

## Final Take-Home Essays

Submitted by : Tasnim Rahman Moumita

ID : 22301689

Course Code : HUM103

Course Title : Ethics and Culture

Date of Submission : 20.04.2023

## **Section - A**

### **Answer to the question No - 1**

#### **Hedonism :**

An ethical philosophy, known as 'Hedonism' places a strong value on the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain as the ultimate ends of human existence. It relies on the concept that pain and pleasure are naturally good and bad respectively. Hedonists encourage people to find pleasure in every area of their lives, including activities that are mental, physical, and psychological. They believe that raising pleasure and reducing pain may lead to well-being and joy.

According to the hedonistic philosophy, happiness and pleasure are the best outputs of an action. What is ethical is more pleasure and less pain. Additional pain is not preferable to lesser pleasure.

#### **Egoism :**

The idea that a person's own self should be, the inspiration behind and the cause of one's own actions is known as egoism. Egoism exists in two forms: normative and descriptive. Egoism is

viewed as a true explanation of human behavior in the descriptive (or positive) version. People cannot be defined in any other way; they are influenced by their own interests and goals and carry the tendency of avoiding pain. No matter what now inspires people's actions, the normative form argues that individuals should be consequently influenced.

Some philosophers argue that a person experiences no control in these things, stating that a person's actions are determined by past circumstances, putting any trust in choice false.

Hedonism and ethical egoism are two principles of ethics that present multiple approaches for making decisions. Hedonism argues that people must work to achieve the greatest pleasure and minimize pain whereas ethical egoism argues that people should act in their own self-interest. Because they put particular importance on values and outcomes; both of these approaches may have distinct impacts in real-life circumstances.

Hedonism and ethical egoism are two ethical theories that offer a variety of ways to select one. Hedonism states that individuals should try for maximum happiness and the least amount of pain in opposition to ethical egoism's argument that people should act in their own best interests. As both of these methods place a great deal of importance in terms and goals, the results could vary when applied to reality.

Making right decisions would be done by an ethical egoist who would prioritize their own interests. They would put their own self-interest above all else and claim that doing so is both

moral and important. For example, when people invest in business, the procedure of that business may harm the environment, but will help to gain pleasure in the form of financial achievement. Thus, this can be seen as ethically right and a practice of egoism.

On the contrary, a hedonist would approach moral choice by considering what actions could increase pleasure and decrease pain. They would put pleasure ahead of self-interest on the basis that it is the primary goal of life. Example: a hedonist may argue that it is moral for a business manager to pay their employees an acceptable salary since doing so would lessen their suffering and increase their sense of pleasure. Also, they believe that it is moral for someone to tell the truth and behave honestly since doing so is going to bring about more pleasure.

The concept that a person's behaviors are always influenced by self-interest is known as **psychological egoism**. In another word, it shows that everyone's main motive is self-interest. Consequently, it provides an explanation for most human actions. But ethical egoism is the idea that everyone should or ought to be motivated by self-interest. So, this is the primary difference between psychological and ethical egoism. According to this theory, there are occasions when we act in ways that appear to be charitable—such as making donations to charities or foundations or providing support to the poor and in need—but we are really only doing for our own pleasure. According to the moral theory of ethical egoism, individuals should to behave in their own best interests. Therefore, it is not only ethically correct but also necessary for people to put the interests of others before their own self-interest.

These differences carry significant consequences for the philosophy of morals. If psychological egoism is right, it means people have basic self-interest and that our behaviors are ultimately motivated by a desire to further that interest. On the opposite hand, if ethical egoism is true, people need to act in the best interests of themselves, even if it means harming others.

The fact is that Ethical egoism as a moral theory has both strong points and weak points.

Because, the main gist of this theory claims that an individual should always seek to maximize pleasure by focusing on one's own interests. But this theory does not provide the determined clarification of the concept of considering the interests of others for the expected pleasure. Moreover, it fails to consider our moral obligations and limitations to other people of the society as well. Again, practice of ethical egoism can be the main factor of selfishness. It is difficult to establish unity, justice, fairness in the society when most of the people are ethically egoistic. As a consequence, society will fall apart in this situation.

