Chapter 2: Introduction to Ethics

Review Questions:

1. Define in your own words what “the ethical point of view” means.

**Basically, when we say “the ethical point of view” we are referring to the way we view things in such a way that it is in line with morality. It is something that is judging something based on its moral standing whether it is morally correct or not. For example, the solution for unwanted pregnancy is abortion. Some people will think that it is correct; because they think that it is the best solution after all it’s not wanted anyway. But if you look into the “ethical point of view”, obviously it is morally incorrect. Killing an innocent child is not the solution, thus it will only cause another mistake.**

1. Define morality and ethics in your own words.

**Ethics basically is the philosophical branch that deals with the issues about morality. It talks about whether our actions are good or evil, right or wrong, whether we are just or biased. It is a study where we build up our values and at the same time or virtues. Ethics, usually answers the question, *“did I do things the right way?”***

**Morality on the other hand, it is the basis of our intentions, decision, and actions. It differentiates our actions into what is right and what is wrong. Moral is also referred to as the code of conduct.**

1. What is the difference between morality and ethics?

**Basically, morality defines our personal character. It is our own understanding of what is right and what is wrong, while Ethics is the principle in which we apply the concept of morality. Morality is somehow, centered on “spiritual standing of a person”, whether his actions are good or evil or if it’s wrong or not. Ethics on the other hand is society based. People judge you according to the result of your actions. Whether it benefits or harms other people. Ethics is created to improve the way people are living and morality is already a part of what we believe in. It is not something that is created anytime we want to.**

1. What is the difference between relativism and objectivism?

**Relativism is a concept of morality in which a person’s point of view of what is right and what is wrong is only patterned on what other people believes. This is a concept that does not have any validity. For example, your friend told you that you’re not allowed do some actions, since your friend told you not to do it, you would follow it because you based your opinion on the point of view of someone else. Objectivism on the other hand is the opposite of relativism. The concept really have a basis since it is already a part of us ever since. The concept of objectivism is somehow related to our common sense. We can already sense whether our actions is good or bad because the rule about it is already established a long time ago.**

1. What are the advantages of using an ethical theory in which all humans are treated equally and guidelines are developed through a process of logical reasoning?

**Basically, if we apply ethical theories in everything that we do, I think every action that we do would be in line with the concept of morality. There would be harmony in the society since each and every one would respect the rights of every person. Fairness would be abundant because we would think of what the outcome would be. Care for other people will be present. Knowing what they want or whether our actions will harm them, will be considered before we really do something.**

1. What do we mean when we say an ethical theory is rational?

**When we say that ethical theory is rational we mean that it is reasonable and has concepts that are agreeable. We all know that there are different ethical theories that were proposed. Each of these theories has different insight on what should be followed. But if we analyzed everything we would realize that each theory has a point. Each concept has someone who supports it and someone who contradicts it.**

1. What is the many/any fallacy? Invent your own example of this fallacy.

**Fallacy of many questions is a fallacy that tackles about rhetorical questions that cannot be answered without admitting a presupposition that may be false. This kind of fallacy generally, assumes whether a person is guilty since that answer in the question whether you answer a yes or no, will only be concluded as guilty. For example, *are you done cheating?* If you answer no, then basically this only proves that you’re guilty, same when you answer yes. Although you’re done the answer concludes that you still cheated. But what if your answer is neither of the two, then you don’t have a chance to defend whether you’re innocent or not.**

1. What is the equivalence fallacy? Invent your own example of this fallacy.

**We usually encounter equivalence fallacy when we are in a political debate. Equivalence fallacy means that you deny or contradicts an accusation by accusing other person that they do the same thing. For example, Camille was accused of copying her classmate’s homework. She knows that she is guilty. But to avoid taking all the blame, she also points out that Fort is also copying homework from their classmates. By doing this, Camille isn’t the only one who will be punished but also Fort who she said do the same thing as her.**

1. Come up with your own moral rule that would violate the Categorical Imperative.

**I think the moral rule that would violate the categorical imperative is the rules that we make that violates Golden Rule, or the rule that is set by Go. One good example that I can give is, It is okay to treat others people in a mean way, after all you’re happy doing it and you don’t care whether he gets back at you or not. Basically, by following the said example clearly we are violating the Golden rule which is under the categorical imperative.**

