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work Philosophy, Exercise Assignments Affiliation Supervisor’s Question A consequentialist person is that one which makes decision in life and is very conscious about the consequences or the impacts of their choices made. While non consequentialist are those people that do not care about the impacts or results of their choices or decision they make in life. They are risk takers in life.
Question 2
Psychological egoists argue that that people always act out of self-interest if there is evidence of them behaving so at one time. This is the basis for the understanding of psychological egoism. While Ethical egoism on the other hand is a behavior that is not within ones interest or control. It asserts that if possible then an action should be morally sufficient if it maximizes one’s self interests. Ethical egoism might also apply to things other than acts, such as rules or character traits.
Question 3
Psychological egoism has to components, strong and weak component. The strong part of egoism alludes that human beings ever act in their own self-interest. That is to say that they are forced to do so by their own psychology. On other side the weak form part of it argues that human beings always and occasionally act in their own self-interest. None of the two forms of Psychological egoism can stand its own to define what egoism is. For example if the strong form would be accepted, then it means that people should not be told on the right thing to do since they are controlled by their instinct. On the other hand if the weak form of it is to be used, that would mean that people should continue behaving the way they are behaving which cannot be proved. Psychological egoism fails to refute morality or to provide a foundation for ethical egoism because everyone always does what they do and it cannot be justifiable by information about their human conduct. Psychological egoism in its strong form alone would destroy all morality and is lacking both in evidence and in logic.
Question 4
“ Individual ethical egoism”, states that people should always act for my “ own” best self-interest while “ Personal ethical egoism”, states that I should behave in “ my own” self-interest, but be mindless about what everyone does. The problem with these forms is that it acts towards one individual and cannot be applied for all humanity in general.
Question 5
Universal ethical egoism is the most commonly held form of ethical egoism because it considers all humanity. It does not only talk about what an individual should consider doing but also is concerned with what all human beings should do for morality principles. However the universal ethical egoism has a problem in that it is inconsistent in its application and that not all human beings could have the same feelings and interest at the same time.
Question 6
Under universal ethical, the term “ everyone” is questionable because when self-interests conflict, universal ethical egoism provides no way out for this and therefore the term “ everyone” might not offer results that will truly be in the best interest of everyone. Therefore the term “ everyone might not hold if there are differing self interests for individuals.
Question 7
Jesse Kalin’s analogy of universal ethical would mean that we have an ethical theory that is private and personal since he argues that everyone should behave in their own self interest irrespective of other individual’s interests which contradicts the law of personal and individual self interest.
Question 8
One advantage is that it’s easier to determine self-interest. For example it would be much easier to identify individuals self interests rather than it is for them to know what is in the best interest for others. People will not always act in their own self-interest and will certainly make errors in judgment about what is in their self-interest. Another advantage is that it encourages Individual freedom and responsibility; people need to be concerned only about their own self-interest and then be ready to take responsibility for their actions. The disadvantage of this theory is that it holds as long as people are operating in own isolation, so as to minimize opportunities for conflict among their own self-interests.
Question 9
The “ Act Utilitarians” believe that all people should behave in manner that will have better results than bad results for the people involved for their action. They don’t believe in setting up rule for action because they believe that each situation and each person are different. This is tricky because it would be impossible to determine which action will be good or bad for the people. However, “ Rule Utilitarian’s” argument differs from “ Act Utilitarians” because they argue that people should always establish and follow those rules that will bring about the greatest benefit for all the people concerned.
Question 10
The challenges with act utilitarianism are difficulty of determining consequences for others . For example it is impractical to decide what the consequences will be good and bad for any action one is about to take since what may be a good consequence may not be the same for others. Another problem is the impracticality of beginning anew or rather difficulty of educating the young people to act morally if there no rules guiding them to do. The challenge with rule utilitarianism on the other hand is difficulty of determining consequences for others since what could be good for one person may not be good or bad for the other colleague due to differing self interest.
Question 11
There is a difficulty of carrying the beneficial aspect of utility for many people. Non-utilitarians for example argue that whether it is always right to try to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number of people in a society. This means that whatever is good for the majority of people would end up with some consequences for the minority of people. This is the struggle for the cost benefit analysis of utilitarianism. If we want to get greatest good for everyone, there is the danger of cost-benefit analysis, or end-justifies-the-means, approach to morality. This means that one is trying to calculate how much effort will bring about the most benefits. This would mean determining the social worth of individuals in a society, so that those people in a society that who are more useful to a society are given more benefits and privileges than those who are not. This would result to unfair judgment and treatment for other people in the society which could result to immorality in the society toward the minority.
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