**Meditations on Moral Philosophy**

**By John Altmann**

1. This work is to serve as a renunciation of my previous two essays on moral philosophy; Treatise on Moral Philosophy & The Nature of Consequence.
2. My new view on morality and whether acts are just or unjust rests on the basis of knowledge and the acts that subsequently arise from it. This view shifts the focus of morality away from actions and consequences which are adrift in a sea of relativity and instead examines morality from an epistemic viewpoint.
3. My new theory states that morality is governed by 4 forces.
4. The first force is knowledge which is the foundation from which the three other forces arise. Knowledge as it pertains to morality can be broken down into two subcategories: *Systematic* & *Immediate*. Systematic knowledge is knowledge that has molded our consciousness. Our society, our education, our relationships, etc. are all sources of systematic knowledge. Systematic knowledge is associated with structured morality because structured morality deals with moral acts and issues that the moral agent has come to believe through systematic knowledge to be just or unjust. Illustrations of structured morality would be one’s stance on gay marriage, aiding the impoverished, Second Amendment rights, etc. Immediate knowledge is knowledge that the moral agent possesses in the midst of a moral conflict. The consciousness is aware & receptive of solely the information being transmitted from the conflict and as a result the systematic knowledge and thus the structured morality of the agent, has been negated. Reactionary morality is associated with this type of knowledge because in these types of moral conflicts, you have no time to weigh the dictates of your society or any knowledge other than what you derive in the moment of conflict. Someone about to be hit by a bus, two people fighting, a fire breaking out, etc. are all cases that deal with reactionary morality.
5. The second force is intention. Like the force of knowledge, the force of intention can be broken down further into two subcategories. These subcategories are active intention & consequential intention. Active Intention is a desire that arises in the consciousness to engage in a moral conflict through the vehicle of the third force known as action (to be discussed next). To illustrate, say someone reading the daily newspaper gains the knowledge that an abortion clinic is being built in their community. The structured morality of this person dictates that such a happening is unjust and as a result stirs the person to act. Their active intention is to ultimately go down to the abortion clinic and protest its construction. Consequential Intention is a desire that arises in the consciousness as their actions are affecting the moral conflict in question. It is a desire for a particular resolution to the conflict based upon the actions undertaken. To return to the abortion clinic illustration, the person who went down and protested its construction may harbor the consequential intention to see construction completely shut down due to their protest. The force of knowledge serves as a scale between the active intention and the consequential intention. Returning to our abortion clinic illustration yet again, we know that the person is aware that an abortion clinic is to be built in their community. Now let us add that the clinic is estimated to bring in $750,000 worth of revenue in its first year of operation as our moral agent learns through the testimonial of a friend who is aiding in the clinic’s construction. Now with this added knowledge while it does not necessarily derail the moral agent’s active intentions, they certainly would not prove sufficient enough to achieve the consequential intentions. Thus the knowledge forces the moral agent to either progress their active intentions or to regress their consequential intentions.
6. The third force is action. Action is the transcendence of the active intention from the mental to the physical as well as the nullification of consequential intention from the mind to nothingness. The force of action is the first force where temporal objects truly gain a presence in the nature of morality. With the force of intention, while the point of *creation* gets swallowed up by the state of past, they still have a malleable property in the states of present and future. Conversely, the force of action is one that gets swallowed up by past and is *irretrievable* and *unalterable*. The only thing the force of action leaves for the temporal states of present and more significantly future, is the byproduct we have come to know as our fourth and final force known as consequences. Action ultimately is the force where the discussion of morality and its relationship with knowledge can be both quantified and qualified.
7. The fourth and final force is consequence. Consequence is the resolution/completion of moral conflicts/acts. It is the realization of the person’s consciousness not only the effect of their actions, but that through the progression of the four forces they transgressed the boundary between a being merely armed with knowledge to a moral agent who actually *applies* knowledge to yield a certain desired result within their society. It is through the force of consequence that we learn what a moral agent is. A moral agent is someone who utilizes knowledge to affect the external world in such a way as to fundamentally alter it either on a micro or macrocosmic scale. To break down this definition even further: *You must possess & act on knowledge in order to be moral or immoral.* (We go far more in depth with this definition later in the work.) In the next few notes we will discuss the epistemological quandary of what knowledge exactly is but for now the final note on consequence is that it serves as either the chasm or the unifier between reality and the consequential intention the moral agent harbors based upon the outcome.
8. The discussion now becomes how we define knowledge. We will begin by outlining the most well-known stance of what knowledge is: Justified-True-Belief (JTB). We will then introduce the Gettier problem and how at least in the context of moral quandaries, it can be overcome. All of these definitions and any illustrations that accompany them are attributable to the [Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy](http://www.iep.utm.edu/gettier/)
9. Justification- The person’s belief that p needs to be well supported, such as by being based upon some good evidence or reasoning, or perhaps some other kind of rational justification. Otherwise, the belief, even if it is true, may as well be a lucky guess. It would be correct without being knowledge. It would only be something else, something lesser.
10. Truth- The person’s belief that p needs to be true. If it is incorrect instead, then — no matter what else is good or useful about it — it is not knowledge. It would only be something else, something lesser. Admittedly, even when a belief is mistaken it can feel to the believer as if it is true. But in that circumstance the feeling would be mistaken; and so the belief would not be knowledge, no matter how much it might feel to the believer like knowledge.
11. Belief- The person believes that p. This belief might be more or less confident. And it might — but it need not — be manifested in the person’s speech, such as by her saying that p or by her saying that she believes that p. All that is needed, strictly speaking, is for her belief to exist (while possessing at least the two further properties that are about to be listed). (Hetherington). Citation: [Hetherington, Stephen. "Gettier Problems." Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. University of New South Wales, 19 Aug 2005. Web. 1 Jul 2013. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/gettier/>.]
12. The Gettier Problem- George works at a car dealership and is competing with Frank for a promotion. George has a justified belief that Frank will get the job. George also believes that Frank has $20 in his pocket. Therefore George justifiably believes that whoever gets the promotion must have $20 in his pocket. However Frank does *not* get the job and instead George does. Furthermore, George also has $20 in his pocket. Thus George’s justified belief is true but does not appear to be knowledge.
13. I have come to find this structure of knowledge to be too rigid and as a result inaccurate. This is especially true as it relates to our discussion of moral philosophy. What the JTB argument needs is not a fourth component but rather a restructuring of one of the pre-existing components. I have determined that the component that needs restructuring is truth. The truth component states that if the belief for p is not true then it is not knowledge. I assert instead that this is a misconception. With the current framework, knowledge is put forth as something that is infallible and I contend that such a definition suits tautologies more than knowledge. As such, the infallibility put forth in the current definition of knowledge deprives it of any real value.