1. What is plagiarism? Describe four different ways that a person can commit plagiarism.

**Plagiarism basically means copying someone else’s work and referring it as your own work. Plagiarism includes copying of pictures, graphs, ideas without giving credits to those who really made it. There are different ways on how a person can commit plagiarism. First is copying everything word-for-word. This is the most common type of plagiarism. A person copies every content from a source without even citing it. Second, metaphor plagiarism. In this type of plagiarism, the content is not copied word-for-word, but the way on how a person compares let say an example is the same as the work of the original owner. Third, is the so-called patch working. Patch working basically means, copying content from different sources and patching it to form a new work. Lastly, self-plagiarism. Self-plagiarism doesn’t mean that you’re cheating yourself. This kind of plagiarism is committed if a person recycles his old works, so he can submit it to let say other subjects.**

1. What is the difference between plagiarism and misuse of sources?

**When we say plagiarism, we are aware that we are copying other people’s work. Basically, the actions that we’ve done are intentional. We really don’t cite the sources on where we got it so we can take the full credit. For example, I have a project that is due tomorrow since I cannot finish it on time; I copy other people’s work in order to pass it exactly on the due date. On the other hand, Misuse of sources is due to ignorance and understanding when it comes to citing sources. This also includes wrong way of paraphrasing. This kind of plagiarism is unintentional.**

1. What is the difference between a consequentialist theory and a non-consequentialist theory?

**A consequentialist theory judge the rightness or wrongness of our actions based on the consequences and outcomes that it produced. For example, I gave money to a beggar, and then later on, he used that money I gave to buy drugs. Then eventually he was arrested by the cops. Based from my example I can clearly state that my action is wrong because instead of helping the beggar the money I gave harmed him instead. A non-consequentialist theory on the other hand is the opposite of a consequentialist theory. The actions are not based on the consequences but instead it is based on the type of action that we made.**

1. Give three example of a situation in which your action would primarily motivated by a sense of duty or obligation. Give three examples of a situation in which your action would be primarily motivated by its expected consequences.

**Sense of duty or obligation:**

1. **It is my duty to respect other people’s privacy therefore I would not interfere with any of his businesses.**
2. **It is my duty to care from other people.**
3. **It is my duty to do things according to the moral law.**

**Expected consequences:**

1. **It is my obligation to do good things to other since I expect that they will do the same for me.**
2. **It is my obligation to not harm other people because I expect that it will not do any good if I harm them.**
3. **I expect that doing well is the right thing because I know that everyone will benefit from it.**
4. What is the problem of moral luck?

**The problem with moral luck it judges the person’s moral worth depending on the weight of the consequences of their actions. It tends to forget that no matter the result of the action is, as long as it breaks a rule or bring harm to other people is still not worthy of having a moral worth. For example, person A killed a person intentionally while person B killed a person because he was defending himself. Mostly, people would respond that person A is much worse than person B because he really had the intention to kill the person. But if clearly analyze the situation they both kill another person. Basically, both of them don’t deserve moral worth.**

1. Why do businesses and governments often use utilitarian thinking to determine the proper course of action?

**The governments and businesses likes to think in a utilitarian way because they knew that if this will be their basis for proper course of action then most likely a lot of people would be benefit from it. The officials of governments and businesses leans toward the maximization of the overall “good” of most of the individuals. For the rulers of a government or businesses, anything that brings happiness is an advantage to the community while anything that gives “unhappiness” is definitely a disadvantage.**

1. What is the difference principle?

**The concept behind the difference principle is that inequalities among the community as long as those who benefit the inequality are those who are the worst members of the community. The said principle is made in order for those who work hard to contribute in the community can claim their rightful parts in the distribution of goods. For example, person A can contribute 2 sacks of rice every month while person B & C contributes only half sack of rice. Difference principle works in a way that person A should claim a bigger part of the good compared to person B & C.**

1. Is social contract theory as first presented a consequentialist theory or a non-consequentialist theory?

**Well, based from my understanding, Social contract theory in a non-consequentialist theory because they based their judgment through the consequences whether it is in line with the rules that was agreed upon by the government and citizens. The rule presented in both theories makes sure that the citizens act accordingly on what is said to be the right way of doing things. Basically, these theories wants the citizens to judge what is right and what is wrong based on the regulations they have agreed upon.**

