

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

When we are talking about "the ethical point of view", we are just simply looking on how we deal things or actions with the principle of morality. It is if an action is morally right or not. An example for this is about the issue right now, Reproductive Health Bill. For some, they say that it is ethical or they think that it is right to have this bill in order to avoid poverty that can also affect the children of course. While some think, like for church that it is not morally right because you are not giving a chance for a person to live.

2. Define morality and ethics in your own words.

Morality is our basis in the society to know what is right and wrong. Without this, we might live in an unpeaceful world. This is what differentiates our actions between right and wrong. On the other hand, ethics is also the difference between right and wrong but with the participation of our moral beliefs and behavior. It is a branch of philosophy that deals with the values relating to human conduct according to its rightness and wrongness. It is based on how a person see a thing, whether it is right or wrong.

3. What is the difference between morality and ethics?

Morality defines who we are. Character is measured with the morality. It is our own understanding of what is right and what is wrong. I believe morality is also based on our religion, or how we see things right or wrong based in God, whether the actions are good or evil or if it's wrong or not. Ethics on the other hand, is based on society; on how people will judge you with your actions.

4. What is the difference between relativism and objectivism?

The difference between relativism and objectivism is that relativism is the view of a person if an action is right or wrong. It means that it depends on the basis of a person, if what action he thinks is right and what is not. While objectivism is whether an action is right or wrong but based on what the people believe. It somehow relies on the beliefs of a person.

5. 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?

Using an ethical theory in the real world I think will be a great way to have a peaceful or maybe a perfect world. If we are all living in an ethical world, I believe we will all benefit from it. Since we are living in an ethical world, one of

the advantages will be all humans will live equally. Another is that there will be no crimes anymore; nobody will suffer from hunger or poverty. Having said these advantages, I can say that the humans are living peacefully in a perfect world.

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

When we say that ethical theory is rational it means that people see things first before judging them. They conclude a thing because it is what they think is right. It is the benefit of a person. Ethical theory is rational because they know how to reason out. They are not just reasoning without any basis, but their reasons are reasonable and can surely help. They just don't reason out without any explanations.

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

According to the book, many/any fallacy is a way of judging many options to be acceptable and then reaching the conclusion that any option is acceptable. An example for this is that in science, we say that cats are mammals. All humans are all mammals. Therefore, humans are also cats. I got this example way back in my high school. I can't think or invent of my own example.

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

Based on the chapter, equivalence fallacy is trying to equate two related but distinct things. It is comparing or saying that two different or unrelated things are actually the same. In the book, the given example is "God is good". It says that it does not mean that God and good are just same thing. It means that there is an objective standard of goodness that God meets perfectly.

9. Come up with your own example of a moral rule that would violate Categorical Imperative.

I believe that expressing an opinion is right of a person. In school, sometimes teachers discuss the lecture in a way with what they believe in, but not everyone can agree with it. Since some of the teachers do not want to listen to the opinions of their students, or cannot accept their opinions, so these students just keep their opinion in themselves which I believe is violating their categorical imperative.

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

Plagiarism is an unauthorized use of someone's original work. It is something that you copy from others without his permission. So, it is also a form of cheating. A person can commit plagiarism through: first, by not rephrasing. Meaning, copying every word of the content. Second, by not citing the source where he got the content. Third, by owning a person's work; lastly by not putting quotation marks in what the author had said.

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

Plagiarism is we copied something intentionally. We didn't rephrase; cite the sources even though we know that it is plagiarism. One example for plagiarism is when you have a research work to be done and what you did is just copy the whole thing from the internet without paraphrasing it or even citing the source. While misuse of sources is something done unintentionally. We just cited wrong source or wrong way of paraphrasing the content.

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

Consequentialist Theory tells that an act is right or wrong depending on its consequences. Consequentialist Theory believes that if an act of a person brings good things to others means that, that person's deed is right; if an act of a person brings bad things to others means that, that person's deed is wrong. It does not consider the true nature of the act. A good example of this is Robin Hood, his act is considered as a bad deed because he steals money from rich and corrupt members of the society but then he gives it to the less fortunate which makes his action right. On the other hand, Non-Consequentialist Theory tells that an act is right or wrong depending on the true nature of the act.

13. Give three examples of a situation in which your action would be 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.