But yes, besides the above mentioned weak points, the strengths of ethical egoism is that it can make people choose the best decisions or actions according to their own desire. Which means it gives importance to an individual's independence.

Hobbes and Locke were different in that Locke saw the natural world as a place where people were free, equal, and independent, but also subject to the natural law of nature, which needed them to respect each other's rights to life, liberty, and property. Hobbes considered the normal environment as a place where people had unlimited freedom. Yet, people decide to establish an

independent nation (and so leave the state of nature) in order to establish an unbiased authority capable of settling conflicts and resolving problems.

To maintain these rights, which is the duty of government, people join into a social contract with it. In order to explain, Locke says that, in contrary to Hobbes, the support of the ruled decides the limit of a government's authority and that, if a people's basic rights aren't honored, they have the right to remove the existing government and choose a new one. In Hobbes' state of nature, humanity are always at conflict with one another due to a lack of resources and a lack of a social system. Under these circumstances, life is "nasty, brutish, and short," and there is always a chance that someone may be murdered or hurt by another person, according to Hobbes. People has to give up their fundamental liberties and surrender them to a single ruler who determines the entire state in order to resolve a conflict.

Leviathan by Hobbes has essential implications for identifying authority and power in modern Bangladeshi culture. According to Hobbes, people are basically selfish and violent in terms of fulfilling his own desires. So, without any social obligations, there will always be a situation of conflict, unrest in the society. In a country like Bangladesh, power and authority has a larger portion of influence in the society. Again, the political condition of Bangladesh was never stable at all. The desire of gaining power and utilizing this on the people who are not able to be a part of the ruler community of the society / state, is the main factor behind this. Thus, political parties being more specific on using the authority power rather than working for the well being of the country. From the birth of this country, this instability has been going on forward. On the one hand, Hobbes' defense of a rule of law may be seen as defending brutal rulers that put the goals

of peace and safety before those of the people. This is how Hobbes' Leviathan's concepts are implied in our country's political conditions.

In conclusion, the idea of both "Hedonism" and "Egoism" have their own sphere of influence on people. Psychological egoism just drives an individual towards his own interest ; but ethical interest also considers the situations of others as well in one's own decision. An alternate perspective is given by Locke's social contract theory, which puts a significant value on individual rights and freedoms while arguing that the understanding of the governed should limit the authority of the state. Leviathan by Hobbes's main concepts of human nature; which shows the self-interests of individuals. In general, the ideas of Hobbes have had a big impact on political theory, influencing how people think about what power and authority are like in society.

---

## **Section - B**

### **Answer to the question No - 2**

In 1947, during the partition of India and Pakistan, Several women suffered from rape, murder, abduction, and forced marriage. They were the objects of horrifying violence, and it was over their bodies in which victory was achieved..Especially, the muslim women suffered the most at that time. Most often, gendered violence has been seen as a symbol of regional violation. In 1947, when India and Pakistan claimed to be rescuing a woman who had been kidnapped, Partition was a confusing and dangerous time. Additionally, they claimed that their behavior may be seen as supporting ongoing violence against women and male standards.

The well-known author Urvashi Butalia expresses and describes the condition of abducted women in the period of 1947's partition. The women suffered because of gender-based violence. Butalia contends that every woman she spoke with had experienced tragedy and loss at some point in their lives. She argues that the pain of partition was caused not only by the violence and dislocation suffered by women, but also by the huge rifts that division caused in their identities in society and culture.



## **Gender-based violence :**

Violence against a person only because of that person's gender or violence against persons of a certain gender is known as gender-based violence.

