

Contemporary Moral Problems: Chapter 1

James Rachels: Egoism & Moral Scepticism

Review Questions:

1. **According to Rachels. Why wouldn't we hurt others, and why should we help others. How can the egoist reply?**

The answer is we should be moral or ethical. We must never hurt others and must always help because it is what we believe that is moral, that is ethical. Most of us think that doing good to others, there will always be a good thing that will happen to you, like karma. However, the true reason for doing good to others is not expecting a benefit from those good actions.

2. **State the argument for saying that ethical egoism is inconsistent. Why doesn't Rachels accept this argument?**

The argument saying that ethical egoism is inconsistent is that, it is impossible to maintain the doctrine of ethical egoism because every time we try there is always a discrepancy.

3. **What three commonplace confusions does Rachels detect the thesis of psychological egoism?**

The three commonplace confusions that Rachels detect in the thesis of psychological egoism are; Selfishness and Self-interest; Actions are done mainly because of self-interest; and incorrect assumptions about others is always opposing the interest of others.

4. **Rachels discusses two arguments for psychological. What are these arguments, and how does he reply to them?**

Rachels discussed two arguments for psychological which are the following; identifying one's action as selfish or unselfish; and the unselfish actions are the source of self-satisfaction and unselfish actions depends on the level of analysis. For Rachels, these two arguments are not true because self-interest, mostly known as the source of selfishness, may vary and may not harm others.

5. **Distinguish between psychological egoism and ethical egoism.**

Psychological Egoism is a view that does not use a normative view. It believes that they only do things because of what they want something good in return. While the Ethical Egoism, it is very much different from Psychological Egoism because it uses a normative view. Unlike Psychological Egoism, Ethical Egoism does not care if they receive something in return, they act on their own.

6. **Explain the legend of Gyges. What questions about morality are raised by the story?**

The legend of Gyges is almost the same story of the "Lord of the Rings" Trilogy. It is about a ring that gives its owner a power of invisibility. It was owned by Gyges, a shepherd. Having the power of invisibility, he seduced the Queen and killed the King to have the King's power. The

story shows that having a certain power can change a good man into someone else. Most people let themselves to be eaten and controlled by their powers.

Discussion Questions

- 1. Has Rachels answered the question raised by Glaucon, namely, "Why be moral?" If so what exactly is his answer.**

Yes, "Why be moral?" that was asked by Glaucon was answered by Rachels in which he said that a person should not harm each other and should give a helping hand to others. A person should not be selfish for them not to harm others.

- 2. Are genuine egoists rare, as Rachels claims? Is it a fact that most people care about others, even people they don't know?**

It is rare to find Genuine Egoist because most people do care about others even if they don't know. There is always sympathy towards others.

- 3. Suppose we define ethical altruism as the view that one should always act for the benefits of others and never in one's own interest, Is such a view immoral or not?**

In my opinion, Ethical Altruism is cannot be considered as immoral or moral because every person has its own self-interest in which it may not give a negative effect to others.

John Arthur: Religion & Morality

Review Questions

1. According to Arthur, How are morality and religion different?

John Arthur believes that morality and religion is different because morality involves our attitude toward to different types of behavior, usually expressed by rules, rights, and obligations. On the contrary, religion normally involves worship, beliefs of the supernatural, prayer, institutional forms, and authoritative texts.

2. Why isn't religion necessary for moral obligation?

Religion isn't necessary for moral obligation for the reason that we were born and raised by our parents to do what is right to become civilized people. Most of the people are too worry to be blamed and being criticized by others. We do what is right, fair and just because we know it is the right thing to do. Overall, we just do what is right so we can't hurt other people and can't make ashamed by our family and friends.

3. Why isn't religion necessary as a source of moral knowledge?

Religion isn't necessary as a source of moral knowledge since we have to consider how much we would want to know about religion and revelation in order for religion to give moral guidance. Also, it is depending on which religion we believe in a person deems the necessity for moral knowledge. So religion cannot be a source of moral knowledge. It is in our perspective on which we choose to be right.

