

Assignment – 3

**MPYE – 002: Ethics**

Notes:

- i) Answer all five questions
- ii) All questions carry equal marks
- iii) For every question, refer to the texts and write down the assignment-responses in your own words.
- iv) Answers to question no.1 and 2 should be in about **500 words** each

1. What makes international ethics important? Discuss how philosophical schools of thought focus on various aspects of international relations. 20

OR

Discuss virtue ethics. How is it different from deontological ethics? Explain. 20

2. Explain the distinctive features of environmental ethics. Why has environmental ethics become an important issue of human concern today? 20

OR

“Human person must invent his own values” – Explain with reference to the existentialist humanism of Sartre. 20

3. Answer **any two** of the following questions in about **250 words** each:

- a) What do you understand by cultural and ethical subjectivism? 10
- b) How do you understand human freedom and moral responsibility? Explain. 10
- c) How do you look at freedom of press and individual’s right of privacy? 10
- d) Make clear the distinction between values and norms. 10

4. Answer **any four** of the following in about **150 words** each:

- a) Briefly explain the emotivism of A. J. Ayer. 5
- b) Describe the doctrine of *karma*. 5
- c) Name the seven norms proposed by Bentham for the measurement of pleasure. 5
- d) Briefly discuss the right to life. 5
- e) What do you understand by social responsibility of media? 5
- f) What do you understand by „the Absolute Should“? 5

5. Write short notes on **any five** of the following in about **100 words** each:

- a) Moral pluralism 4
- b) Svadharma 4
- c) Intuitionism 4
- d) Pancasila 4
- e) Teleology 4
- f) Consequentialism 4
- g) Responsibility for the Other 4
- h) Determinism 4

1. What makes international ethics important? Discuss how philosophical schools of thought focus on various aspects of international relations. 20

OR

Discuss virtue ethics. How is it different from deontological ethics? Explain. 20

Answer: **Virtue Ethics** (or **Virtue Theory**) is an approach to [Ethics](#) that emphasizes an individual's **character** as the key element of ethical thinking, rather than rules about the **acts themselves** ([Deontology](#)) or their **consequences** ([Consequentialism](#)).

There are **three main strands** of Virtue Ethics:

- [Eudaimonism](#) is the **classical formulation** of Virtue Ethics. It holds that the **proper goal** of human life is **eudaimonia** (which can be variously translated as "**happiness**", "**well-being**" or the "**good life**"), and that this goal can be achieved by a lifetime of practising "**arête**" (the **virtues**) in one's **everyday activities**, subject to the exercise of "**phronesis**" (**practical wisdom**) to resolve any **conflicts** or **dilemmas** which might arise. Indeed, such a virtuous life would in itself **constitute** eudaimonia, which should be seen as an **objective**, not a subjective, state, characterized by the **well-lived life**, irrespective of the **emotional state** of the person experiencing it. A **virtue** is a **habit** or **quality** that allows individuals to succeed at their **purpose**. Therefore, Virtue Ethics is only intelligible if it is **teleological** (i.e. it includes an account of the purpose or **meaning of human life**), a matter of some **contention** among philosophers since the beginning of time. [Aristotle](#), with whom Virtue Ethics is largely identified, categorized the virtues as **moral virtues** (including prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance) and **intellectual virtues** (including "sophia" or theoretical wisdom, and "phronesis" or practical wisdom). [Aristotle](#) further argued that each of the moral virtues was a **golden mean**, or desirable middle ground, between two undesirable **extremes** (e.g. the virtue of courage is a mean between the two vices of cowardice and foolhardiness).
- **Ethics of Care** was developed mainly by [Feminist](#) writers (e.g. **Annette Baier**) in the second half of the 20th Century, and was motivated by the idea that men think in **masculine** terms such as **justice** and **autonomy**, whereas women think in **feminine** terms such as **caring**. It calls for a **change** in how we view morality and the virtues, shifting towards **virtues exemplified by women**, such as taking care of others, patience, the ability to nurture, self-sacrifice, etc, which have been **marginalized** because society has not adequately **valued** the contributions of women. It emphasizes the importance of **solidarity**, **community** and **relationships** rather than universal standards and impartiality. It argues that instead of doing the right thing even if it requires **personal cost** or sacrificing the interest of **family** or **community** members (as the traditional [Consequentialist](#) and [deontological](#) approaches suggest), we can, and indeed should, put the interests of those who are **close** to us **above** the interests of complete **strangers**.
- **Agent-Based Theories**, as developed recently by **Michael Slote** (1941 - ), give an account of virtue based on our **common-sense intuitions** about which character traits are **admirable** (e.g. benevolence, kindness, compassion, etc), which we can identify by looking at the people we admire, our **moral exemplars**. The **evaluation** of actions is therefore **dependent** on ethical judgments about the inner life of the **agents** who perform those actions.