Examples for actions that will be motivated by a sense of duty or obligation: first, when you make a promise to a person, it is your duty to do as what you have said or promised. Second, if you are in a team and you are being assigned to do a certain task you are obliged to do it. Lastly, in school, it is your duty to do your homework.

Examples for actions that will be motivated by its expected consequences: first, if you did a crime, expect a consequence from doing it. Second, making a choice

with the reason of someone just forced you to, or you've been forced because of the situation, will also have consequences. Any sin will have consequences.

14. What is the problem of moral luck?

The problem of moral luck is when actions do not have the intended consequences. A person did not intend to do something that will result in negatively. For example, I just wanted to give help to those kids who are begging from something, like money or food. Then I gave them a small amount of money. I didn't know that the money that I gave them will be used to buy rugby. I didn't want them to buy it because I know it is bad for their health. But I didn't know they will use the money to buy some of it.

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

Businesses and governments often think in an utilitarian way because they just want the best for the society. Like for the government, our government just wanted the best for us. If they will not think a thing that will benefit us, I don't think we will survive from a world like that. In business like food, they give what we need. If we don't have supplier of food, how can we survive? The businesses and governments are just giving to us what we need. They won't do a thing that will harm us.

16. What is the difference principle?

Difference principle states that social and economic inequalities must be justified. The given example in the book for difference principle is that the higher the income of a business, the higher the tax they will pay. This act is really unfair for those businessmen who are earning a lot in their business. Instead of saving their money for their future use, or invest more to other businesses, they are obliged to pay a higher amount of tax which I think is not right.

17. Is social contract theory as first presented a consequentialist theory or a non-consequentialist theory? Is social contract theory as articulated in Rawls's two principles of justice a consequentialist theory or non-consequentialist theory?

Social Contract Theory as first presented is a consequentialist theory because I believe that every action will face a consequence. Whether the action is good or bad, it will still surely have a consequence. Based on how I understood the chapter, the two principles of Rawls are both under the consequentialist theory because as being stated in this chapter: "we call utilitarianism a consequentialist theory, because the focus is on the consequences of an action. "

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

The similarity between the divine command theory and Kantianism is that they both have basis in reasoning. In divine command theory, we say an action is right or wrong is based on the Bible or from church. In Kantianism, it is based on chapter or verse. These two can both explain why is it right or wrong. The difference between these two is that in the divine command theory, we believe in God. While in Kantianism, they have this formulation rule.

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

The similarities between subjective relativism and act utilitarianism is that they having nothing to follow. They don't base on something whether an act is right or wrong. These two theories are just based on what they believe in. The difference between the two is that act utilitarianism is still looking for the happiness. The act must give happiness to a person. While subject relativism depends on them on how they will interpret an action, whether it is right or wrong, which I think is unfair.

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

In my own opinion, I think Kantianism and rule utilitarianism are almost the same. They both have basis to reason out. In rule utilitarianism, the rule will be your basis if someone did something wrong. They will not just simply accuse you without holding any evidence.

21. Describe similarities and differences between act utilitarianism and rule utilitarianism.

Act Utilitarianism is basically an act which is concerned with the consequences (whether the act is good or bad). Rule Utilitarianism, on the other hand, based on rules (rules of conduct and other important principle). The rule is the first one needed to be decided then the act is performed. This is the difference between Act and Rule Utilitarianism. The only similarity that I can think of is that they are both connected with the study of ethics.

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

The difference is that in cultural relativism it varies from culture to culture. They see that all cultures are just the same; that all cultures are equal. All opinions are just the same even people are coming from different cultures. Social Contract, on the other hand, society accepts the rules for their benefit. The similarity

between the cultural relativism and social contract theory is that their actions are based with their moral rules that reflects their behaviors.

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

The similarities between Kantianism and social contract theory is that they judge an action whether it is right or wrong with a basis. Fairness is also what we seek for. The difference between the two is that social contract theory is based on obligations of a person. While in Kantianism, they based an act in the moral rules.

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

With the first scenario, Alexis violated the rule utilitarianism by lying to the librarian, saying that she's a student of that university. Based on the Kantian perspective, what she did is not right. She just violated one of the rules of the school.

In the second scenario, what they did is not reasonable enough. I think the organization can have an alternative way to reduce or stop the spammers because in what they did, those innocent computer users are also affected by it. I believe there is/are other ways to do it without getting those innocent ones affect by it.

