

# kkke

*by* Hwh Jjw

---

**Submission date:** 19-May-2021 10:18AM (UTC+0300)

**Submission ID:** 1589377118

**File name:** tuation\_ethics\_provides\_the\_best\_approach\_to\_sexual\_ethics..docx (22.01K)

**Word count:** 1733

**Character count:** 9109

3  
Student's Name

Institutional Affiliation

Course

Instructor's Name

Date

**Situation Ethics and Sex**

When focusing on sex and issues that concern sex situations, ethics does not bring the rigidness of natural law or the Kantian approach. Therefore, situation ethics recognizes that even with rules existing, they are still secure compared to love and are good. This can be stated as even if rules can be broken in some circumstances to do something that one loves the most, the drive to do the most loving thing cannot be. In this essay, we will therefore evaluate situation ethics as the best approach to sexual ethics.

Sexual orientation differs from the question of what is considered as having sex. Sex is considered intercourse. However, sex begs the question of the essential nature of an orgasm in defining sex. When it does not involve manual genital stimulation to attain orgasm, it is still considered sex (Frank, Lily, and Sven Nyholm, 323). The question also questions if coitus defines sex, then does rape count as one who engaged in sex.

The definitive measure people use to report on their sex engagement is a complex notion reencountered from experiences a perception. The use of coitus to define sex is then irrelevant, for homosexual sex would be regarded impossible and might be considered impulsive and false (Frank, Lily, and Sven Nyholm, 323). One might be asked about having had sex and provide an answer based on dependable variables that one seems to consider as having sex and what it means to them. One should reconsider their accounts of having sex and their definition of sex.

Occasionally one might consider as not having had sex after failure to encounter an orgasm.

Such considerations are worth taking notes in the study of situation ethics and sex.

The <sup>1</sup>introduction to situation ethics is the new morality Joseph Fletcher was able to enhance his theory during the western world dramatic transformation and called it an ethical non-system. At this time, the nature of sexual relations that were shocking had begun to come out, such as homosexuality. Cases of divorce had now begun to be a norm, and it was no longer perceived shameful. Couples no longer got married but started living together without marriage. There was the introduction of contraceptive pills, which meant that couples could now engage in sex without the fear of women becoming pregnant. In situation ethics, Agape is the key phrase that entails unconditional love. In a situation where one is faced with a decision to do either right or wrong, the individual should be able to do what he/she loves the most or considerate thing or reverent thing. Therefore, Agape cannot be compared to Eros, a sexual need, or philosophy, which is brotherly love. Agape, therefore, enhances equal treatment for everyone who acts as a result of love.

Joseph Fletcher's book caused a firestorm in the period between 1905 and 1991. The book legitimized <sup>1</sup>general post-war dissatisfaction with authority. However, <sup>1</sup>Fletcher's work is not respected in philosophy but is argued. Through <sup>1</sup>religious terms such as Agape, Fletcher cites famous theologians such as Bultmann, who stated that <sup>1</sup>central ideas could not rely on the truth of a particular religion, that is, faith. <sup>1</sup>This ethical non-system situation and an example of a Bible story are Jesus healing an emaciated hand while in the Jewish temple. This act to us is agape, which portrays Jesus' love for all and unconditional love, but Pharisees condemned this act since it was on a Sabbath and Jewish law is against working on the Sabbath day.

Fletcher, therefore, demonstrated that acts could be morally accepted even if they go against the moral laws. Fletcher stated that Jesus' act is morally accepted even though it is against the Jewish law since Jesus acted to bring out his unconditional love in the right way (Sugimoto, Cassidy, *et al.*, 559).

There are two unappealing views in ethics. These are legalism and antinomianism, and situationism is the appealing view. In legalism, one is subjected to blindly follow moral values without being sensitive to the situation in between (Sugimoto, Cassidy, *et al.*, 559). On the other hand, antinomianism is structured such that an agent can do whatever he wishes in a situation. This agent is subjected to his/her belief whether something is right. This agent is therefore led by conscience and not laws or morals. Situationism is, therefore, the most appealing since it is subjected to the unconditional love of something, whether it is morally wrong or right.

In utilitarianism, there is no ruling out of a particular act. This means that if utilitarianism is right, we cannot say that a particular sex act is wrong. Accepting premarital sex, masturbation, and even homosexuality can be morally accepted depending on one's situation and bringing out pleasure rather than not doing the act.

Sex brings out pleasure, but utilitarianism claims that having sex is good. Therefore, even rape is good even if it brings out pleasure to the rapist but overall is bad since it has severe unhappiness to the victim and relatives, and society (Cresti *et al.*, 559). In utilitarianism, we are therefore left to perceive that even though sex is good, there are also things that bring about overall happiness, and even with having sex all the time, there will be detrimental effects on relationships concerned.

