

ENGINEERING ETHICS

- “Technology can have no legitimacy unless it inflicts no harm”-Adm.H.G. Rickover, father of the US nuclear navy.
- What does Adm. Rickover mean by this?*
- Should engineers avoid technology that has the potential for inflicting harm on a society or its members?*
- Engineers have an ethical and social responsibility to themselves, their clients and society.
- Practically (although there is much debate about this), engineering ethics is about balancing cost, schedule, and risk.

•ENGINEERING ETHICS is:

- the study of moral issues and decisions confronting individuals and organizations involved in engineering and
- the study of related questions about moral ideals, character, policies and
- relationships of people and organizations involved in technological activity.

•TRAINING IN PREVENTIVE ETHICS

Stimulating the moral imagination

- Recognizing ethical issues
- Developing analytical skills

•IMPEDIMENTS TO RESPONSIBILITY

•Self-interest.

•Ignorance.

Eliciting a sense of responsibility

- Tolerating disagreement and ambiguity

•groupthink.

Fear.

- Self-deception.
- Egocentric tendencies.
- Microscopic vision.

SENSES OF EXPRESSION OF ENGG. ETHICS

Ethics is an activity and area of inquiry. It is the activity of understanding moral values, resolving moral issues and the area of study resulting from that activity.

When we speak of ethical problems, issues and controversies, we mean to distinguish them from non-moral problems.

Ethics is used to refer to the particular set of beliefs, attitudes and habits that a person or group displays concerning moralities.

- Ethics and its grammatical variants can be used as synonyms for „morally correct“.
- **VARIETIES or APPROACHES OF MORAL ISSUES**
- *MICRO-ETHICS* emphasizes typically everyday problems that can take on significant proportions in an engineer's life or entire engineering office.
- *MACRO-ETHICS* addresses societal problems that are often shunted aside and are not addressed until they unexpectedly resurface on a regional or national scale.

MORAL PROBLEMS IN ENGINEERING

(SOME EXAMPLES)

1. An inspector discovered faulty construction equipment and applied a violation tag, preventing its use. The supervisor, a construction manager viewed the case as a minor abrasion of the safety regulations and ordered the removal of the tag to speed up the project. When the inspector objected to this, he was threatened with disciplinary action.
2. An electric utility company applied for a permit to operate a nuclear power plant. The licensing agency was interested in knowing what emergency measures had been established for human's safety in case of reactor malfunctioning. The utility engineers described the alarm system and arrangements with local hospitals for treatment. They did not emphasize that this measures applied to plant personnel only and that they had no plans for the surrounding population. When enquired about their omission, they said it was not their responsibility.
3. A chemical plant dumped wastes in a landfill. Hazardous substances found their way into the underground water table. The plant's engineers were aware of the situation but did not change the method of disposal because their competitors did it the same cheap way, and no law explicitly forbade the practice.
4. Electronics Company ABC geared up for production of its own version of a popular new item. The product was not yet ready for sale, but even so, pictures and impressive specifications appeared in advertisements. Prospective customers were led to believe that it was available off the shelf and were drawn away from competing lines.

What is a bribe?

- What is a „profession“ and who are „professionals“?

FACTUAL (DESCRIPTIVE) INQUIRIES

These are inquiries used to uncover information using scientific techniques. These inquiries get to information about business realities, history of engineering profession, procedures used in assessment of risks and engineers psychology.

TYPES OF INQUIRIES

•NORMATIVE INQUIRY

These are about „what ought to be“ and „what is good“. These questions identify and also justify the morally desirable norms or standards.

Some of the questions are:

- How far engineers are obligated to protect public safety in given situations?
- When should engineers start whistle blowing on dangerous practices of their employers?
- Whose values are primary in taking a moral decision, employee, public or govt?
- Why are engineers obligated to protect public safety?
- When is govt justified in interfering on such issues and why?

•CONCEPTUAL INQUIRY:

These questions should lead to clarifications on concepts, principles and issues in ethics. Examples are:

- What is „SAFETY“ and how is it related to „RISK“
- „Protect the safety, health and welfare of public“-What does this statement mean?

VAGUENESS: This complexity arises due to the fact that it is not clear to individuals as to which moral considerations or principles apply to their situation.

