

pc
by Pc Pc

Submission date: 04-Oct-2020 08:05PM (UTC-0400)

Submission ID: 1405128678

File name: Criticism_Paper.edited.docx (15.7K)

Word count: 816

Character count: 4625

Criticism Paper

Students' Name

Professor's Name

Institution Affiliation

Course

Submission Date

Rachel's critique of the active-passive distinction

James Rachel's defense of active euthanasia deserves normative and critical analysis due to its dehumanizing effects. Rachel's is normative, theoretical, conceptually, and practically unjustifiable. To begin with, Rachel's conceptual framework includes three major distinctions, that is, biographic and biological life, letting die and killing, and extraordinary and ordinary treatment. Such distinctions do not provide valid criteria and foundation for the active permissibility enthusiasm since of their practical, theoretical, and conceptual inequalities. First, Rachel's distinctions are invalid because of a slippery slope, irrelevance to core arguments, and reductive fallacy (Chan, 2020). Rachel's second distinction is digressive, irrelevant, and extraneous. His special medical treatment and repudiation of the distinction of the ordinary are invalid. Another criticism is against CDE. Rachel suggests 4 main points which bring the difference between passive and active euthanasia moral ridiculous. In such an instance, Rachel proposes that if the active euthanasia is permitted, then passive should also be permitted. These arguments are

theoretically invalid to support such a position since most of his premises are either weak or irrelevant.

Individual relativism

Generally, ethical relativisms put up with that ethical rules are obtained from individual experience, and what is wrong or/and right depends on places and times. There's an individual or cultural relativist. Relativism assumes that no ethical value of certain culture which is inherently superior to another (Winata et al., 2020). Meanwhile, cultural relativist urges that whether something is wrong or right is determined by government, culture or/ and religion. The individual relativist ignores all cultural arguments and puts up with that it is not the government, society or religion determine wrong or right. This is invalid because society, religion, and the government determine what is right or wrong in one way or the other in different situations and circumstances. Also, individual relatives suggest that society might create values and norms that do not make the right. However, different societies tend to have different values, and what is right may happen not to be right in another place or situation. Therefore proving individual relativist to be invalid. Individual relativism assumes the society we found ourselves is a matter of chance; we aren't more bound by individuals set of rules than by another. Thus, the way to know what is right or wrong is determined by ourselves. This is false since there are social norms and values we ought to follow without questions.

Aristotle: view of happiness

According to Aristotle, the best life is determined by someone's happiness. Eudaimon is referred to as best life while eudaimonia is the best good in happiness. Eudaimonia consists of a eudaimon and contemplation life. Aristotle does not clearly show the relationship between

eudaimon and eudaimonia life. This isn't clear if these are same or different. Also Aristotle doesn't seem to be what every person needs or wants. As per Aristotle, contemplation is only pre-occupation of the gods. This to imply that only one philosopher leads such divine life in exercising a divine faculty of reasoning. However, this is not possible to prove that gods do exist and they contemplate (Hoipkemier, 2018). I believe there are various conceptions of happiness. Happiness is a broad term with wide-ranging diverse modes and applications of our lives and can anyone be conceived of as giving happiness to the individuals concerned. As per my understanding, eudaimonia is a composite end that involves several desirable's goods as well as contemplation.

Leibniz; secular criticisms of religious ethics

Criticism of religious ethics includes criticism of ideas, validity, and concept of religion. Religious criticism portray religion as one or more harmful society, harmful to an individual, and outdated, an obstruction to science progress, a source of immoral customs or acts, or political tool for social control. I think the Bible is wrong since it conflicts with science. According to the Bible, all livings and non-living things were created by God- Genesis creation myth. Meanwhile, we plants and other livings organisms naturally. Another criticism of religious ethics is that things been mentioned in the Bible are impossible to many people. Bibles tell Christians to give and pray for our enemies, which it's a rare thing to most people. No one wishes to forgive his / her enemies. Also, religious ethics tells us to be faithful to the unseen God. It's a mere fact it is challenging to believe in something you never saw, and this drives many to ignore religious ethics.

Reference

Chan, J. K. (2020). *Moral Distinctions between Passive and Active Euthanasia* (Doctoral dissertation, California Institute of Technology).

Hoipkemier, M. (2018). Justice, Not Happiness: Aristotle on the Common Good. *Polity*, 50(4), 547-574.

Winata, S., Kusnawan, A., & Simbolon, S. (2020, March). Individual Ethical Decision Making of Accounting Lecturers Between Idealism and Relativism in Tangerang. In *1st International Multidisciplinary Conference on Education, Technology, and Engineering (IMCETE 2019)* (pp. 229-231).

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off