4. What is the divine command theory? Why does Arthur reject this theory?

The divine command theory means that God himself can say what is right and wrong and that it is the only right and wrong. Meaning, without God's commands there would be no moral rules, just as without a legislature there would be no statutes.

Arthur rejects this theory because of what the divine command theory means. We wouldn't know what was right and wrong to our actions. Presume we were to allow that the divine command theory is right, so that actions are right just because they are commanded by God. The same as the deeds that we believe are wrong. If God hadn't commanded us not to do them, they would not be wrong.

5. According to Arthur, how are morality and religion connected?

Morality and Religion are connected because without religious motivation people could not be expected to do the right thing. Religion has changed as time goes by, also that they have been influenced by history, politics and law. Also, religion is necessary to provide guidance to people in their search for the correct course of action. Furthermore, morality has also influenced religion because it provides guidance to people in search for the correct course of action.

6. Dewey says that morality is social. What does this mean, according to Arthur?

According to Arthur, this means that if Dewey is right, so it looks evident there is an essential logic in which morality not only can be trained but must be. As well as, early moral training, moral thinking depends on our skill to visualize others' reactions and to put ourselves into their shoes. Moreover, morality is inherently social, in a variety of ways. It depends on socially learned language, is learned from interactions with others, and governs our interactions with others in society.

Discussion Questions

1. Has Arthur refuted the divine command theory? If not, how can it be defended?

Yes, he refuted the divine command theory by saying to the people that they should not believe in it; that they should not believe in a God who is the only authorized person to say what is right or wrong. What is right and wrong is not directly stated in the Bible but the Bible itself builds our own instinct of right and wrong. Hence, it is right to say that inherently what is right and wrong comes from God's words.

2. If morality is social, as Dewey says, then how can we have any obligations to nonhuman animals?

Mankind has the right to have a comfortable shelter with food and water as well as the nonhuman animals. From the Bible says that we are to be good stewards (care takers) of the earth God gave us. Meaning all living things on earth are our moral obligations to take care of. Socially, we have personal relationship with animals. As of now, people are more aware of how to give importance to animal welfare.

3. What does Dewey mean by moral education? Does a college ethics class count as moral education?

According to Dewey, moral education means we can learn about it by our own idea or imagination since habits are formed and changed almost constantly and any values which are desirable in education are themselves moral. So, college ethics class is considered moral education.

Friedrich Nietzsche: Master & Slave Morality

Review Questions:

1. How does Nietzsche characterize a good and healthy society?

According to Nietzsche, a healthy society does not exist for its own sake, but exists for the sake of a higher type of person. He stated that all higher civilization arose from the barbarians, who with their will and desire for power, have preyed upon the weaker, moral and peaceful societies. Furthermore, the superior person pursue a master-morality that emphasizes power, strength, egoism, and freedom, as distinguished from slave morality that calls for weakness, submission, sympathy, and love.

2. What is Nietzsche's view of injury, violence and exploitation?

For Nietzsche, injury, violence and exploitation is the consequence of the will to power by man. The will to power is the dominant principle of organic function. Without the will to power exploiting the sentimental weaknesses of equality among people, society cannot develop. The will to power is the will to life. According to him, "to refrain from mutual injury, mutual violence, mutual exploitation, to equate one's will with that of another," is nihilistic. It is a "denial of life." As a "principle of society," it is "a principle of dissolution and decay." He also stated that, "Exploitation pertains to the essence of the living thing as a fundamental organic function; it is a consequence of the intrinsic will to power which is precisely the will to life." This is what he believes in and this is his view on the following. For him, the life of a person naturally involves injury, violence and exploitation and you can only belong either to the ones who do it to others or the one being done unto.

3. Distinguish between master-morality and slave morality.

Master Morality is a "yea-saying" attitude where "good and "bad" are equivalent to "noble" and "despicable" respectively. The master creates values. Slave morality is a "nay-saying" attitude or herd morality which holds to the standard of that which is useful or beneficial to the weak or powerless. The virtues are sympathy, kindness and humility. Strong and independent individual are evil.

