First off, I would like to take an extra second to define clearly what I mean by experience based and individual based systems. Individual based moralities would look something like ideal communism—they care equally for each individual, no matter their age, gender, or achievements. Rights and privileges are distributed equally to each individual. On the other hand, an experience based morality does not care about individuals or their treatment. Kids, especially babies, have less rights because they experience less (also because keeping them alive allows them to have <u>more possibly good experiences</u> later on, but I'd argue it's a mix of these causes). Animals have *much* less importance because their experiences are (seemingly) much less vivid than our own, with no possibility for change; animal rights activists often point to the experience-implicating actions of many "higher" species to argue that they should be saved. No one points to the delicacy of their body functions. (Arguing about the delicacy of the environment as a whole is still probably assuming morality is experience based, as a destroyed environment will spell our end as well.) Such moralities, implicitly assumed almost universally, can produce many radically different sets of rules: the golden rule, capitalism, fascism, communism, and more can all be justified in such a way, just by making different arguments. But they can all start from the same experience-centered basis.

Given these definitions, moral systems may still appear biased, even relative to experience. Most of this strangeness occurs around power. For instance, kings are often given moral rights others don't have. I would argue that this still fits, even beyond the frequent notion that kings are descended from God (which I would assume implies that they have heightened consciousness compared to the rest of us).

I admit that there are many morals made to reinforce the political system, morals that refer specifically to kings, abiding by laws of the land, or something similar. However, I believe these rules still aim to improve experience, albeit indirectly. They are simply assuming that the specified government is the best one possible, and that the prescribed rules will preserve this form of government. Consider a "communist" morality, which might specify that it is immoral to own anything personal. I believe that such a rule would have been derived by something like the following chain of logic:

A) All people are conscious and experience the world equally.

B) The best possible world (and therefore most moral) is the one which maximizes all of these experiences.

C) A lack of material resources can degrade one's life experience.

D) To ensure that no one is lacking for materials, the best strategy would be to share all of the materials equally (and therefore by experience).

E) To ensure that all of the materials are shared, no one can be allowed to keep anything for themselves beyond their own use of it.

F) Therefore, ownership, which represents this very action, must be immoral.

This chain of logic is how I think someone might explain this communist moral rule; as one derived somewhat indirectly from trying to maximize experiences in the world. Admittedly, I would tend to disagree with many of these logical jumps; this is just a rough sketch of what someone could believe, and how they could derive it from a basis of experience. Similarly for kings, or any other political morality; the difference in logic simply occurs when someone tries to derive "logically" the best strategy for "maximizing" experience (differences also appear when morality-makers ascribe different experiences to different individuals, which can determine how slaves, women, children, or different races are treated).

I hope that with this more in-depth explanation, you can understand me better when I assert that nearly all moralities at least attempt to be based on maximizing experience across the world—it's where people go from there that leads to differences, but this assumption is very rarely questioned.