River Schenck

This lecture was very interesting. You never think about the points that the professor talks about. When looking at consequential and non-consequential moral reasoning it brings out many more perspectives that when you first look at a situation. In all the examples the professor discussed either way had serious consequences. This subject and this material hits close to home. I recently had some family pass away in a tragic airplane crash in Ogden. From what we know and from what onlookers saw a theory of what happened got pieced together. It follows right in line with consequential and non-consequential moral reasoning. My uncle was driving the airplane when something happened right after takeoff. They started gliding back to earth. On a plane you can glide and make an emergency landing if your wings maintain lift under them. When he was coming down they were heading straight for a building. On lookers said they thought that the plane was going to go straight through the building. The plane started to gradually turn because if it turned too sharp it would lose lift under the wings and plummet to the ground. The plane started to get very close to the building then at the last second the plane jerked to the side trying to get out of the path of the building but lost lift and went straight down onto the freeway. This example is very personal to me. They could have kept going straight and maybe avoid the building and land but most likely hit it and kill all in it, or jerk to the side avoiding the building but killing all within the plane. It comes back to what one of the students in the video said, you can’t decide someone’s death for them like that. Who are we to say that the one person’s life in front of the trolley car is worth less than the five lives on the other side. I think that killing one is better than five but the argument still presents its self. Also, the argument of stopping the trolley with pushing a fat guy onto the track doesn’t make much sense to me. The fat guy is in no way involved in the situation that has presented its self. Whereas the people on the track are directly related. Pushing him onto the track would be murder. Killing the one on the track would just be a moral decision because one life would be better than 5.

The cannibalism story is in the grey area of my moral compass. I do not think that killing someone in a situation where you do not HAVE to kill someone is something you should do. BUT I don’t think that they should be prosecuted. Either way it is in the grey area. I like the point the student made about necessity.