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# ACTIVITY ONE

1. The argument is valid and unsound. It is impossible to ensure that acts will be truly voluntary, due to the possibility of a patient feeling pressured to request an early death. The argument is unsound as it could be argued that with property written legislation in place, laws will not be abused.

Domain – law, concerned with the law being abused.

1. The argument is valid and sound as premises euthanasia is killing a human being and killing a human being is a sin are true. Resulting in the conclusion that euthanasia is ethically wrong because you must not commit a sin.

Domain – religious, concerned with sin.

1. The argument is invalid and inductive. The premises of the argument do not guarantee the conclusion that euthanasia is ethically wrong. It could be argued that the doctors duty is to act in the patient’s best interest, not only to exercise professional judgement. Therefore, if the patient’s best interest is to relieve pain and request euthenasia, it could be concluded that euthenasia is not ethically wrong.

# ACTIVITY TWO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Argument | Domain |
| If someone is proved to have betrayed their country, it is fine to torture them in order to learn about who they work for. It is not only generally acceptable to do so, but such practice is even legal. | Political |
| Lying is a terrible habit. It damages the reputation of the person. It is very difficult to trust a dishonest person. Further, most religions also strongly condemn and prohibit lying. | Ethics\* and Religion |
| Interracial marriage is not a good idea. Many societies have socially stigmatized interracial marriages. | Social Convention |
| It is correct to wear a helmet when riding a bicycle because this is the law in our state. | Law |

# ACTIVITY THREE

1. There are two clear unethical issues with PhoneDog suing Kravitz. Firstly, with PhoneDog blatantly backflipping on their initial agreement with Kravitz. Secondly, as PhoneDog is a company suing a single individual, an individual would have less resources compared to a company so if court proceedings were to occur, it would lead to an unequal playing field.
2. This issue is unique to Cybertechnology as Twitter and Twitter followers exist online only, and there is no situation in the physical world where an individual employee leaving a company would take with him the contact details of customers from the company. It could be argued that an employee might keep in contact with customers, but this would clearly be outside of the business of the company and it would also not be public information, whereas Twitter follower lists are public for anybody to see. The issue of a company suing an individual however is not unique to Cybertechnology as it happens in other situations too.
3. The contract-based ethical theory applies in this scenario where the company and individual come into agreement in regards to the Twitter account, with PhoneDog allowing Kravitz to keep the account on the basis that Kravitz continues to post tweets on behalf of PhoneDog.

# ACTIVITY FOUR

If a utilitarian approach is taken to this issue there is the advantage of saving your friend and not betraying her, which results in helping someone close to you. You believe your friend is a loyal American and rounding up all Arab-Americans is unfair and unjust so she does not deserve to be put into an internment camp. A downside of this approach is that you are risking your own safety and betraying your country by lying to the officer to protect your friend.

If a deontological approach is taken you will be conducting your actions in accordance with the rules surrounding the situation. As you have a duty to act within the laws of your country, as well as a duty to protect your friend this approach is not so black and white. Either way you will be betraying one party by protecting or helping the other.

When applying Ross's Theory we need to consider all 7 prima facie duties outlined in this theory. These often conflict and need to be weighted accordingly to achieve an outcome. This is very much the case in this situation however, many of the duties support protecting your friend such as:

* **Fidelity** as you promised to protect your friend.
* **Reparation** is likely to apply in a friendship as you try to make up for any past wrong actions.
* **Gratitude** as you respect the friendship.
* **Beneficence** as it results in the happiness of your friend.
* **Non-malfeasance** when protecting your friend from getting hurt.

Only a couple of the duties support telling the truth to the officers:

* **Justice and fairness** as it would result in the same outcome for your friend as other Arab-Americans.
* **Self-improvement** as you would be protecting yourself.

If the duties are weighed evenly, Ross's Theory suggests protecting your friend. This, as with all approaches to solving ethical dilemmas, can be viewed differently by another person and assumptions have been made around the friendship and devotion to country.