Deontology is ethics based on external rules, whereas virtue ethics is based on internal character.

So... Kant is generally the go-to for an example of deontological ethics. Kant determines that there are categorical imperatives that every person should follow, and every person should follow them regardless how it will affect the person or other. For example, one of Kants maxims was that people should not lie, regardless the outcome. This is a rule applies to everyone equally, and everyone should follow it.

Virtue ethics focuses on one's character, and how that will influence ones actions. Virtue ethics stems from early Grecian ethical systems derived from Plato or Aristotle (for example, there are others). In the same example above, a person is given the quandary of whether or not to lie. Rather than looking to some

overarching maxim for guidance, the actor looks to themselves and considers whether or not the lie is a good thing, how this lie sits with them internally, and how this lie may change others' perceptions on them. Virtue ethics essentially focuses on the person's own ability to reason rather than on some set rulebook for deciding a course of action.

Deontology is rule based. You make a statement (stealing is wrong), imagine said statement as a general rule (people shouldn't steal). You consider whether or not everyone following that rule all the time would lead to chaos or would be a good thing, and that determines whether or not it would be good.

Virtue Ethics is character based. The main goal is Eudaimonia which is generally translated as flourishing (or happiness, but i think that's not exactly right). We want to live a good life, that is our goal. We appeal to virtues, or character traits that we think that someone who is living the perfect life would have (kind, honest, courageous, etc) and from that consider what that kind of person would do in a situation. (If im talking to you, and i think honesty is good, I should do my best not to lie, that would be good).

2. Explain the distinctive features of environmental ethics. Why has environmental ethics become an important issue of human concern today? 20

OR

“Human person must invent his own values” – Explain with reference to the existentialist humanism of Sartre. 20

Answer : Environmental ethics is a branch of ethics that studies the relation of human beings and the environment and how ethics play a role in this. Environmental ethics believe that humans are a part of society as well as other living creatures, which includes plants and animals. These items are a very important part of the world and are considered to be a functional part of human life. Thus, it is essential that every human being respect and honor this and use morals and ethics when dealing with these creatures.

As per Nature.com, ” *Environmental ethics is a branch of applied philosophy that studies the conceptual foundations of environmental values as well as more concrete issues surrounding societal attitudes, actions, and policies to protect and sustain biodiversity and ecological systems.*”

Environmental ethics are a key feature of environmental studies, that establishes relationship between humans and the earth. With environmental ethics, we can ensure that we are doing our part to keep the environment safe and protected. Every time that a tree is cut down to make a home or other resources are used we are using natural resources that are becoming more and more sparse to find.

First, environmental ethics is extended. Traditional ethics mainly concerns intrahuman duties, especially duties among contemporaries. Environmental ethics extends the scope of ethical concerns beyond one’s community and nation to include not only all people everywhere, but also animals and the whole of nature – the biosphere – both now and beyond the imminent future to include future generations.