14. In essence what I am saying is that when knowledge makes itself prone to falsification then it becomes something valuable. This is especially true when discussing moral philosophy because it helps the moral agent make the distinction between right and wrong. So, what is my outline of knowledge? Let us formally break it down.
15. Belief- The same definition as the one put forth by epistemologists. The only addition I would make is that the belief *must* take a risk so as create the potentiality to become knowledge. This is a sentiment borrowed from Karl Popper on the legitimacy of theories. He said that for a theory to have any credibility it must take a risk and make itself prone to falsification. I echo that ideal here in regards to moral knowledge. To return to the Gettier Problem example in point XII, George takes a risk with his belief that Frank will get a job because he has $20 in his pocket. He has set up a causal link between Frank and the promotion
16. Justification- Again, same definition as provided in the original framework by epistemologists. However, because our discussion deals with moral philosophy it should be noted that there exists a hierarchy of justification as it pertains to the nature of the moral conflicts we as moral agents find ourselves in. When we engage in moral conflicts that involve the *other* we must justify our actions to the other even when the knowledge meets the criterion of truth and belief. If we do not justify our actions to the other, it will not matter if we acted upon knowledge that fulfilled the criterion of truth & belief the actions undertaken will be rendered immoral. We will go much further into this hierarchy of justification later in the work. Furthermore, we will discuss what it means to provide “reasonable” justification in the face of moral conflicts.
17. Truth- Unlike the definition put forth by epistemologists, a belief that does not attain truth does not automatically disqualify it from being knowledge. To reiterate, this is especially true when discussing morality. The falsification of belief through consequence is what allows us to form the distinction between right and wrong upon which our moral ideologies are built. To illustrate, Say that a brother walks into his sister’s room and it is a complete mess. She is really stressing about how awful it has gotten but cannot clean it because she has work. The brother forms the belief that he should clean her room for her and justifies this belief through her complaints about how messy it is. When she comes home and finds her room clean and later learns that her brother cleaned it, she is furious. She did not like that he was in her personal space of the house sorting through and organizing her belongings. He was not respecting her right to privacy through his actions. Should we take this revelation as his belief not being knowledge? Clearly the answer is no. For now, he will never clean his sister’s room again at least not before ascertaining her permission. So from this illustration we can see what knowledge truly is. Knowledge is an *awareness* of the distinction or unity between belief and reality. This awareness arises from consequence and in turn will either promote or avert repetition. After all, an insane man does the same thing over and over again and expects a different result. A knowledgeable man does the same thing over and over again when he is aware of the result.
18. This raises a critical question: What if a person does something good through knowledge that has been falsified or something bad when the knowledge was verified? The answer to that is that the question is nonsensical. *A person can only be moral if they act on true knowledge as outlined in our model of JTB regardless of the consequence. Likewise, a person will always be immoral regardless of the consequence if they act on falsified knowledge as outlined in our model of JTB.* To understand why it is of the utmost importance that we wrestle morality away from the forces of action and consequence, let us quickly examine the phenomenon known as *resultant moral luck.*
19. What exactly is resultant moral luck? The best way to address such an inquiry is through an illustration provided by the blog [A Misconception](http://a-misconception.blogspot.com/2010/09/list-of-unsolved-philosophy-problems.html). Two persons behave in a morally culpable way, such as driving carelessly, but end up producing unequal amounts of harm: one strikes a pedestrian and kills him, while the other does not. That one driver caused a death and the other did not is no part of the drivers’ intentional actions; yet most observers would likely ascribe greater blame to the driver who killed.
20. We cannot ascribe moral culpability to forces that the moral agent could not control. As the example stated, that one driver caused a death and the other did not is no part of the drivers’ ***intentional action.*** Again we find ourselves returning to the force of consequential intention. We can make the assumption that the active intention of both of these drivers was to make it to a particular destination. I state this to return to a point made earlier in the work when discussing the force of intention. *The force of knowledge serves as a scale between the active intention and the consequential intention.*
21. So the inquiry that must be posed is what was the knowledge of these two drivers? More significantly, how was this knowledge applied? After all, an activity such as driving epitomizes a moral instance where the hierarchy of justification presents itself. We will analyze the hierarchy and its relation to the two drivers and their two distinct moral problems later in the work.
22. The question then shifts to what exactly does that make the person who was killed by the second driver in the illustration of resultant moral luck?
23. We cannot label this person solely as a victim as it pertains to the second vantage point because a victim can only truly arise when a moral agent has acted on false knowledge which is only one possibility. In the first vantage point they could be posited as a victim for this very reason. In the case of verified knowledge, we will deem the deceased the same way we deem everyone else that influences and interacts with the moral agent in question. The person is merely an actor, fulfilling their role in the playing out of verified knowledge. Now is this to say that actors influenced in such a way are helpless? That any and all actors negatively impacted by verified knowledge or outright victimized in falsified knowledge are powerless? Quite the contrary, for the power lies in the simple axiom of *knowledge begetting more knowledge*. This is one of the core concepts that we will return to later.
24. So as you can see, because of resultant moral luck, we have illustrated that the force of consequence has no bearing on whether or not an action is moral or immoral. The morality of acts is simply derived from the force of knowledge from which the other forces arise. The scale that knowledge serves as between active intention and consequential intention is a means for the moral agent not to determine the morality or immorality of their actions, but rather to yield the greatest result for the moral agent with the knowledge they possess. Because we have wrestled morality away from the forces of actions and consequences and have instead invested it completely in the first force of knowledge, we have thereby negated the quandaries that chaotic variables create such as the one in the illustration of resultant moral luck discussed earlier. Now the morality and immorality of acts becomes whether they were acted upon with falsified or verified knowledge. With all of this now discussed, let us now shift into quickly addressing moral passivity as well as going further into the nature of justification as it pertains to the hierarchy of justifying moral acts as well as the types of justification possible in moral conflicts.