Nietzsche, slave morality takes certain typical characteristics of the "lowest order" and master morality in slave morality, "good" means "tending to ease suffering" and "evil" means "tending to inspire fear." Nietzsche believes that slave morality is expressed in the standard moral systems. Master morality on the other hand, discusses the opposite. Master morality is to inspire fear; to inflict injury and exploitation to others.

The history of morals is the conflict of these two moral outlooks. The higher type creates his own values out of strength; the meek and powerless begin with resentment. Coexistence is impossible because the herd seeks to impose its values universally.

4. Explain the will to power.

According to Nietzsche the goal of Will to Power is essentially engaged in the preservation and enhancement of itself: The Will wills itself. Thus the Will to Power is essentially an activity of interpreting aimed at preserving and enhancing life itself. This is Nietzsche's notion of Will to Power.

Discussion Questions:

- 1. Some people view Nietzsche's writings as harmful and even dangerous. For example, some have charged Nietzsche with inspiring Nazism. Are there charges justified or not? Why or why not?**

It is understandable for people to think of it in this manner. Nietzsche does use big words and use them to divide further the superior from the inferior. They may think it inspired Nazism because his master morality takes account on inspiring fear to the weak ones. He believes that life revolves on the master who dictates everything and inflicts pain on those who don't follow and the slaves who have no choice but to accept the suffering the master puts on them.

- 2. What does it mean to be "a creator of values"?**

To be a creator of values is Nietzsche's overman or in other terms his superman. It is his heroic individualism that makes a person an overman. He will be the creator of master morality and the likes.

Mary Midgley: Trying Out One's New Sword

Review Questions:

1. What is "Moral Isolationism"?

Moral Isolationism is a view that we should not care about other cultures and should not be criticized. Every country has its own culture these cultures and traditions differ from one another.

2. Explain the Japanese custom of tsujigiri. What questions does Midgley ask about this custom?

Tsujigiri is a word that means crossroads killing. It is a practice of Japanese Samurai that whenever they receive a new katana or samurai sword, they will try to use it know if it is working properly. Hence, leads to killing an opponent or rather, killing an innocent man. With this tradition, Mary Midgley cited this practice to ask questions to open each other's eyes and minds. "Does the isolating barrier work both ways? Are people in other cultures equally unable to criticize us?" – Mary Midgley

3. What is wrong with moral isolationism, according to Midgley?

Moral Isolationism is somewhat makes us does not care about any other cultures except ours. It was as if we do not care at all.

4. What does Midgley think is the basis for criticizing other culture?

It is to accept other culture, to be part of our culture. Yes, all of us are different but we can accept these cultures based from what we think are right or wrong.

Discussion Questions:

1. Midgley says that Nietzsche is an immoralist. Is that an accurate and fair assessment of Nietzsche? Why or why not?

For me, it is not a fair assessment of Nietzsche because these two people have different views and ideologies.

2. Do you agree with Midgley's claim that the idea of separate and unmixed cultures is unreal? Explain your answer.

In my opinion, separate and unmixed culture is real. Yes, we do respect the culture of others but it doesn't stop us from separating ourselves to them since we hold on to what we believe.

John Stuart Mill: Utilitarianism

Review Questions:

1. **State and explain the Principle of Utility. Show how it could be used to justify actions that are conventionally viewed as wrong, such as lying and stealing.**

The Principle of Utility or the greatest happiness principle affirms the actions are right in proportion as they tend to encourage happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. As a result of happiness are intended pleasures and the absence of pain while by unhappiness, pain and privation of pleasures.

The Principle of Utility could be used to justify actions that are conventionally viewed as wrong by for example deceitful could be a cause for someone to be unhappy. His conscience could harm himself because he would be bothered about his deceitfulness.