Second, environmental ethics is interdisciplinary. There are many overlapping concerns and areas of consensus among environmental ethics, environmental politics, environmental economics, environmental sciences and environmental literature, for example. The distinctive perspectives and methodologies of these disciplines provide important inspiration for environmental ethics, and environmental ethics offers value foundations for these disciplines. They reinforce, influence and support each other.

Third, environmental ethics is plural. From the moment it was born, environmental ethics has been an area in which different ideas and perspectives compete with each other. Anthropocentrism, animal liberation/rights theory, biocentrism and ecocentrism all provide unique and, in some sense, reasonable ethical justifications for

environmental protection. Their approaches are different, but their goals are by and large the same, and they have reached this consensus: it is everyone's duty to protect the environment. The basic ideas of environmental ethics also find support from, and are embodied in, various well-established cultural traditions. The pluralism of theories and multicultural perspectives is critical for environmental ethics to retain its vitality.

Fourth, environmental ethics is global. Ecological crisis is a global issue. Environmental pollution does not respect national boundaries. No country can deal with this issue alone. To cope with the global environmental crisis, human beings must reach some value consensus and cooperate with each other at the personal, national, regional, multinational and global levels. Global environmental protection depends on global governance. An environmental ethic is, therefore, typically a global ethic with a global perspective.

Fifth, environmental ethics is revolutionary. At the level of ideas, environmental ethics challenges the dominant and deep-rooted anthropocentrism of modern mainstream ethics and extends the object of our duty to future generations and non-human beings. At the practical level, environmental ethics forcefully critiques the materialism, hedonism and consumerism accompanying modern capitalism, and calls instead for a 'green lifestyle' that is harmonious with nature. It searches for an economic arrangement that is sensitive to Earth's limits and to concerns for quality of life. In the political arena, it advocates a more equitable international economic and political order that is based on the principles of democracy, global justice and universal human rights. It argues for pacifism and against an arms race. In short, as the theoretical representation of a newly emerging moral idea and value orientation, environmental ethics is the fullest extension of human ethics. It calls on us to think and act locally as well as globally. It calls for a new, deeper moral consciousness.

With the rapid increase in world's population, the consumption of natural resources has increased several times. This has degraded our planet's ability to provide the services we humans need. The consumption of resources is going at a faster rate than they can naturally replenish.

Environmental ethics builds on scientific understanding by bringing human values, moral principles, and improved decision making into conversation with science.

It has become an important issue of human concern today as it creates awareness towards several important aspects to make the world a better place to live. It works on issues such as

**Consumption of Natural Resources :** Our natural environment is not a storehouse to rob resources from. It is a reserve of resources that are crucial to the existence of life. Their unscrupulous depletion is detrimental to our well-being. We are cutting down forests for making our homes. Our excessive consumption of natural resources continues. The undue use of resources is resulting in their depletion, risking the life of our future generations. Is this ethical? This is an environmental ethics issue.

#### Destruction of Forests

When industrial processes lead to destruction of resources, is it not the industry's responsibility to restore the depleted resources? Moreover, can a restored environment make up for the original one? Mining processes disrupt the ecological balance in certain areas. They harm the plant and animal life in those regions. Slash-and-burn techniques are used for clearing land, that leads to the destruction of forests and woodland. The land is used for agriculture, but is the loss of so many trees compensated for?

**Environmental Pollution:** Many human activities lead to environmental pollution. The rising human population is increasing the demand for nature's resources. As the population is exceeding the carrying capacity of our planet, animal and plant habitats are being destroyed to make space for human habitation. Huge constructions (roads and buildings for residential and industrial use) are being made at the cost of the environment. To allow space for these constructions, so many trees have to lose their lives. The animals that thrive in them lose their natural habitats and eventually their lives. However, the cutting down of trees is seldom even considered as loss of lives. Isn't this unethical?