25. The question is certain to be asked: What about those who may possess verified knowledge that could prevent a crisis or put in motion positive reform but opt to not act? Are they moral or immoral? The answer is neither. I refer back to our definition from point VII: You must possess & act on knowledge in order to be moral or immoral. A person is *incapable* of not possessing knowledge otherwise they are not in a state of being but rather are in a state of nothingness. When they possess it but do not act, they are in a state of passivity. Consider if you will the matter of a husband abusing his wife or vise verse. The abused is of the belief that they no longer love their abuser. They justify this internally with how they feel and externally by finding out that the abuser has engaged in infidelity, as well as all the bruises that were left upon them. We find this sentiment to be true for when the abuser goes to be affectionate with the abused, they are repulsed and begin crying or imagining something else. So we know that the abused is armed with verified knowledge so why then do they not feel compelled to act? Why do they choose to remain in a state of passivity instead of crossing the threshold and becoming a moral agent? This question can be answered with the help of two sentiments expressed earlier in the work. Fortunately for us, these sentiments go hand in hand. 1.) A moral agent is someone who utilizes knowledge to affect the external world in such a way as to fundamentally alter it either on a micro or macrocosmic scale. 2.) The force of knowledge serves as a scale between the active intention and the consequential intention.
26. In essence, a person in a state of passivity is not going to alter the external world on any level unless they know that the knowledge they possess balances their active intention and their consequential intention. There are two ways one can emancipate themselves from their own passivity.
27. The first way is by balancing the scale as we discussed earlier. Let’s say that the active intention of the abused is to leave their abuser without them knowing and fleeing to a safe haven somewhere. The consequential intention being that the abused breaks the chains of the abuser and is able to start a new life. However a thought occurs to the abused: If I leave in such a manner, my abuser will be incensed and come after me. They won’t stop pursuing me until I am dead. This revelation forces the abused in question to not alter the essence of their active intention but rather its implementation. The abused may think to go to a police station or get a restraining order and then commit the actual act of leaving their abuser.
28. The second way is through something I call *moral anxiety*. The being in question becomes swallowed up by their passivity and feels a compulsion to act. Needless to say, this anxiety is like claustrophobia. Based on our definition of what it means to be moral (Again, *You must possess & act on knowledge in order to be moral or immoral.*) We then take it one step further and assert that the presence of this anxiety illustrates not only man’s desire to be moral or immoral, but that man in fact ***needs*** to be either moral or immoral. For man is incapable of possessing knowledge and not acting on it. It is through the concept of moral anxiety that we see the true gravity of our constructs of morality at present. Based on the definitions of what it means to be a moral agent as well as how our acts are determined as moral or immoral, as well as the introduction of the concept of moral anxiety ultimately means that to act either morally or immorally means to exist. In a nutshell? *Morality is existence.* Even something as elementary as eating breakfast is a moral act. To illustrate, you eat breakfast every day in a world where global hunger is still prevalent. The knowledge you use to justify this is that if *you* don’t eat the food then the food will get thrown away and thus no one will. This renders you eating food in the midst of world hunger a moral act.
29. This is why states of passivity and potentially anxiety are so important to discuss. In most cases, passivity is only temporary. It could even be argued that passivity can be just as much a strategic maneuver as it can be a state of apprehension. When it progresses to the state of moral anxiety however, it is a crisis of being. When a person is swallowed up by moral anxiety, they feel as if their very existence has ceased despite still being alive. The person is aware of the anxiety that plagues them and they know that they must rebel against it. This rebellion is moral anxiety fully realized. The person rebels not with an awareness of if the knowledge they rebel with will make them moral or immoral, but rather they rebel as a means of reaffirming their existence. To fully examine this point let us return to the abused and the abuser. The passivity of the abused has gone on for six months. The active intention of the abused is to still leave their abuser. However, they are still weary of the consequential intention and lack confidence that the knowledge they possess has balanced the scale between these two intentions. The abused begins to feel choked off, the ensuing anxiety rendering them incapable of thinking, breathing, acting, etc. Their life has become nothing but the dictates and acts of their abuser. They finally snap, without thinking while making dinner one day they fatally stab their abuser in the chest with a butcher knife. Was this act moral? Absolutely. Even more than that though, the abused was rebelling against not only their abuser, but against their own inability to act. It is not about morality for them in that moment though it does come later. In this moment all the victim of this abuse cares about is the sensation of action and subsequently, the affirmation of their existence. For action and affirmation in this case, is one in the same. With this fully addressed, let us now move onto the hierarchy of justification.
30. Before we get into the nature of the hierarchy of justification it is of the utmost importance to understand why this hierarchy was developed. The main assertion and thesis upon which this work is developed is: **A person can only be moral if they act on true knowledge regardless of the consequence. Likewise, a person will always be immoral regardless of the consequence if they act on falsified knowledge.**
31. When we truly ponder this thesis, we can see the dangerous implications it can have when applied to dire moral conflicts. To illustrate, say a rapist is stalking a potential victim and has her cornered in an alleyway. He is of the belief that he will successfully rape her. He justifies this belief that he has her cornered in the alleyway, he is much stronger than she is, and there is no one around within earshot for this act to be heard when perpetrated. His belief becomes truth upon successfully executing the rape. Our thesis applied in a black and white context would find the rapist moral and the woman traumatized. He would have been immoral had she prevented the rape because that would have falsified the knowledge and thus rendered our rapist immoral. However, this reduces our philosophical sketch of morality to complete drivel. When the morality of a moral agent becomes dependent on the action or inaction of the other then we cannot of sound mind say we are still dealing with the morality of that particular agent. The fact is that when your knowledge is being acted on with full awareness of the affect/involvement it will have in regards to the other, it needs to be justified reasonably to them before it can be considered moral. That is why the hierarchy exists, to ensure that if the knowledge of a moral agent is believed to be true, then that belief must be justified to all invested parties to a reasonable degree before the knowledge can be applied and the consequences can be observed. If these actions are not undertaken, then the act is automatically considered immoral regardless of the verification or falsification of the knowledge put forth. So now let us truly begin discussing the hierarchy of justification.
32. How is a moral agent to differentiate between moral conflicts that only require justification of the self and the moral conflicts that involve the hierarchy of justification and subsequently, require that justification be made to the other? The moral agent differentiates between these two types of conflicts through the two conditions that must be met by a moral agent to necessitate the hierarchy of justification in a moral conflict.
33. The first condition a moral agent must meet in order to be required to utilize the hierarchy is that one has to be aware/conscious of the other in the course of their action. Our rapist clearly meets this condition because he has to be aware of the other otherwise he has no victim to speak of.
34. The second condition that must be met is something I deem the proximity principle. Now it should be noted before we proceed any further that proximity comes in two forms when applied to moral problems. These forms are physical proximity and emotional proximity. (All credit for the latter form goes to my sister. I am deeply indebted to her.) We will create a separate illustration that examines emotional proximity but for now all that needs to be known is that our rapist also meets the condition of proximity in its physical form. In its physical form, the proximity principle states that if you share a reasonable proximity with the other than you must justify your act for they logically would be the most immediate ones affected. Our rapist also meets this condition because he is going to rape someone nearby as opposed to a whole other town over.