CONFLICTING REASONS: Even when it is perfectly clear as to which moral principle is applicable to one's situation, there could develop a situation where in two or more clearly applicable moral principles come into conflict.

Why study *ENGINEERING ETHICS

ENGINEERING ETHICS is a means managers, citizens and others to technological activities. to increase the ability of concerned engineers

, responsibly confront moral issues raised by **MORAL DILEMMMA**

There are three types of complexities.

DISAGREEMENT: Individuals and groups may disagree how to interpret, apply and balance moral reasons in particular situations.

Steps in confronting MORAL DILEMMAS:

- Identify the relevant moral factors and reasons.
- Gather all available facts that are pertinent to the moral factors involved.
- Rank the moral considerations in the order of their importance as they apply to the situation.
- Consider alternative course of action, tracing the full implications of each, as ways of solving dilemma.
- Talk with colleagues, seeking the suggestions and perspectives of the dilemma.
- Arrive at a carefully reasoned judgment by weighing all the relevant moral factors and reasons in light of facts.

All the above steps are distinct, even though they are inter-related and can often be taken jointly

MORAL AUTONOMY: This is viewed as the skill and habit of thinking rationally about ethical issues on the basis of moral concerns independently or by self-determination.

Autonomous individuals think for themselves and do not assume that customs are always right.

They seek to reason and live by general principles.

Their motivation is to do what is morally reasonable for its own sake, maintaining integrity, self-respect, and respect for others.

“One who breaks an unjust law must do so openly, lovingly, and with a willingness to accept the penalty. I submit that an individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust and willingly accepts the penalty... is in reality expressing the highest respect for the law.” *Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.* in Letter from a Birmingham Jail, 1963. A person becomes morally autonomous by improving various practical skills listed below:

Proficiency is recognizing moral problems and issues in engineering.

Skill in comprehending, clarifying and critically assessing arguments on opposing sides of moral issues.

The ability to form consistent and comprehensive viewpoints based upon consideration of relevant facts.

Awareness of alternate responses to issues and creative solutions for practical difficulties.

Sensitivity to genuine difficulties and subtleties. Increased precision in the use of a common ethical language necessary to express and also defend one's views adequately. Appreciation of possibilities of using rational dialogue in resolving moral conflicts and the need for tolerance of differences in perspective among orally reasonable people.

A sense of importance of integrating one's professional life and personal convictions i.e. maintaining one's moral integrity.

KOHLBERG'S THEORY

STAGES OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT

•*Pre-conventional Level*

Whatever benefits oneself or avoids punishment. This is the level of development of all young children. -Avoid punishment & Gain Reward

•*Conventional Level*

Uncritical acceptance of one's family, group or society are accepted as final standard of morality. Most adults do not mature beyond this stage. -1. Gain Approval & Avoid Disapproval & 2. Duty & Guilt

•*Post-conventional Level*

Motivation to do what is morally reasonable for its own sake, rather than solely from ulterior motives, with also a desire to maintain their moral integrity, self-respect and the respect of other autonomous individuals. They are „Morally autonomous“ people. -1. Agreed upon rights & 2. Personal moral standards

KOHLBERG'S THEORY:

Lawrence Kohlberg proposed that people progress in moral reasoning based on their ethical behavior.

- He postulated this theory based on the thinking of younger children throughout their growing period as adults.
- He conveyed that younger children make judgment based on the consequences that might occur and the older children make judgment based on their intuitions.

3 Stages of Kohlberg's Theory

1. Pre-conventional Level

•The first level of moral thinking, which is generally found at Elementary school level. The thinker at this stage tends to think and behave based on the direct consequences that might occur

There are two sub-stages in this.

- a. Avoid Punishments**
- b. Self-interest**

2. Conventional Level

The second level of moral thinking, which is generally found at the primary and high school level. The thinker at this stage tends to think and behave based on the want to please others.

There are two sub-stages in this.

- a. Getting people to like them**
- b. Maintain functioning in society**

3. Post-Conventional Level

the third level of Moral thinking, which is generally found after the high school level.

•The thinker at this stage tends to think and behave based on a sense of justice.