2. **How does Mill reply to the objection the Epicureanism is a doctrine worthy only of swine?**

Mill said that the objection that Epicureanism is a doctrine worthy only of swine is disregarding precisely because the beast's pleasure does not satisfy human beings' conceptions of happiness.

3. **How does Mill distinguish between higher and lower pleasures?**

Mill distinguishes the two pleasures as the higher pleasure is the one that all or almost all who have experience of both give a decided preference, irrespective of any feelings of moral obligation to prefer it. While the lower pleasure is when those who are competently acquainted with both, place so far above the other that they prefer it, even though knowing it to be attended with a greater amount of discontent, and would not resign it for any quantity of the other pleasures which their nature is capable of.

4. **According to Mill, whose happiness must be considered?**

According to Mill, those who are in greater in number or the majority should be considered in happiness.

Mill describes "happiness" to be both intellectual and sensual pleasure. He disagrees that man have a sense of dignity that makes a person prefer intellectual pleasures to sensual ones. He also states that the principle of utility involves evaluating an action's consequences, and not the motives or personality traits of the agent. Mill argues that the principle of utility should be seen as a means for creating secondary moral principles, which promote universal happiness. As a consequence most of our actions will be judged according to these secondary principles. He believes that man should appeal directly to the principle of utility itself only when faced with an amoral dilemma between two secondary principles.

5. **Carefully reconstruct Mill's proof of the principle of utility.**

Things done by people will only be right if it will promote happiness. According to the utilitarian conception, there was no unusual desire of it, or motive to it, save its conduciveness to pleasure, and mainly to protection from pain. On the contrary, through the association thus formed, it may be felt a good in itself, and desired as such with a great intensity as any other

good; and with this difference between it and the love of money, of power, or of fame, that all of these may, and often do, cause the individual harmful to the other members of the society to which a person belongs, whereas there is nothing which makes him so much a blessing to them as the cultivation of the disinterested love of virtue.

Discussion Questions:

1. Is happiness nothing more than pleasure, and the absence of pain? What do you think?

Yes, I believe that happiness is different from pleasure and the absence of pain because when you are totally at peace with yourself nothing can shake you. Happiness is the meaning and purpose of life, the whole aim and end of human existence.

2. Does Mill convince you that the so-called higher pleasures are better than the lower ones?

Yes, I am certainly sure that higher pleasures are better than the lower ones because in higher pleasures, you should be ready for anything or you should be superior in anything. Since, the person who experience lower pleasure will experience lower consequences.

3. Mill says, "In the golden rule of Jesus of Nazareth, we read the complete spirit of the ethics of utility". Is this true or not?

Yes it is true because a man should do something for the majority and not for one's self alone. Make a move that ensures that the majority will be happy as you are. Also, a man must act in whatever way every other man should act when in that situation.

4. Many commentators have thought that Mill's proof of the Principles of Utility is defective. Do you agree? If so, then what mistake or mistakes does he make? Is there any way to reformulate the proof so that it is not defective?

In my point of view, he did not consider the individuality of a person. Mill disregarded the aspects that utility is not to be applied as a whole.

James Rachels: The Debate over Utilitarianism

Review Questions:

1. **Rachels says that classical utilitarianism can be summed up in three propositions. What are they?**

Classical Utilitarianism is classified as:

- a. Actions are to be judged right or wrong solely in the virtue of their consequences.
- b. In assessing consequences, the only thing that matters is the amount of happiness or unhappiness that is caused.
- c. In calculating happiness or unhappiness that will be caused, no one's happiness as to be counted as more important than anyone else's.

2. **Explain the problem with hedonism. How do defenders of utilitarianism respond to this problem?**

Hedonism is a belief of moral happiness. Only pleasure can make a person happy and pain to make unhappy. To defend utilitarianism, they should change their view of pleasure and happiness. Happiness is not something that is acknowledged as good and sought for its own sake, with other things appreciated only as means of bringing it about.

