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| 1. Sliwa, P. (2017). Moral Understanding as Knowing Right from Wrong. *Ethics*, 127(3), 521–552. doi: 10.1086/690011 2. To have an understanding in morality is to have a “valuable epistemic and moral good” (Sliwa, P. (2017) I. para 1). The argument being made here is that moral understanding is “a matter of knowing right from wrong” (Sliwa, P. (2017) I. para 2) and cannot be looked at too narrowly as Alison Hills does. Her argument does not take in the “importance first-personal experience” (Sliwa, P. (2017) V. para 1) to acquire moral understanding. To have a greater moral understanding capacity, we must acquire more first hand experiences of morality. This method allows us to give better moral reasoning capabilities and also let us arrive to our own conclusions using our own words. 3. A) Moral understanding is “a matter of knowing right from wrong” (Sliwa, P. (2017) I. para 2)   B) Moral understanding cannot be looked at too narrowly  C) The more “first-personal experience” (Sliwa, P. (2017) V. para 1) a person has with morality, the better that person’s capacity for moral understanding.  D) Moral reasoning allows us to arrive at our own conclusions using our own words.  E) Moral understanding is something we look for when finding a person for moral advice.  F) There is a difference between knowing and understanding something.   1. I would like to know if there are any other sources in which morality is deeply explored as it is in this academic journal. | I thought that Sliwa when over a lot of content really well. Things such as what the definition of morality is and what it means, the flaws of other people who tried to talk about morality and moral understanding such as Alison Hills, how a higher capacity for moral understanding benefits us etc.  This reading ties into my beliefs and experiences as I often find myself having strong opinions on ethics and moral issues but never feel confident enough to say them as they ay be too controversial or the wrong thing to say at that given moment. For example: a person may kill the people that killed his family and most people would deem both criminals. I however, would say he was in the right to kill them back for what they did. It all comes down to an individual’s definition of morality and understanding.  My ideas of what morality (the knowing right from wrong) is has not changed. I still believe that a person’s actions – to an extent – can be justified based on the persons definition of morality and understanding.   1. I can agree with this point as there is often confusion/differences in each person’s definition of what moral understanding is. This clears up this issue by avoiding the use of extra words that may confuse the reader, this definition Is clear, short, and simple. 2. I’d agree because from my experiences, moral understanding comes from looking at a variety of factors in any given situation rather than looking at a preset list of things for every situation. 3. This point is true as a person who has only read or heard about the matter will not be able to be as knowledgeful as a person who has first hand experience with the matter. This is because one person “knows” about the matter while the other “understands” it. 4. This is true because if for example I’m knowledgeful on a matter due to my first hand experiences (direct connections) or even second hand experiences (connections from other sources), I will be able to better arrive to my own conclusions using my own words as I would have experience on the matter. 5. I can agree with this as when ever I think about talking about something related to morality or there is advice I need on something that requires a somewhat moral understanding, I look to people who may either have first hand experiences with the matter or be knowledgeful on it as they can provide more valuable information/advice than someone who cannot relate could. 6. I’d have to agree with this point as in my eyes, there is a clear difference between knowing and understanding something. For example: my friend may be able to know how to solve physics questions but I understand how to solve it. This means that although he may be able to answer basic questions, I would be able to answer almost any question as well as teach others on the subject as I truly understand the matter.   Overall, these points made by Sliwa were strong and accurate. I could not ask to read anything more on the topic of morality and moral understanding as with have reading his journal – paired with my previous knowledge and experiences with morality – I fell as if I understand enough to the point where I am satisfied with what I understand.  This question is important to me as I would truly like to know how many other sources explore the idea of morality as much as this journal did. This is because not every one is willing to read a long, boring journal on a matter. However, if for example a show were to exist that explores morality and also is interesting enough to have other people watch it, then that would mean that people could be educated heavily on the matter all the meanwhile watching something they actually want to rather than read a long page of text. I have found and watched some shows that have done so, they incorporate the ideals of many characters into the plot, teaching the readers about the matter while keeping them engaged in the show itself. I am glad that there is such a method that takes learning into a fun and enjoyable path. |
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