

Course work on
ethics and relativism;
animal rights; the
limits of skepticism;
cr...

[Environment](#), [Animals](#)



1. Ethics and Relativism

When it comes to the way people live their daily lives, ethical beliefs bear tangible implications. Generally, beliefs about such beliefs bear no appropriate or inevitable consequences Paul et al, (2008) When it comes to what people believe or take to be right for what they practically A specific question is if relativism, being a belief about beliefs, is workable or adequate basis for ethics. Many believe it is. Another burning issue is whether relativism in a position to maintain commitment, high moral standards, moral passion and courage, majority believes it can. In some cases for instance, other people do suffer of torment after causing deaths through accidents while with some, it is just a matter of no importance or rather inconsequential (Paul et al, 2008)

According to Nitecki, et al anthropologists do point to a range of various practices that might be moral in some societies while they are at the same time, immoral and condemnable in other societies. Therefore, ethical relativism indicates that morality is only relative to one's cultural norms whereby, it all depends with moral norms of a certain society when it comes to determining whether an action is wrong or right (Nitecki et al, 1993)

References

Doris, V. Nitecki & Mathew, H. Nitecki et al, (1993). Evolutionary Ethics. NY.

University of New York Press. Print pgs, (14-134)

Ellen F. Paul, Fred M Jr. & Jeffrey Paul, (2008). Objectivism, subjectivism, and relativism in ethics, Part 1. NY: Cambridge University Press. Print (pgs12-56)

2. Animal Rights

Linzey suggests that ethical attitudes as well as human ethical practices with respect to animal Kingdom symbolize an inquisitive instability. However, it is very paramount for human beings to understand that it is immoral to kill or torment an animal for petty reasons. Humans should also embrace the fact that they are naturally obligated to take care of animals because they can think and decide. For instance, skinning a dog or even putting it on fire via a juvenile prank is among the examples of common wrongdoings as far as the philosophical literature is concerned. Despite the fact that humans use other animals for food that does not warranty any mistreatments towards them (Linzey et al, 2004)

According to Hile, animals have their rights too. Just like in a family where a man is more superior to a woman, women also have their rights and they deserve to be treated well by men. The same case applies to animals being handled by human beings. Animals should not be killed by men merely for malicious enjoyment. Men do inflict pain to animals or even kill them by inflicting pain on them simply because they are in need of their meat or the useful products that come out of these animals. It is important for man find balance when raising animals either for meat or for other economical reasons. This can be possibly achieved by observing and applying the animal rights. Anything that is considered fit for human consumption should be treated with utmost care to maintain its quality. When the right time comes, the due process of killing the animal can be underway but in a decent form (Hile, 2004)

References

Linzey, A. Paul, A & Clarke, B. (2004). Animal rights: a historical anthology. NY: Columbia University Press. Print, (pgs, 23-35)

Hile, Kevin, (2004). Animal Rights. Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers. Print (pgs 24-99)

3. Limits of Skepticism

Priest insinuates that a person who is skeptic is the one who is inclined to doubting the opinions that are acceptable to others. The truth remains that skepticism has largely remained to be the center of systems of knowledge. People who are skeptic believe that there is some body of knowledge that is accurate. They believe since they have references by which they can determine whether a certain belief or opinion measures up. Therefore a person cannot be skeptic about everything. For instance, religion believers may be skeptical about some teachings or facts. Creationists for example are skeptic towards Darwin's theory of evolution whereas this is not termed as true skepticism due to the fact that it is contradictive or rather rejects some sets of opinions. One of the beliefs that one can possess and cannot be challenged is the Biblical creation theory. I believe that is only God who created the entire world in seven day unlike other scientific theories. The skeptic might not concur with my belief since they also have their beliefs in which they belief. The truth is that everyone is skeptical towards each other since we all have different schools of thought. Scientific skeptics are regarded as perfect skeptics since they are flexible enough to accept deductions, beliefs and opinions based on the assumptions that they have been verified by others (Priest, 1995)

References

Priest, G. (1995). *Beyond the Limits of Thought*. NY: CUP. Print, (Pgs 44-78)

4. Creationism and Science

According to my understanding, creationism should be taught to schools so as for learners to have sober minds of understanding both sides and therefore make informed decisions. This will be an imperative debate because it will expose learners to different schools of thought. By not doing so, people will remain in darkness since they will not have the exposure of knowing either of the sides before he decides given the fact that even the bible itself indicates clearly that man is intelligent enough to make a suitable choice. The New Scientist (1982). Christians do not want biblical creationism to be publicly taught in class rooms, but the fact is that microbes-to-man evolution should be taught in public schools with its entire warts. Intelligent Design (ID) should be taught in classes by teachers without fear of being sacked. Given that creationism is mainly an American phenomenon, there are couples of legal arguments, educational philosophical arguments, religious arguments and epistemological arguments surrounding this question. Creationists do not want anything to do with evolution and they do consider it to be evil but in order for one to judge well, he/she must have both sides of the stories explained well to them in spite of the fact that evolution is based on scientific facts (The New Scientist, 1982)