There are two sub-stages in this

- Reject rigidity of laws**
- Sense of justice**

GILLIGAN'S THEORY

•Pre-conventional Level

This is the same as Kohlberg's first level in that the person is preoccupied with self-centered reasoning, caring for the needs and desires of self.

•Conventional

Here the thinking is opposite in that, one is preoccupied with not hurting others and a willingness to sacrifice one's own interests in order to help or nurture others (or retain friendship).

•Post-conventional Level

Achieved through context-oriented reasoning, rather than by applying abstract rules ranked in a hierarchy of importance. Here the individual becomes able to strike a reasoned balance between caring about other people and pursuing one's own self-interest while exercising one's rights.

Differences between the TWO THEORIES

Carol Gilligan opines that **Kohlberg's** theories are biased upon the **male thinking** process

- Men had a tendency to solve problems by applying ethical principles she proposed a theory which has the same three stages of Kohlberg but with different stages of moral development. **Stages of theory**

- **Pre-conventional Level**

- **A person in this stage cares for oneself to ensure survival.**

- **Conventional Level**

In this stage, the person feels responsible and shows care towards other people.

- **Post-conventional Level**

- **This is the stage, where the principle of care for self as well as others, is accepted.**

KOHLBERG

I. Ethics of rules and rights

II. Studies based on well educated, white male's only, tending male bias.

III. Application of abstract rules ranked in the order of importance

IV. Studies were hypothesized for both

the genders even though the study was

conducted mostly on males

GILLIGAN

Ethics of care

Studies included females and colored peoples

Application of context-oriented reasoning.

Study was conducted on both genders

and it was found, men based their reasoning on „justice“ and women based

theirs on „care“

At a „conventional“ level, an individual might argue that it is not right to steal because it is against law and laws are necessary for society to function.

At a „post conventional“ level, one may argue that stealing is wrong because is against law and it is immoral.

HEINZ'S DILEMMA

The famous example used by Kohlberg was called “Heinz’s dilemma”. A woman living in Europe would die of cancer unless she was given an expensive drug. Her husband, Heinz, could not afford it. But the local pharmacist, who had invented the drug at only one tenth of the sale price refused to sell it to Heinz who could only raise half the required money from borrowings. Desperation drives Heinz to break into the pharmacy and steal the drug to save his wife.

When respondents were asked whether and why Heinz should or should not steal a drug to save his wife from a life- threatening illness. The responses of the individuals were compared with a prototypical response of individuals at particular stages of moral reasoning. Kohlberg noted that irrespective of the level of the individual the response could be same, but the reasoning could be different.

For example, if a child reasoning at a „pre conventional“ level might say that it is not right to steal because it is against law and someone might see you.

CONSENSUS AND CONTROVERSY

CONTROVERSY:

All individuals will not arrive at same verdict during their exercising their moral autonomy.

Aristotle noted long ago that morality is not as precise and clear-cut as arithmetic.

Aim of teaching engg ethics is not to get unanimous conformity of outlook by indoctrination, authoritarian and dogmatic teaching, hypnotism or any other technique but to improve promotion of tolerance in the exercise of moral autonomy.

CONSENSUS:

The conductor of a music orchestra has authority over the musicians and his authority is respected by them by consensus as otherwise the music performance will suffer. Hence the authority and autonomy are compatible.

On the other hand, tension arises between the needs for autonomy and the need for concerns about authority. The difference between the two should be discussed openly to resolve the issue to the common good.

HEINZ'S DILEMMA

- The famous example used by Kohlberg was called “Heinz’s dilemma”. A woman living in Europe would die of cancer unless she was given an expensive drug. Her husband, Heinz, could not afford it. But the local pharmacist, who had invented the drug at only one tenth of the sale price refused to sell it to Heinz who could only raise half the required money from borrowings. Desperation drives Heinz to break into the pharmacy and steal the drug to save his wife.
- When respondents were asked whether and why Heinz should or should not steal a drug to save his wife from a life- threatening illness. The responses of the individuals were compared with a prototypical response of individuals at particular stages of moral reasoning. Kohlberg noted that irrespective of the level of the individual the response could be same, but the reasoning could be different.
- For example, if a child reasoning at a „pre conventional“ level might say that it is not right to steal because it is against law and someone might see you.
- At a „conventional“ level, an individual might argue that it is not right to steal because it is against law and laws are necessary for society to function.
- At a „post conventional“ level, one may argue that stealing is wrong because is against law and it is immoral.

