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Assignment #3

*■THE QUESTION ON THE NORM OF MORALITY*

**1. With reference to man's nature, what means the term good in ethics?**

A good man is one who lives, behaves, and acts in accordance with his nature. That is, he lives and behaves in a way befitting his human purpose and nature. Good acts are, therefore, those which befit him as a man, as a human being: it is natural to a man as a human being endowed primarily with reason and will.

**2. What means "agere sequitur esse?"**

A golden principle of common sense that a thing acts in accordance with its nature. If a thing acts in accordance with its nature, then it does well.

**3. What is the proximate norm and what is the ultimate norm of morality in human acts?**

The proximate norm of morality in man's act is human nature. The ultimate norm is the divine nature.

**4. Why is it often said that human nature and human life is a many splendored thing?**

Human nature is not isolated from the rest of things in the universe. It has, therefore, many aspects or phases: It is a creature and is capable of thinking and doing many things; and is, therefore, related to the Creator.

**5. When we say that human nature is the proximate norm of morality how should we take human nature? What aspects of the same must be considered?**

Human nature, as the proximate norm of morality, means human nature adequately taken, i.e., in all its essential aspects or relationships: the religious, social, political, economic, physical, etc. These relationships comprise what we call the Natural order in things.

*■DEFECTIVE NORMS OF MORALITY*

**1. According to hedonism, what is a morally good action?**

Actions are good or bad according to whether they give or do not give wordly pleasure or temporal happiness to man. Morality, therefore, is grounded on the pleasure or satisfaction that an act brings or entails.

**2. According to utilitarianism what is the norm of morality?**

The norm of morality resides in the usefulness of an action for the production of the temporal happiness of an individual. Therefore, an act is good when it redounds to the temporal welfare and happiness of the individual, and bad if it hinders or hampers this happiness.

**3. What is common to both hedonism and utilitarianism?**

Hedonism and Utilitarianism explain very well the emotional basis and aspects of human actions. There is always some satisfaction accompanying the doing of every good act. These also explains well the reasons behind the doing of action by most people. For there is no doubt that most of them are motivated in their action by their desire for satisfaction or happiness or well-being.

**4. Explain one defect of utilitarianism as an ethical theory.**

Both propose an earthly goal for man, namely, the temporal welfare here on Earth, whereas we have already proved in a former thesis that the ultimate and supreme purpose of man cannot be found in this life.

**5. According to Herbert Spencer, what is life?**

The continuous adjustment of internal to external relations, the adjustment of self to other selves co-existing in society.

**6. What does Kant mean by the categorical imperative?**

Reason commands and the commands of reason are absolute and unconditional, absolutely binding on all men of all times.

**7. According to Kant, on what is morality gounded?**

Duty is the very root, the test and the mainspring of all morally good acts. That alone is moral which is motivated by pure sense of duty, by pure reverence for the law. Any other motive or purpose can only make an act legal but not moral.

**8. What did Kant mean by "universalization without contradiction" as a test for the morality of an action? What example does he give to illustrate this test for the morality of an action?**

An action is good if it can be universalized, that is, it can be practice by all men of all times without bringing about its own negation or abolition.

**9. What is moral positivism?**

The theory that holds that the basis or source of all moral laws are the laws of the state. Good is that which is in accordance with the laws of the State; bad is that which is forbidden by the State.

**10. Give the points of differences between christian and communist ethics.**

* Communism is based on the primacy of matter. Christian ethics is based on the primary of the spirit.
* Communism proposes an earthly goal for man. It is of the Earht, Earthly. Christianity is primarily for the other world.
* They are based on entirely diametrically opposed premises: Christian ethics is based on 3 basic postulates (the existence of God, freedom of will, and immortality); Communism denies all these and substitutes matter for God; life in a classless society for immortality; and the laws of dialetic for freedom
* According to Communist view, the end justifies the means; according to the Christian view, the end does not justify the means.
* Communism subscribes to the evolutionistic view of morality. Christianity maintains that morality is absolute, immutable, and eternal.
* They also differ in the means they propose for the attainment of their ends. Christianity teaches love, right living, prayer, as the road to eternal happines in heaven. Communism uses force, conflict, revolution, for the attainment of its goal: the classless society here on Earth.

*■SPECIFIC DETERMINANTS OF MORALITY*

**1. What three things must be considered to judge an act right or wrong?**

* The end of the agent
* The end of the action
* The circumstances intrinsically affecting either

**2. What means the '"end of, an act?"**

The natural purpose of an act; or that in which the act in its very nature terminates or results. thus, the end of the action of studying is learning. The end of the action is the primary determinant of morality.

**3. What means the '"end of an agent?"**

The intention or aim of the doer of the action.

**4. Explain the difference between the end of an act and the end of the agent.**

The end of agent varies with different individuals, while the end of the act is always the same.

**5. Why is it necessary to consider the intention of the doer in order to morally evaluate an act?**

The end or intention of the doer must also be considered in judging the morality of an act because this goes with knowledge and consent, which is found in every human act. An act good in itself may be spoiled by a bad intention.

**6. Explain the moral principle that moral goodness demands or requires fullness of being.**

An act good in itself and done with a good intention may still become bad because it may have been done in the wrong or improper circumstances; for instace, in the wrong time or in a wrong palce or in a wrong way.

**7. Give an example of an act that is good in itself but becomes bad because of the malicious intent of the doer.**

Holding a high government position is good, but if your intention is to enrich yourself unlawfully while in office, then the holding of your position becomes bad.

**8. Give an example of an act that is morally good or indifferent in itself but which becomes bad because of the circumstances under which it was done.**

Saving someone from being murdered by assaulting the one who’s attempting a murder.

**9. What is the difference between a mitigating and a justifying circumstance?**

The difference between mitigating and justifying circumstance is that the first only lessens but does not remove the crime while the second entirely removes responsibility and punishment because the act done is then right or justified. In the presence of a mitigating circumstances, there's still a crime. In the presence of a justifying circumstance there is no crime or criminal.

**10. Explain the difference between justifying and exempting circumstance. Give examples to illustrate the difference.**

In the presence of a justifying circumstance there is no crime nor criminal; while in the presence of an exempting circumstance there is still a crime materially although there is no criminal because then the agent is exempted from responsibility and punishment.

Example: In the case of murder, there can be no justifying circumstance. However there can be a justifying circumstance in the case of killing an aggressor in self-defense.

The following can be the exempting circumstances:a)age below 9 years; b) insanity; c) violence; d) above 9 but below 15, who acted without discernment.