3. **What are the objections about justice, rights and promises?**

The objection about justice is that, a man should bear false witness against the innocent person. A person is not given a fair justice. While the objection about rights is human being are not practicing their rights. Then, the objection about promises it made to be broken and exposed to sort of criticism.

4. **Distinguish between rule-and-act utilitarianism. How does rule utilitarianism reply to objections?**

Act Utilitarianism is an utilitarian theory of ethics which says that the right action is the one which produces greatest amount of happiness or pleasure for the greatest number of beings. While Rule of Utilitarianism is an opposite of Act of Utilitarianism which states that the morally right action is the one that is accordance with moral rules whose general observance would create the most happiness. The revised version of utilitarianism is better than the old version. It not all about happiness and actions but appropriate behavior will be established. If these rules are refined and perfected then they are in the greater good.

5. **What is the third line of defense?**

It describes that an act utilitarian is an absolutely indefensible doctrine and does not have to be modified. Rule utilitarianism by contrast is unnecessarily watered down version theory which provides rule a better significance than they merit. However, Act-utilitarian is acknowledged to be radical doctrine which suggests that many of our usual moral feelings may be mistaken. As what most philosophy always does it challenges man to consider things that we have taken for granted

Discussion Questions:

1. **Smart's defense of utilitarianism is to reject common moral beliefs when they conflict with utilitarianism. Is this acceptable or not? Explain your answer.**

I believe that it is not acceptable for the reason that it is not right to reject common moral beliefs just because there is a conflict with utilitarianism. It depends on the individual because every person has different beliefs and cultures as a factor for applying utilitarianism.

2. **Utilitarianism is supposed to give moral consideration to all concerned. Who must be considered? What about nonhuman animals? How about lakes and streams?**

Utilitarian's concentrated mainly on human beings although nonhuman beings also can cause unhappiness with humans and affects man's moral beliefs. Therefore they also consider nonhuman beings as well as the environment like lakes and streams. All the things around man's life should give moral consideration to avoid conflict and disharmony to nature.

3. **Rachels claims that merit should be given moral consideration independent of utility. Do you agree?**

I do agree with Rachels that in claiming merits it should be given moral consideration independent of utility.

Immanuel Kant: The Categorical Imperative

Review Questions:

1. Explain Kant's account of the good will.

According to Kant it is impossible to visualize something at all in the world or even out of it, which can be taken as good without condition, except goodwill. Without the principles of good things it may become extremely bad. Also the very coolness of crook makes them not merely more dangerous but more immediately and more abominable in human eyes than we should have taken them to be without.

2. Distinguish between hypothetical and categorical imperatives

According to Kant, human beings dwell in a special place in creation, and morality can be summed up in one ultimate commandment of reason, from which all duties and obligations originate. He clearly defined an imperative as any proposition that reveals a specific action (or inaction) to be required. A hypothetical imperative compels action in a given condition: if I wish to quench my thirst, I must drink something. A categorical imperative, in contrast, symbolizes an absolute, unconditional requirement that asserts its authority in all situations, both required and acceptable as an end in itself.

3. States the first formulation of the categorical imperative (using the notion of a universal law), and explain how Kant uses this rule to derive some specific duties toward self and others.

Kant concludes that a moral proposition is true must be one that is not tied to any particular conditions, including the identity of the person making the moral deliberation. A moral maxim must have universality which is to say that it must be disconnected from the actual physical details surrounding the proposition, and could be used to any rational being. This leads to the first formulation of the categorical imperative:

"Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law."

Kant separates the duties imposed by this formulation into two subsets: perfect duty and imperfect duty.

4. State the second version of the categorical imperative (using the language of means and end) and explain it.

The free will is the source of all rational action. But to treat it as a subjective end is to deny the possibility of freedom in general. Since the autonomous will is the absolute source of moral

action, it would contradict the first formulation to claim that a person is merely a means to some other end, rather than always an end in his or her self.

On this basis, Kant derives second formulation of the categorical imperative from the first.

"Act in such a way that person treats humanity, whether in ourselves or others, always at the same time as an end and never merely as a means to an end."