**Harm to Animals :** Due to habitat loss, animals may enter human settlements, thus posing a threat to the people living there. In some cases, these animals are killed. Secondly, animals serve as food sources of humans, for which they are killed. Also, animal studies cause harm to animals and even their deaths. This destruction has led to the extinction of many animal species. The reduction in the populations of several other animal species continues. How can we deny the animals their right to live? How are we right in depriving them of their habitat and food? Who gave us the right to harm them for our convenience? These are some of the ethical environmental issues that need to be addressed.

3. Answer *any two* of the following questions in about **250 words** each:

a) What do you understand by cultural and ethical subjectivism?

10

b) How do you understand human freedom and moral responsibility? Explain. 10

Answer: **Human freedom** is a social concept that recognizes the dignity of individuals and is defined here as negative liberty or the absence of coercive constraint. Because **freedom** is inherently valuable and plays a role in **human** progress, it is worth measuring carefully.

The nature of human freedom refers to freedom from all societal structures and that which is in conformity to the general way of life that's universally accepted. It refers to a culture of life that upholds everyone's dignity and emphasizes the right to life, a right that is inherent and should not be denied or infringed in any way. Every human being has rights and these rights should not be violated in whichever way whatsoever. Consequently, these rights come with responsibilities. Hence every individual should practice his or her rights cautiously and responsibly so as not to interfere with others rights.

The nature of human freedom should therefore entirely subscribe to the philosophy of the culture of life. A culture that advocates for and promotes human dignity which is core to every individual. A culture that's devoid of any political, social or even economic interference. A culture that nurtures and protects the dignity of every human being from conception to natural death. That should be the real description of life. Society must therefore rise to the occasion and detach itself from conservative ways that do not respect the value of human life. The dignity and value of human life should be protected and defended because that's what describes the nature of human freedom. This can be done through the rule of law or by culture itself. Necessary important legislations can be made to the effect that they uphold protect the right to life of human beings. It's the obligation of everyone to build a culture that favours the development of a society that's mindful of the dignity of its members. Human freedom should accommodate everyone in all respects. It should campaign for the need to respect everyone regardless of his or her cultural background, social status, age, race, political affiliation or gender. That respect to everyone forms the pillar to which dignity is built which is the foundation of every human right. Both men and women should be treated without bias or any form of discrimination to either party. Equality in matters of gender must be emphasized and practiced to the highest standards possible. The essence of human freedom should be that no one is denied his or her fundamental rights and especially the right to life. It should see that society abjures its allegiance to acts that demean the dignity of any person and articulate measures that protect the right to life of every human being. That's the nature of human freedom

In philosophy, *moral responsibility* is the status of *morally* deserving praise, blame, reward, or punishment for an act or omission, in accordance with one's *moral* obligations. Deciding what (if anything) counts as "*morally* obligatory" is a principal concern of ethics.

The libertarian view states that some human decisions and actions, particularly moral and religious decisions, are strictly *uncaused*. In the most sophisticated forms of libertarianism, these decisions are not even caused by our desires or character. They are very insistent on this: a truly *free* act is not an act which carries out our strongest desire; it rather, typically, goes *against* our strongest desire. The libertarian is aware, of course, that our desires are largely a function of our heredity, environment, past decisions and so on. If free decisions are based on desires, he thinks, they are not *fully* free. They are not in this case wholly uncaused.

The libertarian argues that such a view is essential to moral responsibility. For no one is responsible for an act unless he “could have done otherwise.” If I am strapped to a robotic machine which, using my arms, robs a bank, I am not to blame for robbing the bank. I “could not have done otherwise.” Such is the libertarian argument.

- c) How do you look at freedom of press and individual’s right of privacy? 10
- d) Make clear the distinction between values and norms. 10

Obedience to our elders is considered to be a good value and also a norm in our society. Students showing respect to their teachers is similarly both a value as well as a norm in all societies and cultures. It becomes confusing for many to differentiate between norms and values in a society because of their obvious similarities. Norms are mostly social behaviors that people in a society are expected to follow. Values, on the other hand, are our beliefs about what is good, right, or wrong. There are many more differences between norms and values which can be discussed as below.