- **CONTROVERSY:**

- All individuals will not arrive at same verdict during their exercising their moral autonomy.
- Aristotle noted long ago that morality is not as precise and clear-cut as arithmetic.
- Aim of teaching engg ethics is not to get unanimous conformity of outlook by indoctrination, authoritarian and dogmatic teaching, hypnotism or any other technique but to improve promotion of tolerance in the exercise of moral autonomy.

- **CONSENSUS:**

The conductor of a music orchestra has authority over the musicians and his authority is respected by them by consensus as otherwise the music performance will suffer. Hence the authority and autonomy are compatible.

- On the other hand, tension arises between the needs for autonomy and the need for concerns about authority. The difference between the two should be discussed openly to resolve the issue to the common good.
- **PROFESSIONS AND PROFESSIONALISM**
- Engineers normally imagine that they are servants to organizations rather than a public guardian. Responsibility to the public is essential for a professional.

• What is a profession?

JOB" or „OCCUPATION" that meets the following criteria from which a person *earns his living*.

- Knowledge - Exercise of skills, knowledge, judgment and discretion requiring extensive formal criteria.
 - Organization - special bodies by members of the profession to set standard codes of ethics,
 - Public good-The occupation serves some important public good indicated by a code of ethics.
- Who is a professional engineer?
- Has a bachelor's degree in engineering from an accredited school?
 - Performs engineering work
 - Is a registered and licensed Professional Engineer
 - Acts in a morally responsible way while practicing engineering Differing views on Professionals
- "Only consulting engineers who are basically independent and have freedom from coercion can be called as professionals."
 - -Robert L.W hitelaw
 - "Professionals have to meet the expectations of clients and employers. Professional restraints are to be imposed by only laws and government regulations and not by personal conscience." -Samuel Florman
 - "Engineers are professionals when they 1) attain standards of achievement in education, job performance or creativity in engineering and 2) accept the most basic moral responsibilities to the public as well as employers, clients, colleagues and subordinates." -Mike Martin & Roland Schinzinger

• **MOTIVES FOR PROFESSIONALISM**

- A desire for interesting and challenging work and the pleasure in the act of changing the world.
- The joy of creative efforts. Where a scientist's interest is in discovering new technology, engineers' interest is derived from creatively solving practical problems.
- The engineer shares the scientist's job in understanding the laws and riddles of the universe.
- The sheer magnitude of the nature – oceans, rivers, mountains and prairies – leads engineers to build engineering marvels like ships, bridges, tunnels, etc., which appeal to human passion.
- The pleasure of being in the presence of machines generating a comforting and absorbing sense of a manageable, controlled and ordered world.
- Strong sense of helping, of directing efforts towards easing the lot of one's fellows.

- **MODELS OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS**
- SAVIOR: The representative engineer is a savior who will redeem society from poverty, inefficiency, waste and the drudgery of manual labor.
- GUARDIAN: Engineers know, the directions in which and pace at which, technology should develop.
- BUREAUCRATIC SERVANT: The engineer as the loyal organization person uses special skills to solve problems.
- SOCIAL SERVANT: Engineers, in co-operation with management, have the task of receiving society's directives and satisfying society's desires.
- 5. SOCIAL ENABLER AND CATALYST: Engineers play a vital role beyond mere compliance with orders. They help management and society understand their own needs and to make informed decisions.
- 6. GAME PLAYER: Engineers are neither servants nor masters of anyone. They play by the economic game rules that happen to be in effect at a given time.

TYPES OF ETHICAL THEORIES

S.NO	TYPES	BASED ON
1	Virtue ethics	Virtues and vices
2	Utilitarianism	Most good for most people
4	Rights ethics	Human Rights

Actions which reflect *bad character* traits (vices) are inherently *wrong*

- Virtue ethics are tied more to individual behavior than to that of an organization (e.g. business, government)

ARISTOTLE says that moral virtues are tendencies, acquired through habit formation, to reach a proper balance between extremes in conduct, emotion, desire and attitude i.e. virtues are tendencies to find the Golden Mean between the extremes of too much and too little.