If I were in the given situation of a muslim woman from Faisalabad, Pakistan, who was abducted. As I managed to flee to Delhi, it was my first attempt to survive. But when the situation gets complicated and I had to marry off there, the nationality and the aftermath of it gets more puzzled as per the given context. However, when Pakistan require that I would be rescued after the borders are drawn and the new country of India and Pakistan are formed and that brings questions about agency and autonomy. I would face so much suffering, loss and violence in a new country in the period of riots of then India and Pakistan. But As I had started my new family there in Delhi, it would be definitely difficult for me to return to India without my spouse and child.

Yes, the authorities of Pakistan had said that they would “rescue” us from India. They used the phrase "We must save our women" just to maintain their patriarchal power. For example, conditions did not at all profit women in Pakistan and India. They suffered and endured abuse due to their gender. When women seem to be in danger, authorities frequently use the argument that "we must save our women" to justify their actions. This claim has been made in the setting of Pakistan and India to support many forms of oppression and violence against women, including forced marriages, honor killings, and restrictions on their freedom. These actions are usually taken for the sake of cultural or religious customs, which frequently clash with concepts of honor

and shame. The authorities' first priority in the post-partition context is to maintain their control over women. For this reason, the women were taken against their own will back to Pakistan. Women were once again being victimized here. They lost the ability to act as human beings, share their opinions, to stand up for their own desires, and to chase happiness. This showcases how traditions of society cause gender prejudice and unequal positions of authority between men and women. Women's roles in the state and the family may be comparable when it comes to gender-based violence because they frequently must maintain their honor and reputation in their families and in the community as a whole. Women could be overlooked made to feel like victims, or treated unfairly, which could lead to gender-based violence and injustice. But it's important to keep in mind that women have a lot of power and can push back against injustice. They have led the charge in the fight for their rights, the dismantling of gender stereotypes, and the achievement of justice and equality.

However, the government's attempts to save the women frequently neglected to take into consideration their agency and desires. Interviews with abduction survivors, archival research, and secondary sources all served as the foundation for Menon and Bhasin's research. According to the authors, these abductions weren't just acts of violence against women; they were also a part of a bigger plan to weaken communities and create conflict along religious and community categories.

The second situation of this present era also remains the same like the situation of 1947's partition. When a girl or woman gets harassed sexually, usually it's that victim who becomes the talk of the town, rather than the criminal and puts him behind the bars. Additionally, the victim's

family also gets targeted ,insulted in front of all. Logically, the man or men who did that heinous crime, gets released often. Of course it is the lack of both proper ruling system and the preference of patriarchal authority in the society. Yet, the cultural limitations and boundaries are also a big reason behind this situation of gender-based violence and its unfair justice. The violence committed by the individual who committed it is overlooked, and she is blamed for dragging her family and society into dishonor. This could also reflect a male-dominated mentality. This demonstrates how female bodies are frequently linked to honor and society and how women must put in more effort than males to maintain their honor. This may prevent women from obtaining the same advantages and opportunities as males. Their actions and choices may be analyzed more closely than men's, and the respect shown to their appearance may be seen as a sign of devotion to the family or the community.

To sum up, The study of Menon and Bhasin focuses on the importance for a greater comprehension of how gendered violence is employed as a means of oppression as well as the significance of feminist resistance and unity as a result of such violence. And the chapter by Butalia offers a compelling and insightful examination of the experiences of Indian women during the partition. Butalia presents an original viewpoint on this critical historical era by highlighting the views and experiences of women. But it's also important to remember that women have a lot of strength and can fight back. They have been at the leading edge of the struggle for their rights, and the difficulty of conventional gender norms, and the call for justice and equality. First, since they promote traditional gender stereotypes and limit the freedom of women, the government's activities during division might be seen as being male dominated. The

agency and resistance of women should not be disregarded in situations when they are exposed to gender-based violence. While their responsibilities within the family and within the system may be comparable in terms of their role in protecting honor, this should not overshadow their agency.

---

Reference:

1. Hobbes, Thomas, 1588-1679. (1968). *Leviathan*.

2. Menon, R., & Bhasin, K. (1998). *Recovery, Rupture, Resistance: The Indian State and the Abduction of Women During Partition*.

3. Butalia, U. (2000). *The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India*.