In the third scenario, what EDSP did was just right. With their actions, it didn't harm anyone. It helped people instead. It also helped people to follow the rule in the road – not over speeding. At the same time, it also became a way to arrest those people who committed crime like the terrorist.

In the last scenario, the company promised something to a client. Therefore, they should give what they have promised. But in this case, if they push through the project and give it to the client on the date they promised, the system might have multiple errors and in the worse case scenario, will give wrong information to the client which is the hospital. So I think instead of following the rule of promise, it is better to fix all the bugs first before giving it to the client.

25. Evaluate the four scenarios presented in section 2.1 from an act utilitarian perspective.

With the first scenario, Alexis violated the rule utilitarianism by lying to the librarian, saying that she's a student of that university. I think what she did is just right because if she will not do that, she might fail in her subject. And no one got harmed with what she did, so I think it is just ok.

In the second scenario, I think the organization can have an alternative way to reduce or stop the spammers because in what they did, those innocent computer users are also affected by it. I believe there is/are other ways to do it without getting those innocent ones affected by it.

In the third scenario, what EDSP did was just right. With their actions, it didn't harm anyone. It helped people instead. It also helped people to follow the rule in the road – not over speeding. At the same time, it also became a way to arrest those people who committed crime like the terrorist.

In the last scenario, the company promised something to a client. Therefore, they should give what they have promised. But in this case, if they push through the project and give it to the client on the date they promised, the system might have multiple errors and in the worse case scenario, will give wrong information to the client which is the hospital. So I think instead of following the rule of promise, it is better to fix all the bugs first before giving it to the client.

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

Scenario 1: When we are talking about rules, I think what Alexis did is wrong. A rule is a rule, and no one should violate it. The rule has been made because they are trying to avoid a situation that can harm others. Like food and drinks are not allowed in a computer laboratory. This rule is made to prevent spilling of drinks in the computer because once it happened, the computer won't run anymore. So this is one of the reasons why rules must be followed.

Scenario 2: Based from the rule of utilitarian, I think what they just did is right.

Scenario 3: According to the rule, what they did is right. They didn't violate anything.

Scenario 4: The Company promised something to a client. Therefore, they should give what they have promised. But in this case, if they push through the project and give it to the client on the date they promised, the system might have multiple errors and in the worse case scenario, will give wrong information to the client which is the hospital. So I think instead of following the rule of promise, it is better to fix all the bugs first before giving it to the client.

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

Scenario 1: What she did for is not wrong. She just wanted to continually get high grades. It is just that we cannot avoid some situations like, what if there are students who are really students of the university who need to use a computer. Then there are no other computers that are available. I think it is already not right for her to continue what she's doing because someone is already suffering from what she's doing. The student in the university might fail in his subject because of lack of computer. In this situation where I think she needs to stop what she's doing – pretending to be part of the university just to be able to do a research.

Scenario 2: My answer here will be just the same as how I answered the other question based on the act utilitarian. I think the organization can have an alternative way to reduce or stop the spammers because in what they did, those innocent computer users are also affected by it. I believe there is/are other ways to do it without getting those innocent ones affected by it.

Scenario 3: What the East Dakota State Police did is just right. I don't think they harmed some people because the one who benefited from it are the citizens. They can easily catch those terrorists. And with this, citizens are now safe from them, or in the future, will be free from them.

Scenario 4: The Company promised something to a client. Therefore, they should give what they have promised. But in this case, if they push through the project and give it to the client on the date they promised, the system might have multiple errors and in the worse case scenario, will give wrong information to the client which is the hospital. So I think instead of following the rule of promise, it is better to fix all the bugs first before giving it to the client.

DISCUSSION

28. 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 will base his action with the divine command theory. If you practiced what you have learned in your religion, I don't think he will do such a thing. This act is absolutely unethical. It did not give happiness to the victims as well. And based on the utilitarianism theory, an action will be considered good if it gives happiness to the person. But in this case, it gives sadness and maybe at the same time, anger to the victims.

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

In my opinion, I don't think there would be any need for a rigorous study of ethics because if everyone has already agreed to take the ethical point of view by respecting each other and their core values, I assume that everyone know what is right and wrong. Just by respecting each other, everything will go peacefully.