1. Describe similarities and differences between divine command theory and Kantianism.

**Both Kantianism and the divine command theory follow the rule given by God. Both theories use the categorical imperative or the golden rule as the basis of knowing what is right and what is good. Although the two theories can be a little bit similar, these two theory still have distinctions that made them different from each other. In Kantianism, people believe that they should be the mean of end to other people, while the divine command theory sticks to its original concept which is to act accordingly that it will provide “greater good” to many individuals.**

1. Describe similarities and differences between subjective relativism and act utilitarianism.

**Both subject relativism and act utilitarianism doesn’t follow what is on the moral code. For both theories they say that there are really no basis in determining which is right and which is wrong. Both of these theories are based on what they know & sometimes it is just something they create because they think that it will be good for the many. However, these two still have their differences. Act utilitarianism still aims for the happiness of many while subject relativism can be a little biased thus resulting to unhappiness of other people.**

1. Describe similarities and differences between Kantianism and Rule Utilitarianism.

**I think the main similarity of both theories is that their aim leads to the greater good. Their basis is both according to the moral rule. I Kantianism the rightness or wrongness of our action is judged whether it is in line the universal law, while the Rule utilitarianism based the rightness and wrongness of an action is based on the consequences after the action is done.**

1. Describe similarities and differences between Act Utilitarianism and Rule Utilitarianism.

**Both kinds of utilitarianism aim of the good of many. They promote good judgment when it comes to determining whether an action right or wrong. They are different in a way that act utilitarianism based the rightness and wrongness of an action on the results while the rule utilitarianism based its judgment according to the consequences after the action is made.**

1. Describe similarities and differences between cultural relativism and social contract theory.

**Both theories promote the right of people to receive equal treatment. This theory promotes practice of the rights of people. They are different in a way that cultural relativism is geared towards the understanding of other people’s belief and convincing other people to respect whatever their culture is about. The social contract theory on the other hand is geared towards good relationship of the citizens to their government, citizens to their fellow citizens.**

1. Describe similarities and differences between Kantianism and social contract theory.

**Both Kantianism and Social Contract Theory are geared towards the judgment of what is right and what is wrong depending on the consequences of the action. In these theories fairness is actually measured. These two theories, on the other hand also have their differences. The social contract theory is more focused on the social and political obligations of a person. Whether he/she disobeyed any rules that are in line with their obligations. Kantianism is more focused on the moral rules. They judge according to what is written in the moral code.**

1. Evaluate the four scenarios presented in Section 2.1 from a Kantian Perspective.

**Scenario 1:**

**If you would base the situation in Kantian perspective I think Alexis did something wrong. Alexis’ actions was kind of selfish because instead of waiting for her turn to use the computers in their school, she pretended to be a student in another school just to finish whatever requirement she needs to pass. The only one who benefited from her action is she and her family of course, since Alexis got the scholarship she wanted. Of course, she has the advantages compared to her classmates.**

**Scenario 2:**

**I think they did nothing wrong. Their action was based on the number of people who would benefit. The spam message that was received by the people in their country was reduced to 25% percent. Of course, the one that benefited were those who were affected by the SPAM messages. The one who was hurt was obviously the one who was sending them.**

**Scenario 3:**

**I think the East Dakota State Police did nothing wrong. The ones who benefited from their action are the citizens and the police as well. No one is harmed, well if we would consider the terrorists then they are the ones who are hurt by the action. I think they can just manually search for the terrorist but it will really take a long time before they capture them.**

**Scenario 4:**

**No. I will not recommend the release of my product since it is not finished yet. Many people will benefit from my decision; the end-users, my employees, my company and its reputation. If ever I ordered the release of my product then the ones who will be harmed are the company itself and the end-users. Of course I am obliged to take action on the effect of the unfinished product that we released.**

1. Evaluate the four scenarios presented in Section 2.1 from an act utilitarian perspective.

**Scenario 1:**

**From an act utilitarian perspective, Alexis did something wrong because her action was somewhat selfish. Moreover, an act utilitarian follows the rule that it is right as long as it brings happiness to many. Well, of course the ones she hurt are those people who have the same dream as hers but did not get the chance to fulfill it since they are always the one who don’t have enough time to spend in front of the computer because there’s a limitation in using of since a lot of people are waiting for their turn.**

**Scenario 2:**

**I think the anti-spam organization and the ISP providers did something wrong. First, there is no rule when it comes to spam messages. People have the option to allow the organization to send them messages. These messages are usually coming from the sites that we subscribe. The ones who benefited are those who received the messages, and the one who were hurt are those who sent the messages.**