35. Now let us provide an illustration of a moral conflict that deals with the proximity principle in its emotional form. A young teen falls into a deep depression and forms the belief that everyone around him would be happier if he was dead. With this sentiment swimming ceaselessly in his mind, the boy decides to commit suicide. Now suicide is one of the ultimate acts of self and yet it *still* requires the hierarchy of justification. Firstly, the boy has an awareness of his family and friends while he is committing suicide. After all, it is their happiness that he feels his existence is injuring that makes him pursue this course of action. Furthermore, he loves his family and his friends deeply (For the record he could hate them just as much and that still meets the condition. It is called emotional proximity so ***all***emotions are encapsulated) and loathes feeling like his life has harmed them in any capacity.
36. We can see here that both the rapist and the teenage boy in their respective moral scenarios fulfill the criterion necessary to achieve the hierarchy of justification and thus, the rapist has to justify his belief to his intended victim and the teenage boy is required to justify his belief to his loved ones. Of course the chance of this justification not only occurring but occurring successfully is slim to nonexistent. As such, these acts are rendered immoral regardless of the truth or falsity of the knowledge possessed by the moral agent in question.
37. With the hierarchy of justification now sketched out, we now return to our earlier moral dilemma presented by an instance of resultant moral luck. To reiterate the problem, two persons behave in a morally culpable way, such as driving carelessly, but end up producing unequal amounts of harm: one strikes a pedestrian and kills him, while the other does not. That one driver caused a death and the other did not is no part of the drivers’ intentional actions; yet most observers would likely ascribe greater blame to the driver who killed. We will start with an in-depth analysis of the driver who hit and killed a pedestrian and then later in the work we will analyze the other driver who though he did not kill anyone, still drove recklessly.
38. We know that the first condition for having to exercise the hierarchy of justification is that the moral agent must be conscious of the other as it relates to the act. I assert that our driver meets this condition. Despite his reckless driving that clearly illustrates that the other may not have been at the forefront of his mind we must remember that roads are a *public* service. They are utilized by a multitude of people and our driver does not have a monopoly over them. As such, he would have to be aware that while the roads may be clear, a car or a person could appear any moment either in front of or behind him.
39. The second condition that must be met is the proximity principle. Clearly this one is fulfilled. He hit and killed another person in an area that even when it lacks congestion, will more than likely have activity due to pedestrians, animals, etc. With that sentiment in mind we can clearly see he has fulfilled the second condition and as a result, must exercise the hierarchy to justify to the other his reckless driving to reach a destination. Our driver however faces a very glaring problem. The other who they have to justify their actions to, died as a result of the driver’s reckless behavior. Thus, the act is considered immoral for our driver never justified his actions to the other who was the most immediately affected. Though our driver is in a state of despair upon the revelation that their false knowledge cost another their life, our driver has the power to make moral strength arise from this abyss of which they now find themselves engulfed. This moral strength is known as redemption. How will our driver seize this redemption, this moral power while in an immoral state? The answer to that is a phenomenon known as Transference.
40. Transference occurs when a moral problem is such that the other most immediately affected by the act of a moral agent due to certain circumstances, is rendered incapable of receiving and weighing the justification of the moral agent and thus is unable to determine whether the moral agent is behaving on verified or falsified knowledge. To illustrate, let us assume that our driver was driving recklessly on the road because their daughter called them and told them their mother came down suddenly with a violent illness such as coughing up blood. Swallowed up by emotional turmoil and panic our driver speeds home as quickly as possible completely inconsiderate of their present environment. Because of this they hit and killa person. Now we already stated in our previous points that our driver fulfilled the criterion necessary in order to be required to exercise the hierarchy of justification. The driver was aware of the other while driving because he is on a road which is a public service and therefore even if only subconsciously, it can be assumed he knew of the presence of the other. Furthermore, the driver fulfilled the proximity principle because the person they hit was in the same general area as they were upon the occurrence of the accident. Therefore, our driver would have to justify to this person why they were driving so reckless to a reasonable degree which we will discuss in the next point. The person then may either say that the justification proved insufficient and press charges, rendering their act immoral, or tell them that their justification was quite compelling and to just get to his wife thus making his action moral. However, as we have already illustrated, this exchange is not able to occur due to the death of the person hit. As we also already asserted, this result has rendered our driver immoral because he did not justify to the other his actions and instead ended up killing them. So it is important to note that *Transference cannot convert an immoral act into a moral one. For we know that actions are irretrievable and once knowledge has been transmuted into action, it attains a static nature and thus cannot revert back to being pure knowledge. Transference is a construct of redemption should a moral agent choose to exercise it. A chance for, as we said, moral strength to arise from an abyss of immoral nature thus making our moral agent all the more powerful.* With that in mind the obvious as well as critical question becomes: What exactly happens during Transference? We already have established how this phenomenon occurs, but now we begin the dissection of the phenomenon itself. Transference sees justification in a moral problem shift over to those whom the other shares the greatest emotional proximity. Returning to our vehicular incident to illustrate this, we see that the person whom our driver had to justify their behavior to has been killed. Our driver, feeling distraught over everything happening around them yearns to resolve this moral problem and regain balance within themselves as a moral agent. They realize that Transference is the only conceivable medium upon which to achieve such goals and as a result they set out to find the parents of the victim to divulge the details of the night’s events and to hopefully attain redemption. Now that we have outlined both the foundation for Transference, as well as how the phenomenon itself is defined, we may now progress to not only defining what reasonable justification is which will also boil down the very nature of morality, but afterwards begin our analysis of the second driver who did not take a life, but still drove recklessly. Then we will outline the exceptions or “blind spots” that exist in the hierarchy of justification.