### **What are Norms?**

Socially acceptable ways of behavior are called norms. They are a way to induce uniformity and keep in check deviant behavior. Society also devises a way to get rid of deviant behavior as people are punished when they are seen flouting norms of a society. However, norms are not to be confused with laws that are written and codified and those who break or violate laws are punished by courts of laws. As such, norms are unwritten code of conduct that is desirable and those members of the society who flout these norms are looked down upon and derided by the society.

In early times, when norms were not devised as a way, to make people comply with a code of conduct, societies had to depend upon taboo behaviors. This was done to prevent people from engaging in undesirable behaviors. With the development of norms, it became possible to enforce social order in an informal manner.

If you are attending a funeral, you are not expected to start laughing uncontrollably or take out a cigarette and start smoking. Similarly, shaking hands with your competitor after the completion of a tennis match is a social norm that has to be done whether you have won or lost. As a foreigner, it is better for a person to learn more about social norms in a country to behave in a socially acceptable behavior and also dress up accordingly.

### **What are Values?**

It is difficult to live in isolation, and when living in a society, it is essential to have a belief system to deal with other people and situations in one’s life. Orientation in a society becomes much easy with values that are developed over a period of time in the mind of individuals in a society about right and wrong, just and fair, good and bad.

Most of the values are learnt from elders, parents, teachers and religious books though there are also personal beliefs. Beliefs are mostly cultural and religious in nature. Some of the values that are found universally across cultures are compassion, honesty, integrity, love, sex, friendship, and many more. Having a strong belief system enables people to steer through difficult situations in life because of the anchorage provided by these values.

### **What is the difference between Norms and Values?**

- Values are sets of beliefs an individual has to guide his behavior while norms are codes of conduct set by a society.
- Norms are unwritten laws of a society and flouting them entails derision and boycott while, values are guiding principles that help individuals move ahead with confidence in difficult situations, in life.
- Norms play a role in building up of values in the mind of an individual.
- Norms are imposed from outside while values are made inside the mind of an individual.
- Norms are specific guide to behavior while values provide indirect guidance only.

4. Answer **any four** of the following in about **150 words** each:

a) Briefly explain the emotivism of A. J. Ayer. 5

Answer: Emotivism, as laid out in Ayer's *Language, Truth, and Logic*, is a different understanding of what ethical statements convey. In emotivism ethical statements are not statements of truth or fact but statements that reveal a person's feelings toward a certain situation and the response that they expect from others. So when someone states "I should not have cheated" the only part of the statement that is factual is that the person cheated. The ethical part "should not" is not factual but just an expression of that person's feelings toward cheating. Ethical statements also give commands or expectations to those that hear them. The sentence "You should not cheat" is most obviously a command to others to not cheat. This ethical statement is said to create a desired reaction and convey the person's expectation for that action to others. Thus in emotivism the only real ethical philosophy is the study of the definitions of ethical terms. An example of this is the study of the difference in meaning between "duty" and "ought to" or "good" and "bad". Any other ethical discussion, such as an ethical judgement, is a discussion of individual opinions and not facts. Thus any real understanding of what is to be considered good or bad for all can not be attained.

This ethical theory easily leads to an act utilitarianism where individuals decide themselves what they think is good and act towards that. But in a society that bases itself in rules and laws that are said to be rooted in ethical understanding how does this understanding of ethics effect this system? We often take "Don't murder" as a given but is just a commonly held feeling toward murder or a fact that murder is ethically impermissible? Are some feelings common to all humans that even if they are feelings they are still a fact of human nature? Just something to think about.

b) Describe the doctrine of *karma*. 5

Answer: The law of karma is the counter-part in the moral world of the physical law of uniformity. It is the law of the conservation of moral energy. The vision of law and order is revealed in the Rta of Rig-Veda.