The second formulation also directs to the imperfect duty to extend the ends of ourselves and others. If any person wishes perfection in himself or others, it would be his moral duty to search for that end for all humankind equally, so long as that end does not conflict perfect duty.

Discussion Questions:

- 1. Are the two versions of the categorical imperative just different expressions of one basic rule, or are two different rules? Defend your view.**

In my point of view it is one basic rule as in the categorical imperative it is just concerning about the subject in which it is not really certain difference in rules. If you will accept a case whether you know or not you will accept it for the reason that in any sense you still have to do it in which you will need same approach in spite of everything you will be suspected.

- 2. Kant claims that an action that is not done from the motive of duty has no moral truth. Do you agree or not?**

Yes, I agree to it for the reason that in any sense you did not do a task as you are considering it as a job.

- 3. Some commentators think that the categorical imperative can be used to justify non-moral or immoral actions. Is this a good criticism?**

I believe that is not a good criticism because not at once you can say what that object thinks of it. You cannot criticize a person easily because you know what it contains. I think there are still different factors to consider before criticizing issues.

Aristotle: Happiness and Values

Review Questions:

1. **What is happiness, according to Aristotle? How is it related to virtue? How is it related to pleasure?**

Happiness is not a pleasure, honour or wealth, but an action of the soul in harmony of virtue.

Happiness is neither no one chooses for the sake of these nor for anything other than itself.

Happiness is related to virtue in the sense that it makes no small difference whether we place the chief good in possession or in use, in state of mind or activity. For the state of mind may exist without make something any good result.

Comparable to virtue, happiness is related to pleasure because it is a state of the soul in which it depends on the man or individual how they will find happiness in the things they are doing.

Disagreements occur because sometimes it is just not by nature pleasant but as an adventure charm.

2. **How does Aristotle explain moral virtue?**

The moral virtue is a mean and in what sense it is so. A human being has the virtue in studying, sometimes failure in any form can be experienced followed by either a person accept that failure as a challenge as a positive approach or down himself and deal with the failure as the end of his life. As stated it is not easy but then it is not for everyone.

3. **Is it possible for everyone in our society to be happy, as Aristotle explains? If not, who cannot be happy?**

As my point of view, it is probable that all people are happy but if everyone will include the creatures or creation by God then I do not believe that all creatures will be happy. In the text, it says that "by the fact that the other animals have no share in happiness, being completely deprived of such activity. I assume those creation by God that incompetent of the virtuous activities are those who cannot be happy.

Discussion Questions:

1. **Aristotle characterizes a life of pleasure as suitable for beasts. But what, if anything, is wrong with a life of pleasure?**

I believe that anything in excess or deficiency is not good because the value given to it will be unpleasant for one person's acceptance and behaviour.

- 2. Aristotle claims that the philosopher will be happier than anyone else. Why is this? Do you agree or not?**

I do believe that the philosopher will be happier than anyone else for the reason that these people have experience and study various subjects as well as different ideas in this world. Their willingness for understanding and eagerness to learn different aspects of life makes them happier than anyone else.

Joel Feinberg: The Nature and Value of Rights

Review Questions:

1. Describe Nowheresville. How this world different from our world?

Nowheresville is a place similar to our world except that we have no rights to defend ourselves or moral claims are limited.

2. Explain the doctrine of the logical correlativity of rights and duties. What is Feinberg's position on this doctrine?

The rights and duties are connected in the sense that we uphold our rights. This doctrine has two claims. First, All rights entail other people's duties and second, that all duties entail other people's rights.

3. How does Feinberg explain the concept of personal desert? How would personal desert work in Nowheresville?

According to Feinberg, personal desert means when a person deserves something good from mankind what is meant in parts is that there would be a certain claim that an individual cannot avail because human rights are only limited. The good thing is that rewards are given by higher authority to the weaker one. Someone cannot claim rewards even a person deserve it. A man is only entitled to be given not to claim.