41. The question before us presently is what constitutes as reasonable justification when reconciling moral problems with the self as well as with the other in instances that bring forth the hierarchy of justification and at times Transference? *The answer is the external and more significantly, the empirical.* This ultimately, should be what every moral agent strives for when calibrating their moral compasses or erecting their moral ideologies. *Morality is not and indeed should never be an emotive construct beyond the exercising of emotional proximity. For morality to have any kind of a value to moral agents and subsequently the societies in which they reside, the actions undertaken by moral agents must be something of a quantified and qualified nature.* So with this sentiment in mind, what would reasonable justification be in our driver scenario? Well firstly, upon our driver relaying everything to the parents the body language and mannerisms of the driver is a sufficient starting point. However, their testimony as it pertains to our definition has no merit until backed by external and empirical evidence. This would include the scene of the accident, a transcript of the call between the driver and their daughter, actual proof of the wife’s ailment, etc. These things are all capable of being qualified or quantified and as a result, these things attain value as evidence to support the justification of the moral agent in question. It is important that we completely incinerate any constructs of morality that deal with the emotive (Again outside of emotional proximity.) or the internal (When I say this I mean things like memory, opinions, etc.) For a truly objective moral standard to be created we must negate such things and start dealing with the rational, empirical, factual, and external as it relates to morality and moral actions. Knowledge is the basis of all things and it is through that basis that objective morality can shine through.
42. Now that the framework for reasonable justification has been put forth in regards to the driver who ended up taking a life with his recklessness, let us now shift our investigation to the driver who did not take a life but still drove recklessly. We will begin this analysis the same way we did the previous one and that is examining this moral problem as it relates to the hierarchy of justification.
43. The first requirement of the hierarchy of justification is the presence of awareness/consciousness of the other in your action. As we have already stated with the driver who hit and killed a person, this requirement is met. We must remember that things such as roads are *public* transportation and as such are utilized by countless other drivers. Therefore awareness would certainly be present for our driver unless they fulfilled one of our “blind spots” which will be discussed later.
44. The second requirement of the hierarchy of justification is the proximity principle. As previously stated, the proximity principle (particularly the physical construct of this principle) states that if you share a reasonable proximity with the other than you must justify your act for they logically would be the most immediate ones affected. Again just like our previous driver, our second driver meets this condition. Even if our driver drove recklessly in a seemingly vacant rode, we cannot discard the notion that the driver is utilizing public transportation and thus the *possibility* of the presence of the other is always present. Thus, we can proclaim this requirement as fulfilled.
45. So we have once again sketched out our hierarchy of justification and see that our second driver much like the first has fulfilled both requirements present. As such, the second driver will have to justify his reckless driving to the other. We know that our driver will not do this, and thus his act can be rendered immoral. However, it is with the second driver that two very important inquiries arise. 1.) What about “normal” drivers? Clearly the reasons we have given for why the two drivers in our analysis meet the criterion for the hierarchy could very easily apply to every other driver on the road. 2.) Can our second driver redeem himself as did our other driver?
46. In regards to the first inquiry the answer to it could be an essay in itself but the succinct answer is something known as *collective consent.* When we imagine a society, we picture a social contract of sorts. A contract where all participants agree to certain terms and regulations in the shared interest of forming a society Now of course, a concept such as collective consent is so broad as to warrant its own commentary in regards to defining the collective, the just or unjust nature of said laws, the nature of consent, etc. For this essay however, let us just assert that the consent to such traffic laws is meant by the collective with no issue. When a driver complies with these laws that serves as their justification to the other because those laws were agree to by the collective in either an express or implied manner. It is when a driver deviates from the collective consent that justification is warranted. Therefore in the case of “normal” drivers while they meet the criterion for the hierarchy of justification, they are already exercising it through collective consent.
47. Now for the second inquiry. Can our driver who drove recklessly redeem his immoral behavior? The answer to that is certainly. In fact, the second driver while equally immoral to the first based upon our preceding assertions also has a stronger foundation for redemption compared to the first driver. The stronger foundation can ultimately be attributed to an easier path to redemption. Remember, our first driver killed another person and therefore his redemption was dependent upon the phenomenon of transference. For our second driver to redeem himself there are two potential avenues for him to utilize. The first avenue reveals itself when the police officer stops the driver for his reckless driving. Now our driver may either beat the charges in court, or be penalized and have to endure the punishment incurred upon him. In the case of the former, we can hope our driver has an appreciation for escaping the judicial abyss and exercises greater caution and consideration for the other going forward thus deriving empowerment from the experience. If it is the latter, then our driver must endure being an inhabitant of the abyss and pay his debt to society for violating the contract constructed by the collective consent of the particular society our driver finds themselves in. Now before I proceed any further, it must be stated that of course the question of whether or not the contract or the laws therein are just or not is present, but seeing as how this is an essay on moral philosophy and not political we will assume the laws are just. So, our second driver pays their debt to society and upon being released, has a deeper appreciation for the collective consent of the other, as well coming out as a stronger moral agent and exhibits that strength in acts going forward.
48. Now the second avenue entertains the occurrence that *no cop* has stopped our driver. Thus they reach their destination and their reckless driving goes unpunished yet is still immoral for violating the collective consent that was established in the preceding points. What is our driver to do? Well, he makes moral strength arise from his immoral act. Just as our first driver did when they used transference in their moral problem. This is the mark of a truly ascended moral agent. The ability to *make moral strength/acts arise from an immoral foundation.* In the case of our first driver, they behaved immorally when they hit and killed another person. However, they found strength in this moral abyss when they confronted it head on through transference. Though the act was still immoral, our driver empowered themselves as a moral agent by cultivating moral strength from the act when they faced the living in the form of the victim’s parents. How can our second driver find power from an immoral situation such as driving recklessly? Well the most obvious ways are either confessing the recklessness to the other, or should that not be a viable option for our driver, they can always maximize their moral potential once at their destination. Say our driver drove recklessly so that they could get to work on time. They could make moral strength arise from their immoral act by having a very productive day at work. Help increase revenue at the business, be a leader and set a good example for their coworkers, put in extra hours and establish a line of communication with the boss, etc.
49. The main point to take away from these assertions which will be expounded upon more at the end of the essay when I outline the *Moraliter Eximium* is that while it is not possible to make an immoral act a moral one itself, the moral agent has the power to close the abyss that they themselves created. To ensure that an immoral act does not beget more immoral acts. On the contrary, the truly ascended moral agent makes moral strength and moral acts as we have defined them arise from a singular immoral point. It is of critical importance that we do not forget the assertions that *morality is existence* & *morality is action*. We must not forget them for the essence of these assertions is that man is free. The freewill of man is what makes deriving moral strength from the immoral abyss or the deeper excursion into it possible. Therefore, it should never be an excuse for man to say that they are not capable of changing their immoral nature nor should it ever be a cause for excessive pride when a man is morally strong. Both are simply mere courses of action that interchange the roles of realization and negation.