According to the principle of karma there is nothing uncertain or capricious in the moral world. We reap what we sow. Since the sense of individual responsibility is emphasised, there are critics who think that the karma doctrine is inconsistent with social service. It is said that there is no emphasis on the bearing of one another's burdens.

As a matter of fact, the Upanishads hold that we can be free from karma only by social service. So long as we perform selfish work we are subject to the law of bondage.

When we perform disinterested work we reach freedom. "While thus you live there is no way by which karma clings to you". What binds us to the chain of birth and death is not action as such but selfish action.

In an age when the individual was ever ready to shirk responsibility for what he did by throwing the burden on providence or stars or some other being than his own self, the doctrine of karma urged that a man “fetters himself by himself, like a bird by its nest”.

What looms over us is no dark fate but our own past. We are not the victims of a driving doom. Suffering is the wages of sin. There is no question that such an idea is a great incentive to good conduct. Man is not a mere product of nature. He is mightier than his karma.

If the law is all, then there is no real freedom possible. Man’s life is not the working of merely mechanical relations. There are different levels—the mechanical, the vital, the sentient, the intellectual and the spiritual—these currents cross and recross and inter-penetrate each other.

The law of karma, which rules the lower nature of man, has nothing to do with the spiritual in him. The infinite in man helps him to transcend the limitations of the finite. The essence of spirit is freedom. By its exercise man can check and control his natural impulses. That is why his life is something more than a succession of mechanically determined states.

Karma has a cosmic as well as a psychological aspect. Every deed must produce its natural effect in the world; at the same time it leaves in impression on or forms a tendency in the mind of man. It is this tendency or samskara or vasana that inclines us to repeat the deed we have once done. So all deeds have their fruits in the world and effects on the mind.

So far as the former are concerned, we cannot escape them, however, much we may try. But in regard to mental tendencies we can control them. Our future conduct holds all possibilities. By self-discipline we can strengthen the good impulses and weaken the bad ones.

The principle of karma is not inconsistent with the reality of the absolute Brahman. The moral law of karma is the expression of the nature of the absolute. Anthropomorphically we can say a divine power controls the process.

Rta is the law in the Vedas. Varuna is the lord of Rta. Karma refers to the unchanging action of the Gods. It is an expression of the nature of reality.

There is no doctrine that is as valuable in life and conduct as the karma theory. Whatever happens to us in this life we have to submit in meek resignation, for it is the result of our past doing. Yet the future is in our power, and we can work with hope and confidence. Karma inspires hope for the future and resignation to the past.

c) Name the seven norms proposed by Bentham for the measurement of pleasure. 5

d) Briefly discuss the right to life. 5

Answer: The right to life is undoubtedly the most fundamental of all rights. All other rights add quality to the life in question and depend on the pre-existence of life itself for their operation. As human rights can only attach to living beings, one might expect the right to life itself to be in some sense primary, since none of the other rights would have any value or utility without it. There would have been no Fundamental Rights worth mentioning if Article 21 had been interpreted in its original sense. This Section will examine the right to life as interpreted and applied by the Supreme Court of India. The following rights have been provided to the citizens of the country:

- Right To Live with Human Dignity
- Right Against Sexual Harassment at Workplace
- Right Against Rape
- Right to Reputation
- Right To Livelihood
- Right to Shelter



Right to Social Security and Protection of Family  
Right Against Honour Killing  
Right to Health & medical care  
Right to get Pollution Free Water and Air  
Right to Clean Environment  
Right Against Noise Pollution  
Right to Know or Right to Be Informed

Every human being has the inherent **right to life**. This **right** shall be protected by law. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his **life**. Everyone has the **right to life**, liberty and security of the person and the **right** not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

e) What do you understand by social responsibility of media? 5

Answer: The mass media have not just one public but many publics, depending on the sex, age, race, nationality, educational, political affiliation, religious affiliation, and geographical location of those who receive the message with the exception of house organs issued for restricted groups. The mass media, seeking to appeal to two or more of these publics, must constantly strive for the least common dominator, for a variety of content and programming that will attract many.