4. Explain the notion of a sovereign right monopoly. How would this work in Nowheresville according to Feinberg?

The sovereign has a certain has a duty to treat his students well, but this duty was owed not to the subjects directly but to God, just as man might have duty to a person to treat his property well, but of course no duty to the property itself but only to the owner and was rather competent of harming his subjects. Furthermore, he could commit no wrong against them that they could criticize about, since they had no prior claims against his behaviour. As the Genuine sovereign monopoly they will do all those things too, and thus sustain genuine obligations will not be owed directly to pledge creditors, parents, and the like but rather to god alone, or to the members of some elite or to a single sovereign under god.

5. What are claim rights? Why does Feinberg think they are morally important?

A claim right is a right which involves responsibilities, duties, or obligations for other parties. This is to petition or seek by virtue of supposed right. It simply means the legal power to claim one's right. This is done by acknowledged right holder when he serves notice that he now wants turned over to him that which has already been acknowledged to be his, something borrowed, say, or improperly taken from him. It also serves as man's shield of protection to secure individual rights.

Discussion Questions:

1. Does Feinberg make a convincing case for the importance of rights? Why or why not?

Yes, Feinberg successfully make a convincing case for the importance of rights. He makes a clear illustration on how a man can claim his rights for his own good. Also, the mutuality and relativism of it is really confused to anyone in the society today. Then, right is one the essential things that a man possesses especially in any society today because it guides anyone to perfect acceptance and freedom.

2. Can you give a noncircular definition of claim-right?

I don't have any idea of noncircular definition of claim; right because I believe it's the same with the definition given. As well as on the basis of claim; right is always circular and it applies in different scenarios in the society.

Ronald Dworkin: Taking Rights Seriously

Review Questions:

1. **What does Dworkin mean by rights in the string sense? What rights in this sense are protected by the USA Constitution?**

Dworkin stated that if the people have the right to do something, it follows that it is wrong to get involve with them. This concept of rights according to him rest on the Kantian's idea of treating people with dignity as part of the moral community as well as to the idea of political equality.

The rights that are protected by the USA Constitutions are those rights that are known and agreed upon by their country and by their people. The American provides a set of individual legal rights in the First Amendment, and in the due process, equal protection, and similar clauses

2. **Distinguish between legal and moral rights. Give some examples of legal rights that are not moral rights, and moral rights that are not legal rights.**

Legal rights are rights which exist under the rules of legal systems as well as the rights of every citizen in a country. The Legal rights are is likely about human rights which allowed the citizen to have a freedom of speech, equality and due process. However, moral rights are rule by our self. Moral rights are rights that protected by morality or it is the rights that are not written but we built this by our minds. To add, Moral rights are rights that are based from morality and conscience of an individual. It is also called moral rights or inalienable rights, are rights which are not contingent upon the laws, customs, or beliefs or a particular society. One good example is the Mercy Killing. For some it is legal but still for others they consider it immoral.

3. **What are the two models of how a government might define the rights of its citizens? Which does Dworkin find more attractive?**

The first model proposes striking a balance between the rights of the individual and the demands of society at large. The first model is believable, and most laymen and lawyers would response to it warmly. The metaphor of balancing the public interest against personal claims is established in our political and juridical rhetoric. It gives the model both familiarity and appeal.

The second is more typical idea of political equality. This expects the weaker members of apolitical community are entitled to the same concern and respect of their government as the more powerful members have secured for themselves, so that if some men have freedom of decision whatever the effect on the general good, then all men must have the same freedom.

Dworkin become more attracted with the second model for way government define the rights of citizens.

4. According to Dworkin, what two important ideas are behind the institution of rights?

The two important ideas behind the institution of rights are act of faith by the majorities and minorities will defend themselves as well as justifications of rights.

Discussion Questions:

1. Does a person have the right to break the law?

Yes, a person have the right to break the law, if man's life is in danger and no choice to do an action that may cause less damage or it can do good to others.