50. Now that all of this has been outlined and expounded upon we can begin discussing the exceptions or as I like to deem them “blind spots” of the hierarchy of justification. There are 3 main exceptions to cover. Let us begin with the first one which we will deem: *The Emotive Veil.*
51. The Emotive Veil presents itself when someone refuses to acknowledge the strong empirical evidence and reasoning brought forth by a moral agent in the midst of a moral problem and opts instead to act emotionally. An illustration of this would be a woman that shoots an attacker coming at her with a knife and subsequently kills him. Now the mother of the attacker is seething and utterly despises the woman who shot her son. Despite the fact that his fingerprints were proven to be on the knife, there was clear evidence that her son had forcefully broken into the woman’s home in order to perpetrate the attack, and that the woman’s life was in lethal jeopardy, the mother still harbors feelings of hatred and repulsion when she gazes upon her son’s killer. Such blatant disregard for the evidence that is existent in this moral dilemma by the mother should not mean that the woman’s morality as a moral agent should be tarnished. Quite the contrary, if one cannot combat empiricism that provides justification for the opposing side with empiricism that provides justification for their own side and instead rely on emotional reasoning and the “Emotive Veil”, then it is they who become immoral for indulging in her emotions. As it pertains to our illustration, the mother is the one behaving immorally and not the woman who shot her son because she refuses to embrace the evidence before her and justifies such refusal and the subsequent actions that arise from it on false knowledge: *Emotional knowledge*.
52. *Immediate Consequence-* There are certain moral quandaries that moral agents can be expected to encounter in which the consequences of said quandaries are imminent. Because of this, these moral problems are one where *Justification is preceded by Ramification.* To give an example of a moral problem that perfectly embodies the sentiments of immediate consequence, imagine a serial killer who breaks into somebody’s home with the full intention to commit a murder. The intended victim deduces this fact by examining that the killer is in possession of a pistol, duct tape, and some rope. Now in this situation, it cannot be expected by any reasonable person for the intended victim to provide justification to the serial killer as it pertains to using self-defense against them. When a moral agent knows that they have been rendered incapable of providing justification for their actions due to the event of immediate consequence they simply react to the knowledge that is present to them. This reaction, is a direct response to the other whom the moral agent’s actions most immediately affect (In this case that would be the serial killer) not providing justification for their actions first. *When such an event transpires, the other has committed the forfeiture of being owed justification. Thus, the moral agent preserves their morality.* Now, what is important to note is that the moral agent themselves is not always the center of problems dealing with immediate consequence. People trapped in a fire, someone about to be hit by a bus, or a group of people dying of hunger at the peak of winter are also illustrations of people dealing with immediate consequence. Where the moral issue arises is the fact that the moral agent is standing on the outside looking in and with such limited knowledge, must act in the midst of the problem before the consequence has rendered itself. This sentiment is the very essence of reactionary morality which we will discuss later.
53. *Cognitive Disparity*- This is perhaps the most controversial “blind spot” that exists in regards to the hierarchy of justification. Cognitive disparity is when a moral agent and the other whom their actions affect, share a significant difference in cognition and cognitive development. This disparity in cognition makes it impossible for the moral agent to justify their actions to the other. Because the moral agent cannot provide justification of their actions to the other due to this disparity, the moral agent is deemed immoral upon perpetration of these acts. It is because of the existence of cognitive disparity that acts such as child & elderly abuse, pedophilia, abortion, and the killing of animals are considered immoral. Now, in the case of abortion and the killing of animals I shall refer back to the point I made being that the mark of a truly ascended moral agent was the ability to make moral strength/acts arise from an immoral foundation. Though the killing of fetuses and animals is immoral, the moral agent perpetrating them can turn these immoral acts into a source of moral power from which to make moral acts arise. In particular, it is the act of abortion which I will lend a critical examination. Imagine if you will a young woman at the age of 19 who has just been impregnated by her boyfriend of eight months. This young woman is currently attending Cornell University in New York and is majoring in Mechanical Engineering. When the revelation of this pregnancy is made to this young woman, she is mortified. She already is burdened by the prospect of the student loan debt she will have to pay off when she gets out of college. Her boyfriend, though in love with her, is in no way able nor does he even possess the desire to take care of a child. If they would raise it, she would find herself a financial slave to the institutions of parenthood and Academia and may not even be able to pursue a worthwhile career with her major. It is here that our moral agent is at a crossroads: Does she let the fetus develop into a child and then forfeit it to the nearest adoption agency? Or does she abort it early on and go about her life? Our moral agent leans towards adoption but realizes that such an avenue of action would mean the relinquishing of control. Her child would be in the hands of another family which makes our moral agent lament such a choice. She laments this choice because however small, the possibility exists that the family with which her child would end up would be one of an abusive, callous, and all around brutal nature. Such prolonged agony, certainly would prove far worse than aborting the child before it was fully developed. With that sentiment in mind the moral agent comes to the resolution of aborting the child. Now we arrive at the initial inquiry of where is there moral power to be drawn from this act? The source of moral power for this young woman in the wake of her abortion is its very aftermath. She resumes her schooling at Cornell and is excelling in her studies. Many years later she is using her degree to help developing countries achieve technological advancements that better their overall well-being socially, morally, and economically speaking. It is through this illustration that I promote another tenet as it relates to morality. *Morality is not about equivalency between acts but rather morality is about the exhibition of knowledge and power in such a way so as to make a moral agent as morally strong as possible.* There is no objective means in which to determine what actions our moral agent should undertake in the wake of her abortion so as to achieve equivalency between those acts and the act of killing a fetus. Because of this, though the abortion in itself was immoral, our moral agent should not become enslaved by the ideal of atonement. Rather, she should draw strength from the experience and achieve and promote moral soundness through her existence henceforth. She knew that she took a life and seized all the power that such an act can provide and used that and the knowledge behind it to become an even stronger moral agent than she was at the time of conception. By knowing that she killed a fetus just so her life could remain uninhibited, our moral agent realizes that she has only widened the mouth of the abyss that attempts to swallow her and thus scratches and claws out so as to gaze into the blackness of it knowing she has ascended morally. Now that we have established the blind spots of the hierarchy of justification let us now discuss the idea of knowledge begetting more knowledge.