A weekly newspaper tries to represent the interests of all members of the local community, a daily newspaper, its entire circulation region with something for each age group, a magazine may make a general appeal to all ages and groups or slant its material for a more limited audience, such as teenage girls, the trade book publisher seeks the novel universal appeal, radio, television and movies all gear their offerings to mass appeal.

**Social Responsibility of the Mass Media :**

There is no question but that mass media are the greatest social force in all over the world. The only forces that even approach them are the governments, organized religion, formal education, and politics, all four of which seek to utilize the mass media to a greater or lesser extent.

In a democracy at least, responsibility necessarily comes with potentiality. How responsible the mass media are in fulfilling for social obligation is a matter of keen debate. In truth, of course, it is unfair to label them good, bad or indifference with each media. However, these media are responsible in some fields. Their first duty is to be impartial. They should present facts as they are not slanted or angled. Also, in developing countries, like Indian, media should educate their publics as an extra national responsibility. We may say that in every country, media have at least idealistically two purposes today :

**(A)** To serve the interests of the general population as well as those of special interest groups.

**(B)** To stress reliability, honesty, and impartiality in the handling of ideas, issues and propaganda.

f) What do you understand by the Absolute Should"? 5

5. Write short notes on **any five** of the following in about **100 words** each:

a) Moral pluralism 4

Answer: Moral pluralism is the idea that there can be conflicting moral views that are each worthy of respect. Moral pluralists tend to be open-minded when faced with competing viewpoints. They analyze issues from several moral points of view before deciding and taking action.

Moral pluralists believe that many moral issues are extremely complicated. Thus, no single philosophical approach will always provide all the answers.

For example, assume a building is on fire. A woman has the opportunity to rush inside and save the children trapped in the burning building. But in doing this she may die, and leave her own child an orphan. A moral pluralist would conclude that there is no definitive way to decide which is the better course of moral action. Indeed, moral pluralism declares that it is sometimes difficult to choose between competing [values](#).

So, moral pluralism occupies a sensible middle ground between “there is only one right answer” as [moral absolutism](#) says, and “there is no wrong answer” as [moral relativism](#) claims.

b) Svadharma 4

c) Intuitionism 4

**Answer: Intuition** is the ability to understand something without conscious reasoning or thought. Like we know that stealing is bad, being honest is good, and being mean is wrong. We do not make reasoning or thought. **Intuitionism** is the philosophical theory that basic truths are known intuitively. Basically, your intuition knows something because it is true. Universally, objectively, true. When you're a philosopher, looking for the fundamental sources of morality, that's a pretty major claim to make.

There are three characteristics of intuitional theory:

- There are real objective moral truths that are independent of human beings.
- These are fundamental truths that can't be broken down into parts or defined by reference to anything except other moral truths.
- Human beings can discover these truths by using their minds in a particular, intuitive way.

d) Pancasila 4

The **Five Precept** constitute the basic code of [ethics](#) undertaken by [upāsaka and upāsikā](#) ("lay followers") of [Buddhism](#). The [precepts](#) in all the traditions are essentially identical and are commitments to abstain from harming living beings, stealing, sexual misconduct, lying and intoxication. A precept is a general rule intended to regulate behaviour or thought.

Undertaking the five precepts is part of both lay Buddhist initiation and regular lay Buddhist devotional practices. They are not formulated as imperatives, but as training rules that lay people undertake voluntarily to facilitate practice.