**Scenario 3:**

**They did not do something wrong. They did not cross any rules and besides they are police they have the rights to check who violate the rules. It just happens that they also find the lead to the terrorist by using video cameras. The ones who benefited are the police and the citizens, the ones who are harmed are the violators and the terrorists as well. They can station on the side of the road and just inspect or question those who violate the rules, although in this procedure, there is a possibility that not all the violators will be caught and there is no chance that they will easily recognized the terrorists.**

**Scenario 4:**

**Of course, I would not recommend the release of my product. Everyone will benefit if they follow my recommendation. If ever they do not follow my recommendation, everyone will be harmed; the company and its reputation and the users as well. I will have an obligation to them since I recommended that they use the product even though it not 100% fixed.**

1. Evaluate the four scenarios presented in Section 2.1 from a rule utilitarian perspective.

**Scenario 1:**

**Based from a rule utilitarian perspective, Alexis did not do anything wrong. Although her actions were a little selfish on her part, it still brought good things to her. She was able to accomplish what she really wants, without hurting other people.**

**Scenario 2:**

**Based from a rule utilitarian perspective, the anti-spam organization and ISP providers did not do something wrong. The reason why the block the spam messages is because many people are complaining about it. They are just doing their job, and as far as many people is concerned, they will do anything to help them.**

**Scenario 3:**

**I think the East Dakota State Police did not do something wrong. The ones who benefited from their action are the citizens and the police. Those who are harmed are the violators and the terrorists. They can do a manual search but this procedure is not advisable since it will take too long before they catch the terrorists.**

**Scenario 4:**

**No, I will not recommend the release of product. Of course, everyone in the company will benefit if they follow my recommendation/ If they don’t follow my recommendation, the ones who will use the product and the company itself will be harmed. Of course, if ever I released the product I have an obligation to those who will use the product.**

1. Evaluate the four scenarios presented in Section 2.1 from the perspective of social contract theory

**Scenario 1:**

**Well, I think in terms of her determination in getting a really high grade I think there is nothing wrong with it. But pretending to be a student of other private school is wrong. What if she broke the computer then definitely she will be busted. She’s like trespassing just to finish her researches. Of course she’s the one who benefited for her actions. And her family as well, since she got her scholarship. The one’s she hurt are those who are waiting in their school libraries to get their turn to use the computers.**

**Scenario 2:**

**I think that the anti-spam organizations and the ISP’s who refuse to accept mail did something wrong. Although, the spam-emails dropped down into 25% it is not right to put it in their so-called “blacklist” without even considering the East-Asian citizens that don’t send spam messages. Only the organization and the other ISP owners benefited from the action. Obviously the ones who are hurt are those people who live in the East-Asian countries.**

**Scenario 3:**

**No. I think the East Dakota State Police didn’t do anything wrong, in fact what they do is really smart. The one who benefited are citizens of course because first of all the one they caught are terrorists; these group of people are trained to hurt innocent people.**

**Scenario 4:**

**No. I would not recommend the release of my product especially if it still has some issues that are needed to be fixed. Of course, my company would benefit from the recommendation. My reputation would not be affected. If ever I recommended releasing the product obviously the users will be the one who is harmed. Of I have the responsibility since I proposed that I will deliver a good product to the users.**

1. A college student attached a webcam to his laptop computer and left the computer running in his dormitory room in order to broadcast video images of his roommate and his roommate’s girlfriend engaged in sexual intercourse. They were unaware of his actions. The student’s website accumulated thousands of hits for the two weeks it was up. Copies of some images were posted on at least one other web site. Using each of the four workable ethical theories presented in this chapter, evaluate the actions of the college student.

**I think the student did a very bad action. Why? Because first of all, he invaded the privacy of his roommate. Being caught in a situation like that is very embarrassing what more if it is published in the internet wherein many people can view the video. The college student did not consider the consequences of his actions. He didn’t consider whether his friend will be harmed by his actions. Even if his excuse is that he is just having fun, he shouldn’t be selfish that he is happy while his friend is having a hard time because of what happened.**

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

1. If everyone agreed to take the ethical point of view by respecting others and their core values, would there be any need for a rigorous study of ethics?