54. If you recall I touched upon the idea of knowledge begetting more knowledge earlier in the essay when I wrote: **Now is this to say that actors influenced in such a way are helpless? That any and all actors negatively impacted by verified knowledge or outright victimized in falsified knowledge are powerless? Quite the contrary, for the power lies in the simple axiom of knowledge begetting more knowledge.** The simplest explanation of knowledge begetting more knowledge would be the act of rape. An act that epitomizes victimization and false knowledge. When a rapist or anyone for that matter, resorts to coercion and the imposition of their will upon another to achieve a certain end they have, as I stated when discussing Immediate Danger, they have forfeited having to be owed justification for any acts that the other might perpetrate upon them. When discussing morality it must be remembered that the truly ascended moral agent does not resort to coercion or barbarism to justify their acts to others or to attain moral power. The strong moral agent always engages with the other on a rational, empirical, and all around intellectual plane. They interact with each other as traders of knowledge. The rapist is the antithesis of morality as we have defined it and it is that very knowledge that they impart to the one they have raped. The victim thinks to themselves: *This person defiled me, this person objectified me, and this person dehumanized me.* When this knowledge has taken siege of the consciousness of the other the process of knowledge begetting knowledge begins. For when that knowledge is grasped, the victim then thinks to themselves: *I can pursue legal action against this person and see him rot.* Or they may think to themselves *because this person provided no justification to me, I owe them no justification and because of that I can harm them.* The fact is, due to the framework of morality we have laid forth, our moral agent/victim is absolutely right. Our moral agent could buy a gun and kill her rapist and be completely justified and retain moral soundness. However, the knowledge begetting more knowledge does not stop there. Entertaining the prospect that our moral agent has gunned down their rapist, the knowledge then sinks in that they have committed a felony of their own much like the rapist with their act. In essence, they are now a criminal in the eyes of the State. It is at this point that I want to articulate two points regarding moral agents, their conundrums, and action as the vehicle of resolution. The first point is that there exists a line of distinction between morality and the law. What is sometimes moral is not always legal and what is legal is not always moral. The State and its relationship with morality and moral agency could in itself be an entirely separate commentary but for now, know that even with the apprehension of our moral agent and their subsequent labeling as a felon and a criminal, that they have still preserved their moral strength. The second point is that *no moral quandary and the actions that arise from it are never entirely closed off or isolated. The knowledge that began the chain and fueled the links of action feeds off of itself. Therefore, the process of knowledge begetting more knowledge is cyclical in nature.* Returning to our illustration of the rape victim turned vigilante, we see that the knowledge of our moral agent is feeding off of itself. I will sketch this out by way of a diagram.

The chain goes on and on and even includes the knowledge of other moral agents involved. People like the rapist’s family, the family of the victim turned murderer, the judge presiding over the case, etc. all contribute to what we call the base of knowledge that set this all in motion. The base being that the rapist knew they could impose their will upon their intended victim. So we have seen an example of knowledge begetting more knowledge with a knowledge base of falsified knowledge, what about one of verified knowledge where people are still negatively affected and wish to pursue action? For this we shall refer back to the very beginning of this essay when active intention was being discussed. The example used during this discussion was a woman who harbored the intention of stopping an abortion clinic from being built into her community. Now, we know that the clinic was ultimately built because it was projected that the clinic would generate $750,000 worth of revenue during its first year of operation. The clinic does end up generating $750,000 and is hailed as a success to the community. Despite these facts however, the woman remains both unsatisfied and undeterred in her goal of seeing the demolition of the clinic. She begins doing research on the clinic and five months later, uncovers evidence that the clinic donates aborted fetal cells to the soda company Pepsi in secrecy who used the cells for flavor testing (This was actually a legitimate occurrence that took place last year but was later stopped. You can read about it [here](http://www.lifenews.com/2012/04/30/pepsi-stops-using-aborted-fetal-cell-lines-to-test-flavors/).). This unearthing of evidence proves most empowering to the woman’s cause. She brings her findings before a federal court which then rules to see the clinic torn down. With no abortion clinic in the community, revenue is lost, pregnancies remain steady, and adoption is rising. So despite the fact that the clinic was built on a base of verified knowledge, because the woman was against abortion she felt negatively affected by its presence. Thus she combated it with verified knowledge of her own. Again, here is a diagram to sketch out the chain of events.

We can see here much like with the case of the rapist and the victim turned murderer, that the base of knowledge being one woman’s awareness of an abortion clinic being constructed begot a chain of knowledge and subsequently actions that goes on and on. It is made apparent in both of the cases that we have illustrated that the existence of power is also cyclical in its nature. In our example of the rapist and the victim, the rapist had the power to act immorally and did so through coercive behavior. The victim had the power to respond morally with two given avenues of force or going through the appropriate societal channels. She opted for the power of force which then instilled power in the State to detain her as a criminal and try her for murder. This act then empowered her society in the form of a jury to ultimately decide her fate. It is through this infinite dance between knowledge, power, existence, and action that morality will always have a presence in human society. One element cannot conceivably exist without the other. Thus, since all of these elements come together to create morality, it can be deduced that one *cannot exile morality from their consciousness or from society For to exile morality, would mean to exile all of these elements would be to reduce human life and all of its machinations to nothingness.* I state this as a means of retort against those of an amoralist position. To be amoral means to never possess knowledge. To be amoral means to never act. To be amoral is to never possess power in any form. Finally, to be amoral is to not exist. With these feelings addressed we may now begin our commentary on structured & reactionary Morality.

1. Structured morality deals with systematic knowledge. We defined both of these constructs at the beginning of the essay as follows: “Systematic knowledge is knowledge that has molded our consciousness. Our society, our education, our relationships, etc. are all sources of systematic knowledge. Systematic knowledge is associated with structured morality because structured morality deals with moral acts and issues that the moral agent has come to believe through systematic knowledge to be just or unjust. Illustrations of structured morality would be one’s stance on gay marriage, aiding the impoverished, Second Amendment rights, etc.” What is important to note when discussing structured morality as well as systematic knowledge is that both of these constructs are transformational in their nature. That is to say, that the ideologies a person may adopt as well as the values a particular society may exalt change over time due to the introduction of new verified knowledge or the revelation of false knowledge. To illustrate, a person may be of the belief that strict gun control is a necessity in order to attain a healthy society. This person strengthens their position by citing that [according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics](http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?iid=4616&ty=pbdetail), from 1993 to 2011; about 70% to 80% of firearm homicides and 90% of nonfatal firearm victimizations were committed with a handgun. However, the person changes their position when a new study is released showing that from 2007 to 2011; the total number of self-protective behaviors involving a firearm by victims of attempted or completed violent crimes or property crimes totaled [338,700](http://takingnote.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/04/15/defensive-gun-use/?_r=0). What must be grasped about structured morality is that a stance is only immoral if it is propped up by falsified knowledge. You can be *against* gun ownership so long as you are dealing with strong empirical data. The quandary that both individuals and their respective societies face is what position in a particular moral issue has the more compelling empirical evidence. In the end, so long as said societies are dealing with verified knowledge in respect to the issue, it ultimately comes down to a value judgment.