VIRTUE ETHICS

- “*The unexamined life is not worth living.*” (Socrates, 470-399 B.C.)

“*The happy life is thought to be virtuous; now a virtuous life requires exertion and does not consist in amusement.*”

(Aristotle, 384-322 B.C.) The Four Main Virtues

- Prudence (mind): to think about a moral problem clearly and completely
- Temperance (emotions): control attraction to positive emotions
- Fortitude (emotions): control aversion for negative emotions
- Justice (will): choose according to truth and fairness.

Virtue Ethics

- Focuses on the type of person we should strive to be
- Actions which reflect *good character* traits (virtues) are inherently *right*

• **PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY**

- Being morally responsible as a professional.
- Most basic and comprehensive professional virtue.
- Creation of useful and safe technological products while respecting the autonomy of clients and public, especially in matters of risk taking.

This encompasses a wide variety of the more specific virtues grouped as follows:

SELF DIRECTION VIRTUES:

- Fundamental virtues in exercising our moral autonomy and responsibility. e.g. self-understanding, humility, good moral judgment, courage, self-discipline, perseverance, commitments, self-respect and dignity
- PUBLIC SPIRITED VIRTUES:
 - Focusing on the good of the clients and public affected by the engineers" work by not directly and intentionally harming others i.e. „no maleficence“.
 - Beneficence, sense of community, generosity are other virtues falling in this category.
- TEAMWORK VIRTUES:
 - Enables professionals to work successfully with others. E.g. collegiality, cooperativeness, the ability to communicate, respect for authority, loyalty to employers and leadership qualities.

PROFICIENCY VIRTUES:

- Mastery of one's craft that characterize good engineering practice e.g. competence, diligence, creativity, self-renewal through continuous education.

MORAL INTEGRITY

- Moral integrity is the unity of character on the basis of moral concern, and especially on the basis of honesty. The unity is consistency among our attitudes, emotions and conduct in relation to justified moral values.

SELF-RESPECT

- Valuing oneself in morally appropriate ways.
 - Integral to finding meaning in one's life and work
 - A pre-requisite for pursuing other moral ideals and virtues.
 - Self-respect is a moral concept of properly valuing oneself but self-esteem is a psychological concept of positive attitude towards oneself.
- Self-respect takes two forms.
 - Recognition self-respect* is properly valuing oneself because of one's inherent moral worth, the same worth that every other human being has.
 - Appraisal self-respect* is properly valuing ourselves according to how well we meet moral standards and our personal ideals.

VARIOUS SENSES OF RESPONSIBILITY

- Responsibility ascribed by i) virtue, ii) obligations, iii) general moral capacities of people, iv) liabilities and accountability for actions and v) blameworthiness or praiseworthiness.
- By virtue: A person is said to be a responsible person when we ascribe a moral virtue to the person. We expect that the person is regularly concerned to do the right thing, is conscientious and diligent in meeting obligations. In this sense, professional responsibility is the central virtue of engineers.
- By obligation: Moral responsibilities can be thought of as obligations or duties to perform morally right acts.
- By general moral capacity: When we view a person as a whole rather than one with respect to a specific area, we are actually thinking about the active capacity of the person for knowing how to act in morally appropriate ways e.g. the capacity of children grows as they mature and learn.
- By accountability: Responsibility also means being accountable, answerable or liable to meet particular obligations. The virtue of professional responsibility implies a willingness to be accountable for one's conduct.
- By being blameworthy: When accountability for a wrongdoing is at issue, responsible becomes a synonym for blameworthy. When right conduct is the issue, the context is praiseworthiness.

CAUSAL AND LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Causal Responsibility: consists simply in being a cause of some event. E.g. lightning as being responsible for a house catching fire.