30. If you had to choose only one of the 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 will choose the divine command theory because I believe in God. I have faith in Him. I know the actions that are good for Him, and those that are not. I know what will be the consequences if I will do things that are wrong. I believe that everything in the Bible are all right. Therefore, it is the only theory i will apply to my everyday life.

31. 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 it already depends on a person on how he understood a theory. Like, there is one theory saying that it is right as long as you are happy when you are doing it. With this, we all know that not everything is right if we are just happing doing it. Like bullying other people, we are happy to do it but it does not mean it is morally right. We are hurting other people already. Therefore, it really depends on how a person understood a theory and how are they going to apply it in their real life.

32. 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 colonized 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?

For me, I will choose the theory of utilitarianism. I believe that a world will be perfect as long as everybody is happy. In this theory, as long as you give happiness to a person, an action is already right. Of course, the action is still based on the moral rules. Someone must be positively benefited from the action

that you have done. I chose this ethical theory because for me, happiness is what people are looking for.

33. According to the golden rule, you should do unto others what you would want to do unto you. Is the categorical imperative simply the golden rule in disguise?

I believe in this golden rule and I apply it in my real life. Based on how I understand the meaning of the categorical imperative, it is something you do for yourself. Then, the reason why I am applying this golden rule in my life is for me to benefit too. I believe that it is not only me who can benefit from it, it is a dual effect. Of course, I don't do things to others that can harm them. In return, they should not do things that can harm me too.

34. 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?

I can't think of any ethical theories that would allow someone to use the argument "Everybody is doing it" to show that an activity is not wrong. I think only their conscience will tell them that an activity is wrong. It is not because everybody is doing it, it already means that it is right. What if everybody got addicted to drugs already? We can't say that because they are all taking drugs like marijuana, we should also take it. It does not mean it is right. Therefore, it depends on how we think already whether something is right or wrong.

36. 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.

a. I don't have enough money to buy it.
Borrow money from someone.

b. The retail price is too high. The company is gouging customers.
It is just the normal price. It is better to buy rather than duplicating it.

c. Since I wouldn't have bought it anyway, the company didn't lose a sale.

d. I'm giving my friend the opportunity to do a good deed.
It is not a good deed. You are actually giving him an idea of doing a bad deed. It is not right to teach your friend to cheat.

e. Everyone else is doing it. Why should I be the only person to buy it when everyone else is getting it for free?

You know that what they were doing is not right. It is cheating. Then why will you still do it?

f. This is a drop in the bucket compared to Chinese pirates who sell billions of dollars' worth of copied music.

You only care for yourself. How about for those people who worked hard just to compete the music?

g. This is insignificant compared to the billions of dollars' worth of music being exchanged over the net.

Can you tell what will they feel about it? If you are in their position, would you still tolerate these kinds of actions?

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

Yes, the citizens of a representative democracy are morally responsible for the action of their government. It is their obligation or responsibility of the actions that are being done by the government. These citizens must see if the actions are already wrong, and they need to correct it since it is one of their responsibilities because once they tolerate these actions, they government officials will just continue doing those wrong actions.

40. 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.

Mary just did a wrong action. It is clearly stated in the rules of their instructor that they are supposed to do their own work. She just violated the rule given by the instructor. Even though what John said is reasonable, I don't think it is still right to not follow the rules. And in this case, it is already a form of cheating.

42. 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?

The right to life is a positive right. Everyone is given the chance to live. God created us with a purpose. We are created to not harm other people because as we say, we need to respect other people's rights. They have been created with a purpose too. We are here to help each other. We should help people who need food or shelter. But I don't think we are obliged to do it. What we need to do is to take care of our life that God has given us and not waste it with things that are useless. Let us not do things that are not ethical.

43. Which of the following rights should be considered legitimate positive rights by our society?
- a. The right to K-12 education
 - b. The right to a higher education
 - c. The right to housing
 - d. The right to health care
 - e. The right of a presidential candidate to receive time on television

In my opinion, I think the right to health care should be considered legitimate positive rights by our society because I know that not everyone can go to hospital to have check-up. Because of poverty, they are not able to take care of their health. If they are sick, they can't even buy the medicine. For children ages 12 and below can't also buy vitamins to make them healthier. Therefore, this right to health care must be given with our society.