2. To begin the discussion of reactionary morality I am going to put forth what I deem the “Kino Problem” which was inspired by an episode in the anime Kino’s Journey. The Kino Problem is as follows: *Kino is riding her motorcycle in an isolated area in the midst of winter. While on her expedition Kino encounters a band of men suffering from starvation, appearing greatly fatigued, and being on the verge of death itself. Kino, feeling deeply the plight of the men before her, decides to grant them shelter in her tent as well as share her food supply with them as well as kill wild rabbits for additional sustenance. The men appear very grateful to Kino and explain to her that their truck was traveling through this area a few days ago and that the inclement weather had rendered them unable to go any further. They have been struggling to survive ever since. They tell Kino that thanks to her, they will now be able to endure the harsh weather and resume their travels when the weather breaks. A few days later that time arrives and as the men are about to leave they call Kino over to thank her. In reality, the men hold Kino at gunpoint and tell her to get in the back of the truck. It is then revealed by the men that their occupation was that of the sex trade and human trafficking. They were traveling with girls in the back of the truck on the way to make a potential sale when they got caught in the violent weather. The harsh conditions the men found themselves in made them resort to cannibalism as they ate the women in the back of the truck as means of survival. In the end Kino ends up averting and killing her captors as she is left to wonder whether or not she did the right thing.*
3. We too are left with this same inquiry. Did Kino do the right thing by saving that band of men? Or should she have left them to die and continue on her journey undeterred by their dilemma? The answer is she would have been morally correct either way because she was dealing with limited knowledge. All Kino truly knew as it relates to our scenario was that the weather was volatile, a band of men got caught up in it, and they are on the verge of death. Kino is completely ignorant to the nature and the very essence of these men and the problem before her has rendered her incapable of becoming enlightened on these very subjects. All Kino can do is react. To make a decision based on knowledge that she knows to be true and to regard as a moot point the knowledge she does not possess. It is through reactionary morality that we may establish the following sentiment as truth as it relates to moral agents and the quandaries they inherit as a society. *The more knowledge a moral agent possesses, the greater the moral responsibility they shoulder in a particular society.* Say someone was traveling with Kino when she discovered this band of men and this person recognized them. This person knew the nature of these men and knew or at least could logically deduce, why they along with their truck had become captive to the harshness of the winter. This person has a greater moral responsibility than Kino to decide the fate of this band of men. That said, a person may possess more knowledge than another in a given moral quandary only for that knowledge to later be proven false. In such a case that person would be deemed immoral for acting on falsified knowledge.In the end, when in scenarios dealing with reactionary morality, it is always better to act upon what you know with certainty than what exists merely as possibility.
4. The notion of greater knowledge translating into greater moral responsibility is even more apparent when dealing with structured morality. You see, because we have defined morality as existence in itself, then it logically follows that every aspect of existence is, in one form or another, a moral problem to be dealt with. What that leaves us with as a society is a form of decay I deem *Moral Specialization*. Moral specialization is just as it sounds. It is the idea that certain moral agents possess greater capability to deal with certain moral problems than others. To illustrate, the economists are tasked with resolving the moral problems that arise within an economy. Politicians are tasked with the moral problems that are prevalent during their period of leadership. Gun control, education, marriage rights, etc. The problem of moral specialization is two-fold. Firstly, we trust these moral agents to always act upon verified knowledge consistently as well as to make moral strength arise when having acted upon falsified knowledge. Secondly, moral specialization creates the potentiality for a monopolization of power. Remember, power as we have posited it in this essay is essential to the moral agent and their respective actions. If certain pathways to said power have been cut off to particular moral agents, then what results is an overall weakening of the moral strength of the society. With all of this in mind, I shall now begin the final descent of our discussion of morality. The discussion of the *Moraliter Eximium*.
5. So what exactly is the Moraliter Eximium? The Moraliter Eximium is the highest ascension of moral strength possible for a moral agent to attain. The Moraliter Eximium is a moral agent who acts upon verified knowledge more than falsified knowledge. When the Moraliter Eximium falters and acts upon falsified knowledge however, they exercise all of their power to make moral strength arise from an immoral foundation. The Moraliter Eximium always bears in mind those who their knowledge and its potential applications most immediately affects before they act and they adhere to the hierarchy of justification. Unless the other falls into the category of being coercive in their nature or they meet one of the blind spots of the hierarchy, then it is the job of the Moraliter Eximium to rigorously amass the evidence necessary to justify their actions to the other before mobilizing so as to preserve their moral strength. The Moraliter Eximium is one who recognizes morality not as a product of emotion but as a product of knowledge & empiricism. With this sentiment taking firm siege of the consciousness of the Moraliter Eximium, they acquire as much power as conceivably possible and exercise it with a mind sound with verified knowledge so as to promote moral goodness. They segregate this knowledge with their egoism for ego much like emotion, has no place when committing or dissecting moral acts. The Moraliter Eximium is a watchdog and castigator of moral specialization. They do not trust the few with the power meant to solve the moral plights of the many. For since such plights affect everyone, they must be approached and engaged by everyone. Finally we come to the most significant aspect of the Eximium Moraliter. The Eximium Moraliter recognizes the essence of an objective morality. The objectivity in morality rests upon all positions for all moral quandaries being supported by verified knowledge. That is to say, so long as a position is soundly constructed and supported such as the gun control debate that was illustrated earlier, then it does not matter what side of the argument you are on because the evidence is strong. Therefore, to put it succinctly, objective morality is achieved when all moral quandaries are simplified down to the very evidence of their positions and the value judgments made are ones not of right and wrong per say, but of which position contains the stronger set of evidence in the eyes of the moral agent. I will conclude by illustrating these sentiments through the gun statistics discussed earlier. For the pro-gun control moral agent: from 1993 to 2011; about 70% to 80% of firearm homicides and 90% of nonfatal firearm victimizations were committed with a handgun. For the anti-gun control moral agent: from 2007 to 2011; the total number of self-protective behaviors involving a firearm by victims of attempted or completed violent crimes or property crimes totaled 338,700. Both positions are backed up by evidence that is capable of being tested. In the event that both statistics prove true we are not left with right and wrong but *right and right*. In the end, objective morality is ultimately *the existence of* *objective evidence and the rendering of subjective value judgments.* When harmony is achieved between these two things, only then will the potentiality for an objective moral system and subsequently, the Moraliter Eximium, be created.