**Well, I think there should still be study about ethics. Even though ethics cannot be taught, it still best to have a reminder that there are certain rules that we should follow. When I say that it still needed to be taught, I mean all the rules but not all the different concepts because it actually made people confused on what is the best theory to follow. The study about ethics should highlight all the rules that are similar among the different theories.**

1. If you had to choose only one of ethical theories presented in this chapter and use it for all of your personal ethical decision-making, which theory would you choose? Why? How would you respond to the arguments raised against the theory you have chosen?

**I think I would choose the utilitarianism theory among all the theory presented in the chapter. It will be my basis when making a decision since it involves the happiness of many individuals. Maybe the best way to contradict all the arguments is to simply prove or show them the advantages of choosing this theory as the basis of decision-making.**

1. Most ethical theories agree on a large number of moral guidelines. For example, it is universally held that it is wrong to steal. What difference, then does it make whether someone subscribe to the divine command theory, Kantianism. Utilitarianism or one of the other ethical theories?

**I think the only way it could be different is depending on how these theories are applied. There is theory that states that it is not wrong as long as you’re happy while doing it. From that theory alone we can say that it’s already not following the moral code. Therefore there are still ethical theories that if you analyze it further the meaning would be different. That instead of promoting positive attitudes you will figure that is actually promoting good and bad.**

1. Suppose a spaceship lands in your neighborhood. Friendly aliens emerge and invite humans to enter the galactic community. You learn that this race of aliens has colonialized virtually the entire galaxy; Earth is one of the few inhabitable planets to host a different intelligent species. The aliens seem to be remarkably open-minded. They ask you to outline the ethical theory that should guide the interactions between our two species. Which ethical theory would you describe?

**I think I would describe the Utilitarianism Theory where the basis of decisions depends on the happiness of the majority. I would explain to them that if they based their actions in this theory then basically there would be harmony between us people and the aliens. Of course, it’s more important to think of what’s best for all than to think only for ourselves.**

1. According to the Golden Rule, you should do unto others as you would want them to do unto you. Is the categorical imperative simply the golden rule in disguise?

**Well, if you would base it on the rule maybe there is a possibility that the categorical imperative is simply the golden rule in disguise. Basically, the rule that is promoted in the categorical imperative is same as those that are promoted in the golden rule though there are other rules in the golden rule that are not under the categorical imperative.**

1. Are there any ethical theories described in this chapter that would allow someone to use the argument “Everybody is doing it” to show that an activity is not wrong?

**As far as I understood the topic, I think this reasoning falls under fallacy and not in the theories discussed from the chapter. The equivalence fallacy is the nearest answer I can think of. Because in equivalence fallacy, people who wants to depend themselves by pointing out that other people are also doing it. They point out that they are not the only one who does it.**

1. What are some examples of contemporary information technology issues for which our society’s moral guidelines seem to be nonexistent or unclear?

**Although, there is a moral code that can be applied in Information technology. I think there are still issues that are solved by these moral rules. Invasion of privacy, cybersex, plagiarism and piracy these issues are still abundant in the net. Although there is the so-called cyber ethics I think people don’t apply it every time they use the internet.**

1. People give a variety of reasons for copying a music CD from a friend instead of buying it. Refute each of the reasons given below using one of the visible theories described in this chapter.
2. I don’t have enough money to buy it.
3. The retail price is too high. The company is gouging customers.
4. Since I wouldn’t have bought it anyway, the company didn’t lose a sale.
5. I’m giving my friend the opportunity to do a good deed.
6. Everyone else is doing it. Why should I be the only person to buy it when everyone else is getting it for free?
7. This is a drop in the bucket compared to Chinese pirates who sell billions of dollars’ worth of copied music.
8. This is insignificant compared to the billions of dollars’ worth of music being exchanged over the net.

**I think if you will base this answer to the moral code then basically this kind of reasoning is morally incorrect. This kind of reasoning shouldn’t be accepted easily because the action is also same as stealing. The reason why a music store sells the CD in a high price is because they want to give credit to those who really work hard in producing the CD.**

1. Supposed a society hold that it is wrong for one individual to eavesdrop on the telephone conversation of another citizen. Should that society also prohibits the government from listening in on its citizens’ telephone conversations?