Legal Responsibility: consists simply in being a cause for harm that was so unlikely and also unforeseeable that no moral responsibility is involved

UTILITARIANISM

- That which produces the maximum benefit for the greatest number of people (e.g. Democracy)
- Tries to achieve a balance between the good and bad consequences of an action
- Tries to maximize the well-being of society and emphasizes what will provide the most benefits to the largest group of people
- This method is fundamental to many types of engineering analysis, including risk-benefit analysis and cost-benefit analysis

Drawbacks:

- Sometimes what is best for the community as a whole is bad for certain individuals in the community
- It is often impossible to know in advance which decision will lead to the most good

Organizing Principles to Resolving Ethical Issues

- Utilitarian thinking
- a standard that promotes those individual actions or rules that produce the greatest total amount of utility to those affected.
- A code that enjoins engineers to promote the safety, health, and welfare of the public.
- What is utility, though? Happiness?
 - Preference utilitarianism
- promote those conditions that allow each individual to pursue happiness as he or she conceives it.
- Two conditions necessary for this: freedom and well-being.

Practically, for engineers, this advocates cost/benefit analyses. Problems with Utilitarianism

- Difficult to quantify benefits for ALL those affected.
- “Greatest good” difficult to apply to an all-inclusive population.
- Someone gets “shafted” – approach justifies perpetrating injustice on individuals, i.e., s someone gets left out.
- Three approaches:
 - Cost/benefit – quantifiable approach. Maximize positive utilities (benefits) against negative utilities (costs).
 - Act utilitarian – “Will the course of action produce more good than any alternative course of action that I could take”?
 - Rule utilitarian – “Would utility be maximized if everyone did the same thing in the same circumstances”? Adoption of commonly accepted rules.

- **COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS:**

- Assess the available options
- Assess the costs and benefits of each option for the entire audience affected
- Make the decision that is likely to result in the greatest benefit relative to cost.

- **ACT-UTILITARIANISM:**(professed by John Stuart Mills)

- Focuses on individual actions, rather than general rules.
- An act is right if it is likely to produce the best for the most people involved in the particular situation.
- Rules may be broken whenever doing so will produce the best in a specific situation.
- Happiness is the only „intrinsic“ good and all others are „instrumental“ goods that serve as the means of happiness.

- **RULE-UTILITARIANISM:**(professed by Richard Brandt)

- This regards moral values as primary.
We should follow the rules and avoid bribes, even when those acts do not have the best consequences in a particular situation, because the general practice of following rules and not bribing produce the most overall good
- Rules should be considered in sets called „moral codes“. A moral code is justified when followed, would maximize the public good more than alternative codes would.

DUTY ETHICS (Immanuel Kant's view)

- Contends that certain acts (or duties) should be performed because they are inherently ethical such as:
 - be honest,
 - keep promises,
 - do not inflict sufferings on other people,
 - be fair,
 - make reparation when you have been unfair,
 - how gratitude for kindness extended by others
 - seek to improve own intelligence and character,
 - develop one's talents,
 - don't commit suicide.
 - Duties, rather than good consequences, is fundamental.
 - Individuals who recognize their ethical duties will choose ethically correct moral actions
- These duties should meet Kant's 3 conditions i.e.

- It should express respect for persons,
 - People deserve respect because they have capacity to be *autonomous and for exercising goodwill*.
 - Goodwill is the *conscientious and honest effort* to do what is right according to universal principles of duties.
 - Moral motives and intentions play a prominent role in duty ethics rather than utilitarianism.
- It is an universal principle
 - Duties are binding on us only if they are applicable to everyone. They must be universalizable.
- It expresses command for autonomous moral agents. Duties prescribe certain actions categorically, without qualifications or conditions attached. Valid principles of duties are *Categorical Imperatives*. They contrast with non-moral commands called *Hypothetical Imperatives* which are conditional.
- The above ■► „RESPECT for PERSONS“

Drawback of Kant's duty ethics: It has failed to be sensitive to how principles of duty can *conflict* with each other thereby creating Moral dilemmas.

Rawls Development on Kant's Duty Ethics

- Rawls argues that all rational people would agree to abide by two basic moral principles:
- Each person is entitled to the most extensive amount of liberty compatible with an equal amount for others and
- Differences in social power and economic benefits are justified only when they are likely to benefit everyone, including members of most disadvantaged groups.