In situation ethics, there is a dismissal of marriage, and marriage is therefore omitted. By loving someone that is enough to justify a sexual relationship outside marriage, why should one

opt for the marriage process? Christian approach, situation ethics have undermined most Catholic church teaching, even natural law (Sugimoto, Cassidy, *et al.*, 559). In situation ethics, it is right to use contraceptives to prevent abortions and pregnancy termination if it is unwanted. In situation ethics, therefore, it perceives termination of pregnancy as the most loving thing to do since personhood comes first in this situation, and raising the child to birth would bring about the poor quality of life due to financial stability or premarital sex. Therefore, situation ethics apply relativism, which is the detriment of reliability while making decisions related to premarital sex.

Fletcher used an example of a woman who was impregnated by a guard as per her request to be free from a prison of war camp and also the scenario of the spy who had sex with an enemy intending to end the war (Jabal, Kamal Abu, *et al.*, 200016). Fletcher, therefore, proposed that situation ethics make moral decisions in circumstances where usual moral rules do not work. This has enabled a pragmatic approach to premarital, extramarital, and homosexuality setting in a relationship to put the person and their relationship at the heart of a decision.

Situational ethics lays an insight on injustices of heterosexual relationships that are viewed as unjust, which would be justified if the measure of who gets to have sex would be nullified (Sugimoto, Cassidy, *et al.*, 559). Extramarital sex is justified in conjunction with premarital sex since it is viewed as good. Critics of situation ethics are protagonists who make them lace society and family interests aside. Situation ethics encourage a sexually permissive society and justify the exploitation of the young, considering it as flaws of justice and love.

Fletcher glorified love as intrinsically good more than anything else as he defended the agape calculus. He considered welfare rather than love as he took on the technical meaning of love. His views were on the agape type o unconditional love, considering it justice (Sugimoto, Cassidy, *et al.*, 559). However, his theory on situations is considered hopelessly confused and

confusing regarding moral theory. His philosophical insights are borrowed from other theorists such as Aristotle to substitute his arguments. Critics disregard his approach considering it useless and unappealing to situationism theory.

Critics argue that his work is unclear between love and situation, talking about love as an attitude and in some cases as a means to bring about an endpoint. He does not clearly distinguish the two concepts, and critics consider it problematic (Frank, Lily, and Sven Nyholm, 323). He is not clear about details on situations and no clarity of his definition of love. He offers a shallow discussion on situationism and concepts in consideration of all dispositions discussed in his text.

Moral situations offer what to do and what not to do, considering what is considered important (Cresti *et al.*, 558). Fletcher's perception of what brings out the most loving situation is presumable by different perspectives, and his theory does not provide a compass on the direction to take regarding situations. However, he rejects antinomianism. He utilizes utilitarianism, thus replaces agape for happiness. Situationism is counter-intuitive on the cause of action in dilemmas on what cause of action to take when moral and personal standards come into play. Critics were unforgiving to Fletcher on his book on situationism but were more unforgiving for his publishers to having published his book on a whole set of problems that fail to answer on love and situations.

In conclusion, situation ethics focus on injustices and views love from an agape point of view. The theory focuses on sex as good in some circumstances and encourages engagement in sexual relations. The theory concludes that situationism justifies sex and lovemaking love intrinsically good more than anything else. Love and justice are unflawed in situationism theory irrespective of context that validates agape love as a technicality different from brotherly love

and Eros towards others. Love is subjective in situationism, willing the good of others towards actions of the greater good. From Fletcher, the ends justify the means. Situationism in ethics and sex validate decisions situational and not from prescriptively accustomed to love and particular situations.

## References

- Cresti, Matteo, Elena Nave, and Roberto Lala. "Intersexual births: the epistemology of sex and ethics of sex assignment." *Journal of bioethical inquiry* 15.4 (2018): 557-568.
- Frank, Lily, and Sven Nyholm. "Robot sex and consent: Is consent to sex between a robot and a human conceivable, possible, and desirable?." *Artificial Intelligence and Law* 25.3 (2017): 305-323.
- Jabal, Kamal Abu, et al. "Impact of age, ethnicity, sex and prior infection status on immunogenicity following a single dose of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine: real-world evidence from healthcare workers, Israel, December 2020 to January 2021." *Eurosurveillance* 26.6 (2021): 2100096.
- Sugimoto, Cassidy R., et al. "Factors affecting sex-related reporting in medical research: a cross-disciplinary bibliometric analysis." *The Lancet* 393.10171 (2019): 550-559.



ORIGINALITY REPORT

8%

SIMILARITY INDEX

2%

INTERNET SOURCES

7%

PUBLICATIONS

2%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

Mark Dimmock, Andrew Fisher. "Ethics for A-Level", Open Book Publishers, 2017

Publication

7%

2

[www.austintxgensoc.org](http://www.austintxgensoc.org)

Internet Source

1%

3

[www.coursehero.com](http://www.coursehero.com)

Internet Source

1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches < 10 words