequately characterizes an action. Doesn't have a way to resolve a conflict between rules. Doesn't allow exceptions to moral laws. 	 Unclear who to include in calculations; who are the moral beings involved in the decision? Calculations are too much work. Intent of the action is not considered; ignores our innate sense of duty. Hard to see where the lines are drawn. Doesn't handle the problem of moral luck. Individual rules work poorly in larger context/community. 	 Ignores a potentially unjust distribution of good consequences (may ignore minority groups). Single scale does not apply in every situation. Some situations may be just, regardless of the rules. No objective measure of amount of happiness. 	 No one actually the contract. Some actions have multiple characterizations. Problems with conflicting rights. May unjustly treat people who cannot uphold contract. 	•	