RIGHTS ETHICS (JOHN LOCKE - 1632-1704)

- Everyone has inherent moral rights
 - Everyone has rights that arise from *EXISTING* (i.e. right to Life, maximum individual Liberty, and human Dignity are Fundamental Rights).
 - Other rights arise as a Consequence.
 - Duties arise because people have rights, not vice versa.
 - Any act that violates an individual's moral rights is ethically unacceptable.
 - Rights ethics was highly individualistic.
 - Rights are primarily entitlements that prevent other people from meddling in one's life. These are referred to as Liberty Rights or Negative Rights that place duties on other people not to interfere with one's life.
- e.g. Individuals do not have rights to life because others have duties not to kill them. Instead, possessing the right to life is the reason why others ought not to kill them.

Drawbacks

- How do we prioritize the rights of different individuals?
Rights ethics often promote the rights of individuals at the expense of large groups/society A.I.Melden's version of Rights Ethics
- Human rights are intimately related to communities of people.
- This version is known as POSITIVE WELFARE RIGHTS and is defined as rights to community benefits for living a minimally decent human life.

EVALUATION OF ETHICAL THEORIES

- We are basically not interested in which of the ethical theories is the best. It is believed that there are areas in which each theory complements others by how they differ.
- Procedure for General Evaluation:
 - The theory must be clear and formulated with concepts that are coherent and applicable.
 - It must be internally consistent in that none of its tenets contradicts any other.
 - Neither the theory nor its defense can rely upon false information.
 - It must be sufficiently comprehensive to provide guidance in specific situations of interest to us.
 - It must be compatible with our most carefully considered moral convictions about concrete situations

SELF-INTEREST AND ETHICAL EGOISM

Psychological Egoism

- All of our actions can be reduced to self-interest. We always do what we most *want* to do. e.g., a man who helps others has *chosen* to do so, so he sees doing it, is in his
- *self-interest* : We do what makes us feel good. e.g., a man who helps others must get *pleasure* from doing it – hence it is in his *self-interest*
- The Problem of Counter Examples What about *charity* and *pity*?
- These require the egoist to distinguish selfish and unselfish *acts* from selfish and unselfish *motives*
Charity – I enjoy showing *my power*
Pity – I worry that it might happen to *me* So again, doing these, we act from *self-interest*
- Confusion over self-interest and selfishness
- Not all actions are done from selfishness
Brushing my teeth (self-interested but not selfish) Also confusion over self-interest and pleasure
 - Not all actions are done from self-interest
- Smoking cigarettes (pleasurable but not self-interested)
- *Self-interest* = *any interest the self has*
- What do all major Ethical Theories say about this?
- All major theories acknowledge the *importance* of Self Interest.
- Utilitarian's take into account one's own good as well as others.
- Duty ethics emphasizes duties to ourselves.
- Right ethicists talk about our rights to pursue our own good.
- Virtue ethicists emphasize the importance of self-respect.
- But all these theories also emphasize that the pursuit of self-interest must be balanced with our moral responsibilities to others.

RELIGION and DIVINE COMMAND ETHICS

Ethics and Religion:

- Moral issues and religious belief are related in several positive ways.
- First, they are shaped over time from the central moral values of major world religions.
- Second, religious views often support moral responsibility by providing additional motivation for being moral.
- Third, sometimes religions set a higher moral standard than is conventional.
- Societies often benefit from a variety of religions that make prominent particular virtues, inspiring their members to pursue them beyond what is ordinarily seen as morally obligatory.
- **Divine Command Ethic:** This says that an act which is right is commanded by god and the one which is wrong is forbidden by God.
- The difficulty in this is to know precisely what God's commands are and in knowing whether God exists.
- We can view that moral reasons are *not reducible* to religious matters, although religious belief may provide an *added inspiration* for responding to them.

Uses of Ethical Theories

- Ethical theories aid in identifying the moral considerations or reasons that constitute a dilemma.
- They provide a precise sense of what kinds of information are relevant to solving moral development.
- They sometimes, offer ways to rank the relevant moral considerations in order of importance and provide a rough guidance in solving moral problems.
- The theories help us identify the full moral ramifications of alternative courses of action, urging a wide perspective on the moral implications of the options and providing a systematic framework of comparing alternatives.
- The theories augment the precision with which we use moral terms and they provide frame works for moral reasoning when discussing moral issues with colleagues.
- By providing frame works for development of moral arguments, the theories strengthen our ability to reach balanced and insightful judgments.