**Review Questions:**

1. Explain the legend of Gyges. What questions about morality are raised by the story?

The legend of Gyges a story about a shepherd who found a magic ring that makes the wearer invisible. After obtaining the ring, what the shepherd did was to go to the palace. He seduced the queen, and then he murdered the king and seized his throne.

Glaucon raised a question in the story. Supposing there are two rings. One is obtained by a man of virtue and the other is obtained by the rouge. As expected the rouge will use the ring for self-interest and will never bother about the consequences of his actions. But what about the man of virtue? How is he going to act? Glaucon said that the man of virtue will behave no better than the rouge after all he has the freedom to do everything that he pleases.

1. Distinguish between psychological egoism and ethical egoism.

Psychological egoism is a view that perceives that all man is selfish and their acts is based on self-interest alone whereas an ethical egoism is a normative view of how a person acts to fulfill his/her self-interests. The acts are justified according to their self-interest regardless of the effects on other people.

1. Rachels discusses two arguments for psychological. What are these arguments, and how does he reply to them?

**Argument 1: If we describe one person’s action as selfish, and another person as unselfish, we are overlooking the crucial fact that in both cases, assuming that the action is done voluntarily, the agent is merely doing what he wants to do the most.** According to Rachels, a person who we think acts unselfishly should never be praised immediately. Why? The first reason is the fact that this person do the act because it is something that they really want to do. The second reason is the fact that they do this act not because they want to but because they feel obliged to do them.

**Argument 2: Since the so-called actions always produce a sense of self satisfaction in the agent and since this sense of satisfaction is a pleasant state of consciousness, it follows that the point of the action is really to achieve a pleasant state of consciousness rather than to bring about any good for others, Therefore the action is “unselfish” only at a superficial level of analysis.** According to Rachels if a man is truly selfish he wouldn’t even bother whether others suffer or not. Actually a selfish person wouldn’t mind his conscience at all. For him this argument is about attaining the goal before you get self-satisfaction. Although, the fact that if we desire the happiness of others and derive self-satisfaction through it doesn’t mean that it is really our object of desire.

1. What three commonplace confusions does Rachels detect the thesis of psychological egoism?
2. The confusion of selfishness with self interest
3. The assumption that every action is done either from self-interest or from other regarding motives
4. The common but false assumption that a concern for one’s own welfare is incompatible with any genuine concern for the welfare of others
5. State the argument for saying that ethical egoism in inconsistent. Why doesn’t Rachels accept this argument?

Ethical egoism is at bottom inconsistent because it cannot be universalized. So basically this argument means that we cannot act the same way as the others. Rachels doesn’t accept the argument because he thinks that ethical egoism can be maintained consistent. It’s just the matter on how we interpret the egoist’s position. Actually, we have to view it in a sympathetic way.

1. According to Rachels. Why wouldn’t we hurt others, and why should we help others. How can the egoist reply?

We wouldn’t hurt others because we know that it will harm them. The same way as helping them. The reason why we are doing this is because we know that they will benefit from it. Of course, the egoist wouldn’t be happy with this reason. As we all know egoists don’t care about other people’s feelings. We could appeal to them & try to change their minds by using threats and bribe.

**DISCUSSION QUESTIONS**

1. Has Rachels answered the question raised by Glaucon, namely, “Why be moral?” If so what exactly is his answer.

I think Rachels answered the questions raised by Glaucon .all throughout the topic Rachels have been citing examples to be able to answer Glaucon’s question. Rachels explained different situation that explains the side of an egoists for us to be able to understand what it is like if a person don’t have morals.

1. Are genuine egoists rare, as Rachels claims? Is it a fact that most people care about others, even people they don’t know?

I think genuine egoists are not rare. They are those people who do kindness without actually noticing it. If we would observe our society, most people ought to act like they don’t care about other people at all. Maybe because they are strangers. But if that person is caught in an unexpected situation: let’s say an old lady was hit by a car. That is where “care” comes in. In a simple way that person would think of something to help the old lady.

1. Suppose we define ethical altruism as the view that one should always act for the benefits of others and never in one’s own interest, Is such a view immoral or not?

I think this view is not immoral at all. For me it’s all right to think if other people will be happy or affected with my decision. After all, I would also like it if other people will think about how their action will affect me, and whether to do it or not. This view simply wants us to care about other people and not just to do everything we want because we want to. Sometimes, we need to sacrifice our own happiness just to make other people happy. But on the other hand, of course we should also think of ourselves but we must be sure that no one will be hurt,