**Well, basically yes it is wrong for one individual to eavesdrop on the telephone conversation of another citizen. And it is also wrong for the government to eavesdrop on the conversation of its citizen although they are doing this for the sake of monitoring processes. By eavesdropping we are violating the privacy that is needed by that citizen. We should not do this, because even us hates when someone is eavesdropping on our conversation.**

1. Should moral guidelines for individuals apply to nation-states as well? Are the interactions of nation-states analogous to the interactions of individuals? Should there be a different kind of morality to guide the actions of nations-states, or are the actions of nation-states w/ each other outside the moral realm?

**I think it’s a great idea that the moral guidelines for individuals should also be applied to nation-states. By doing so, those who are ruling a nation-state would be sure that everything in his territory is in order. There would be harmony and there would be less crime. I think there is no need for a separate moral guideline between the individuals and the nation-state. I also think that the interaction among the individuals is also same with the interaction that is happening in a nation-state.**

1. Are the citizens of a representative democracy morally responsible for the action of their government?

**Well, I think the citizens still have a responsibility towards the actions of their government. First of all, they are the one who voted for the officials of their government. Whether these officials do good or bad depends on how the citizens react to their action. If they are doing something wrong and the citizens don’t do anything about it, then obviously these officials will continue to do wrong actions.**

IN-CLASS EXERCISES

1. Students in a history class are asked to take a quiz posted on the course website. The instructor has explained the following rules to the students: First, they are supposed to do their own work. Second, they are free to consult their lecture notes and the textbook while taking a quiz. Third, in order to get credit for the quiz, they must correctly answer at least 80 percent of the questions. If they do not get a score of 80 percent, they may retake the quiz as many times as they wish. Mary and John are both taking the quiz. They are sitting next to each other in the computer room. John asks Mary for help in answering one of the questions. He says, “What’s the difference if you tell me the answer. I look it up on the book, or I found out from the computer that my answer is wrong and retake the quiz? In any case, I’ll end up getting credits for the right answer.” Mary tells John the correct answer to the question. Discuss the morality of Mary’s decision.

**I think Mary came up to the decision that she should tell John the answer because she thinks that John’s reason is correct. Mary’s action benefited them both but they disobeyed their teachers rule. He trusted them that they should do their quiz on report. The teacher is basically testing their honesty but since Mary is influenced by John, she disregards the trust given to them.**

1. In Plato’s dialogue *The Republic*, Glaucon argues that people do not voluntarily do what is right. According to Glaucon, anyone who has the means to do something unjust and get away with it will do so. Glaucon illustrates his point of view by telling the story of Gyges. Gyges, a shepherd, discovers a magic ring. He accidentally discovers that wearing this ring renders him invisible. He uses the power of the ring to seduce the queen, kill the king and take over the kingdom. Glaucon believes that whenever people have the opportunity to act unjustly without any fear of getting caught or anyone thinking worse of them, they do so. If they do not act to their own advantage when given the opportunity, others will think they are fools. Do you agree with Glaucon?

**No, I don’t agree with Glaucon. I think it’s not right to be called a fool if a person does not act to their own advantage. Perhaps there are certain reasons why some people choose to do things that will not provide them any advantage among other people. Maybe that person, really don’t want to do something like that because he knows that if he do it, his actions will cause harm to other people. Another reason can be that he really is a fair person. He doesn’t want to take advantage on other people.**

1. Is the right to life a negative right or a positive right? In other words, when we say someone has the right to life, are we simply saying we have an obligation not to harm that person, or are we saying we have an obligation to provide the person what he or she needs in order to live, such as food and shelter?

**Obviously, the right to life is a positive right. Everybody needs to be given a chance to live and fulfill whatever his purpose is. Our obligation to them depends on what relationship we are in. For example, person A didn’t know person B, basically person A don’t have any reason to harm person B. But let’s say they know each other. Person A doesn’t have any obligation when it comes to the basic needs of person B. Well, we can say that person A can help person B but it doesn’t mean that person A is obliged to do it.**

1. Which of the following rights should be considered legitimate positive rights by our society?
2. The right to K-12 education
3. The right to a higher education
4. The right to housing
5. The right to health care
6. The right of a presidential candidate to receive time on television

**I think the right that should be considered is the K-12 education. The reason why I choose K-12 education is because I know if this right is considered in the society then the people here in our country will be as educated as the American, though it’s not that were not educated enough, it’s just that I think the people here in country needs additional knowledge because based from the standing of the industry today, we can be very sure that it is getting more and more competitive.**