Additionally, in the [Theravada](#) schools of Buddhism, the [bhikkhuni](#) lineage died out, and women renunciates practicing Theravadin Buddhism have developed unofficial options for their own practice, dedicating their life to religion, vowing [celibacy](#), living an [ascetic](#) life and holding eight or ten precepts. They occupy a position somewhere between that of an ordinary lay follower and an ordained monastic and similar to that of the The following are the five precepts

- I undertake the training rule to abstain from killing.
- I undertake the training rule to abstain from taking what is not given
- I undertake the training rule to avoid sexual misconduct.
- I undertake the training rule to abstain from false speech.
- I undertake the precept to refrain from intoxicating drinks and drugs which lead to carelessness.

e) Teleology 4

Answer: Aristotle is commonly considered the inventor of teleology, although the precise term originated in the eighteenth century. But if teleology means the use of ends or goals in natural science, then Aristotle was rather a critical innovator of teleological explanation. Teleological notions were widespread among Aristotle's predecessors, but he rejected their conception of extrinsic causes such as intelligence or god as the primary cause for natural things. Instead, he considers nature itself as an internal principle of change and as an end, and his teleological explanations focus on what is intrinsically good for natural substances themselves. Aristotle's philosophy was later conflated with the teleological proof for the existence of god, the anthropic cosmological principle, creationism, intelligent design, vitalism, animism, anthropocentrism, and opposition to materialism, evolution, and mechanism. But an examination of both his explicit methodology and the explanations actually offered in his scientific works (on physics, cosmology, theology, psychology, biology, and anthropology) shows that Aristotle's aporetic approach to teleology drives a middle

course through traditional oppositions between: causation and explanation, mechanism and materialism, naturalism and anthropocentrism, realism and instrumentalism.

#### f) Consequentialism 4

Answer: **Consequentialism** (or **Teleological Ethics**) is an approach to [Ethics](#) that argues that the morality of an action is **contingent** on the action's **outcome** or **consequence**. Thus, a **morally right** action is one that produces a **good outcome** or result, and the consequences of an action or rule generally **outweigh** all other considerations (i.e. the **ends** justify the **means**).

It is **distinct** from the other main types of ethical system: [Deontology](#) (which derives the rightness or wrongness of an act from the character of the **act itself** rather than the outcomes of the action), and [Virtue Ethics](#) (which focuses on the **character of the agent** rather than on either the nature or consequences of the action itself). Consequentialist theories must consider **questions** like "What sort of consequences count as **good consequences**?", "Who is the primary **beneficiary** of moral action?", "How are the consequences **judged** and who judges them?"

**Agent-Neutral Consequentialism** ignores the specific **value** of a state of affairs **for the individual**, so that their own **personal goals** do not count any more than **anyone else's** goals in evaluating what action should be taken. **Agent-Focused Consequentialism**, on the other hand, focuses on the **particular needs** of the individual, so that (although they may **also** be concerned with the **general welfare**) they are **more** concerned with the immediate welfare of the individuals' self, friends and family.

#### g) Responsibility for the Other 4

#### h) Determinism

**Answer: Determinism**, in [philosophy](#), theory that all events, including [moral](#) choices, are completely determined by previously existing causes. Determinism is usually understood to preclude [free will](#) because it entails that humans cannot act otherwise than they do. The theory holds that the universe is utterly rational because complete knowledge of any given situation assures that unerring knowledge of its future is also possible. [Pierre-Simon, Marquis de Laplace](#), in the 18th century framed the classical formulation of this thesis. For him, the present state of the universe is the effect of its previous state and the cause of the state that follows it. If a mind, at any given moment, could know all of the forces operating in nature and the respective positions of all its components, it would thereby know with certainty the future and the past of every entity, large or small. The Persian poet [Omar Khayyam](#) expressed a similar deterministic view of the world in the concluding half of one of his quatrains: "And the first Morning of Creation wrote / What the Last Dawn of Reckoning shall read."

[Indeterminism](#), on the other hand, is the view that at least some events in the universe have no deterministic cause but occur randomly, or by chance. Exponents of determinism strive to defend their theory as compatible with [moral responsibility](#) by saying, for example, that evil results of certain actions can be foreseen, and this in itself imposes moral responsibility and creates a deterrent external cause that can influence actions.