

Answers_to_Three_Questions.edited.docx

by

Submission date: 04-Sep-2021 03:35PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1641263945

File name: Answers_to_Three_Questions.edited.docx (17.87K)

Word count: 895

Character count: 4733

Answers to Three Questions

Name:

Institution:

Course:

Instructor:

Date:

Answers to Three Questions

Question 1

Ethical relativism is the concept that moral code is comparable to one's given cultural standards. Thus, whether an action is good or bad is determined through ethical rules of society carried out. The same behavior may often be ethically correct in one culture and not in the other. There are no collective ethical ideals, according to the moral relativist, criteria that are equally acceptable to all persons on all occasions. The only decent norms that can be used to evaluate a culture's activities are its own. If moral relativism is valid, there is no standard framework for settling moral disagreements or achieving morally acceptable agreements between members of various communities.

Those who argue that broadly accepted social norms can exist because some moral values and beliefs differ across societies make perhaps the most robust case against ethical relativism. Put differently; one can recognize ethnic contrasts beliefs and practices while still believing that most of these ideas and traditions are ethically reprehensible. Regardless of the perceptions of those communities, for instance, the slave system in pre-Civil War America or segregation in South Africa is incorrect. Ethics is a field of good and wrong by carefully analyzing underlying activities and ideologies. In its comparative approach, ethical relativism fails to acknowledge that some cultures have added causes to hold their perspectives than in others. Even though the supposition of moral relativism is overlooked, it ought to be accepted that it generates noteworthy matters. Ethical relativism reassures us that ethical views vary across cultures, and our ideologies are heavily shaped by culture.

Question 2

The dogma that the source of decency is a utility or the utmost happiness principle holds that actions are valid infractions since they produce the opposite of contentment. Satisfaction denotes pleasure, but the absence of it means unhappiness or pain and the absence of pleasure. The consideration of utilitarianism is how to increase overall benefit. Their approach to ethics is founded on the premise of utility, which asserts that the justly correct action is the one that results in the greatest good (Abumere, 2019). The inherently reprehensible action results in the decrease of the maximum good. For instance, assume Peter is an impoverished, unemployed person in New York. Despite his lack of funds, his family is still reliant on him; his economically inactive wife (Audrey) is sick and requires \$500 in intervention. Their two children (Helen and Sam) have been expelled from school due to their inability to pay tuition costs.

Peter has no source of income and therefore cannot obtain financing; even Thomas (his filthy wealthy friend) has continued to refuse to assist him. From his point of view, there are only two options: he either pays by theft, or he does not. As a result, he takes \$1000 from Thomas to pay for his wife's treatment and Helen and Sam's school fees. Theft is morally reprehensible, one might argue. As a result, we will conclude that Peter's action (stealing from Thomas) is morally unacceptable. Utilitarian theory, on the other hand, will say that what Peter has performed is morally acceptable. According to Abumere (2019), stealing, according to utilitarian theory, is no right nor wrong in itself; what makes it terrible or decent are the repercussions it creates. In the example, Peter did steal from one individual who had very little need for the cash and put it on three individuals who require it more. As a result, for utilitarian theory, Peter's stealing from Thomas (the means) can be justified since the funds were used for Audrey's treatment and Helen and Sam's tuition costs (the end).

Question 3

Mill tries to discern utilitarianism by responding to misapprehensions about it. He observes that many people misinterpret the utilitarian principle by viewing utility as opposed to pleasure. In actuality, utility is described as the delight and the avoidance of pain (Mondal, 2016). According to this concept, actions are justified insofar as to how they maximize contentment and wrong in part to how they seem to generate the reverse of happiness. Mill explains how to distinguish both higher- and lesser pleasure. According to Mondal (2016), a pleasure is of the top standard if individuals can choose it over another gratification even if it causes distress and cannot trade it for more of the other delight. In addition, Mill asserts that provided fair access to all sorts of satisfactions, people would love those which resonate with their "higher" abilities. An individual cannot choose to be an animal, nor will an informed adult become uneducated, and so on. Even someone who uses higher faculties endures more in daily lives; he will never choose a lesser presence, choosing to preserve his integrity.

Whenever I score good grades in school, I feel I have gained the ability to experience a higher pleasure, as described by Mill. In my view, this type of pleasure is a higher pleasure since it leads to self-gratification because of the achievement realized. It is not a different kind of pleasure because I choose it over any other pleasure I felt at that time, and it resonates well with my learning abilities and my cognitive understanding.

References

Abumere, F. A. (2019). Utilitarianism. *Introduction to Philosophy: Ethics*.

Mondal, A. L. (2016). Mill's critique of Bentham's utilitarianism. *International Journal of Philosophy Study (IJPS)*, 4, 13-21.

Answers_to_Three_Questions.edited.docx

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off