

Section 3 Guide

1. Review - Utilitarianism and Deontology

Note 1.1

Act Utilitarianism focuses on performing utilitarian calculus every time we have to make a decision to try to have the biggest net positive through our decisions.

On the other hand, in Rule Utilitarianism we try to define rules that make it so that we can bypass having to perform utilitarian calculus every time.

Note 1.2

Formulation 1: Act only in ways where you wouldn't want your actions to become universal law for all. Can everyone, in principle do this without any issue?

Formation 2: Act in a way such that you treat humanity not just as a means of an end but as individual people that you respect. This emphasizes dignity and respecting others for who they are.

2. Social Contract Theory

Definition 2.1

The **social contract theory** is a theory that addresses the origin and legitimacy of political authority and governments. It is an agreement between individuals and their government that they give up some of their rights for the protection of their other rights, because humans are believed to have entered into with one another to form a society and create governing structures.

The creation of rules in the social contract theory is generally followed by the process where rational individuals would collectively accept the rule as binding because of its benefit to the community.

Pros:

- It is framed in the language of rights
- It is based on a solid understanding of human nature, recognizing that people often act out of self interest in the absence of common agreement
- It explains why under certain circumstances civil disobedience is the morally correct decision

Cons:

- No one signed the social contract
- Unsure what to do when conflicting rights
- Unjust to those who are struggling to maintain their part of the contract

I think that those other questions are important to ask but I think that people focusing on making their own actions more moral is much more effective in improving society.

3. My Quote

Quote 3.1

Just as Jake is confident the judge would agree that stealing is the right thing for Heinz to do, so Amy is confident that, “if Heinz and the druggist had talked it out long enough, they could reach something besides stealing.” As he considers the law to “have mistakes,” so she sees this drama as a mistake, believing that “the world should just share things more and then people wouldn’t have to steal.”

Both children recognize the need for agreement but see it as mediated in different ways — he impersonally through systems of logic and law, she personally through communication in relationship

The conclusion underscores the common ground between the two children — the acknowledgment of the necessity for agreement. However, their divergence lies in the methods of mediation. Jake favors an impersonal approach, relying on **systems of logic and law being utilitarian**, whereas Amy advocates for a more personal route, emphasizing the **importance of communication and relationship-building** to address societal issues. Overall, the passage illustrates how individuals may perceive and approach problem-solving through distinct lenses, influenced by their views on established systems and personal connections. **Even when we feel like laws are generally correct there are a lot of gray areas where some people think laws are at fault and others think our application of laws are at fault.** KANTIANISM SHE IS KANTIANISM

4. Ethical Dilemma

You are clinging to a tree with your two children in a tsunami, and you can’t hold on any longer to both children. You need to choose a child to let go of, how do you choose? Is it ethical to let go of the older child because they have a better chance of living? Based on an actual story