2. Are rights in the strong sense compatible with Mill's Utilitarianism?

Yes, I absolutely believe there is strong sense compatible with Mill's utilitarianism because of similar concepts and views discussed in this section as well as Mill's utilitarianism.

3. Do you think that Kant would accept rights in the string sense?

I do not think so Kant would accept rights in the strong sense.

John Rawls: A Theory of Justice

Review Questions:

1. Carefully explain Rawls' conception of the original position.

Rawls describes that the rules of justice are chosen in an Original Position. This tells that there is no one that can benefit or be harmed by the choice of principles.

2. State and Explain Rawls' first principle of Justice.

According to Rawls' the first principle of justice is each person have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all. It must be treated equally and we must know how to treat equally not only to others but as well as to all aspects of life.

3. State and explain the second principle. Which principle has priority such that it cannot be sacrificed?

The second principle is called the difference principle, and it identifies how economic compensation should be distributed. Everyone will have their own rights but the distribution of wealth and income will not be equal. It has two parts. Firstly, there is the difference principle proper, the principle for the distribution of acquired wealth in society. This is basically the principle to regulate taxation and redistribution. The second part of the second principle is the principle of equal opportunity. It regulates access to coveted social positions - basically jobs and positions of authority

Discussion Questions:

1. On the first principle, each person has an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty as long as this does not interfere with similar liberty for others. What does this allow to do?

The first principle each person has an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty as long as this does not interfere with similar liberty for others allows each individual in the community or in the society to weigh and to know the goodness and the badness of a certain act which we cannot deny the fact that most of the times its happening.

2. Is it possible for free and rational persons in the original position to agree upon different principles than those given by Rawls?

In my point of view, it is possible for free and rational persons in the original position to agree upon different principles than those given by Rawls.

Annette Baier: The Need for More than Justice

Review Questions:

- 1. Distinguish between the justice and care perspective. According to Gilligan, how do these perspectives develop?**

Annette Baier explains that the base of ethics is justice while care is to enhance on what we believe that is justice based on our tradition.

- 2. Explain Kohlberg's theory of moral development. What criticisms to Gilligan and Baier make of this theory?**

According to Kohlberg, there are stages in moral reasoning which is also the basis of ethical behaviour. With this theory, Gilligan and Baier made some criticisms; there are no solid proofs that there was uniformity between gender and moral perspective and the data gathered were open for other interpretations; the care of a woman is a reflection of what a woman is truly is in their tradition and culture; and lastly, the data gathered were not valid to conclude as a whole for the experiment only focused in a particular race.

- 3. Baier says there are three important differences between Kantian liberals and their critics. What are these differences?**

There are three important differences between Kantian liberals and their critics. The differences are the following; the weight was put on relationships between equal and freedom of choice; and the authority of intellect always overshadow emotions.

- 4. Why does Baier attack the Kantian view that the reason should control unruly passions?**

The reason that Baier attack the Kantian view is because she believe in using emotions such as care over other things, which is very much contrast to the Kantian view.

Discussion Questions:

- 1. What does Baier means she speaks of the need "to trans value the value of our patriarchal past"? Do new values replace the old ones? If so, do we abandon justice, freedom, and rights?**

I do believe that replacing the old with a new one is really accepted, now that we are surrounded with new approach. The views on moral issues are been developing and yields to a more new approach which is sometimes opposing to the old one. Definitely, we do not abandon justice, freedom and rights.

- 2. What is wrong with Kantian view that extends equal rights to all rational beings, including women and minorities? What would Baier say? What do you think?**

There is nothing wrong with the view of Kant and of Baier.

3. **Baier seems to reject the Kantian emphasis on freedom of choice. Granted, we do not choose our parents, but still don't we have freedom of choice about many things, and isn't this very important?**

I do aware why this opinion is stressed out but I opposed to treat this kind of issue to test as freedom. Since it would be unfair for people and it does not show certain equality and fairness. Maybe there will be people who will not be lucky to be chosen. Another point is that not all people are capacitated to have a baby and in that sense they also do not have freedom.