References

The new Scientist, (1982). *The new scientist*. UK: OUP. Print (Pgs 12-45)

5. Proof of God's Existence

Arguments on whether God exists have been proposed by various schools of thought including scientists, philosophers and theologians among others. Personally, I am certain that God does exist and I concur with facts laid down by philosophers concerning the existence of God. According to Aquinas, Thomas (2011), God exists in our minds and souls meaning that his concept is with us and it resides in our minds as an idea. Another fact is that God almighty is a possible being who might exist in reality. This means that he is possible because his concept bears no internal contradictions. Another fact that has been put forward by philosophers concerning the existence of God is the new set up of the universe. Intricate mechanisms from orbits of planets surrounding the sun towards the cells in our fingernails could not have happened by chance. Meaning that the enormously mechanisms that is complex has been redesigned and the designer is God. That is also a very interesting fact. Another fact is that “ God is the perfect being” and the only perfect being since he possesses all the possible perfections and therefore if he did not have existence in him, he could not be perfect. Therefore as perfect as he is, he exists. Philosophers have sought for many years to provide such proofs. This is because they want to believe that they came from somewhere. This has been necessary because man and everything in the universe must have come from somewhere since nothing came into existence from nowhere and everything was created by God. Therefore God exists. (Aquinas Thomas, 1996)

References

Aquinas, Thomas. (1996). Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas. New Advent Inc. Print Pg, (13-56)

6. The Turing Test

When Turing was held in 1950, it was revealed fully and most confidentially that at that time, computers would rival human intelligence by acquiring some unique programming abilities. The famous element in the Turing paper depended on the test Shieber (2004). Turing therefore proposed the notion of imitation game which encompassed the interrogation of humans and computers under circumstances the interrogator did not know which was which, with conversations done through text messages. In his argument, Turing stated that if the interrogator could fail to distinguish his interviewees through questioning, then it could not be reasonable to call the computers unintelligent. Given a chance, I personally will ask the computer to tell me what is in my mind, what I think of it. Due to the fact that the computer cannot reason just as a human being, these questions will prove that the computer will remain to be computers since they are manmade and cannot reason since they are only programmed. These responses would be given by a human being because he is the one operating the computers and they cannot operate themselves. Human beings are unique creatures as compared to computers. This is because they can think and decide unlike computers that are only programmed (Shieber, S. 2004)

References

Shieber, S. (2004). The Turing test: verbal behavior as the hallmark of intelligence. Massachusetts: Stuart M. Shieber Publications. Print pgs (12 -66)

7. The Values of Philosophy

After reflecting on what we have read and thought about in our course, the topic that has been interesting, challenging and aggravating was the one challenging the existence of God. This topic has brought to my attention that philosophy is a value in the study of wisdom. At the same time, the same topic has helped me understand that it philosophy is the exercising of the wisdom we obtain Sharma (2002) as we endeavor to understand our origins. This complex topic has also challenged my mind concerning the two explanations of God's existence and that is: the creationist's point of view as well as the evolution point of view. Following various explanation from both sources, it has challenged my moral and religious since both the creationist and evolution theory sounds convincing. Having observed how both sides defends their positions, I have managed to learn and observe the source that is truthful based on the evidence produced. This topic has also helped me realize that philosophy is about the values of life. I have also discovered that philosophy helps guide my every action and whether it is acknowledged or not, we all live by a philosophy (Sharma, C. 2002)

References

Sharma, C. (2002). Modern Methods of Teaching Moral Values. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons. Print, (pgs 12-78)

8. Philosophy and Society

De Landa comments that in our daily lives, philosophy has a strong influence. Philosophy helps us enrich our respective day-to-day lives by thinking substantially. Philosophy is part of our roadmap since it guides us through our daily lives. The truth is that, philosophy is very dynamic since it lacks specific subject matter and therefore making it difficult to be defined through a specific avenue of investigations. Philosophy may appear to be dealing with all dimensions of life but can raise questions in every field of study. As a result, there are multiple varieties of “ philosophies-of subject” as well as “ philosophies of discipline” People stand to benefit from thinking philosophically since it is based on the pursuance of questions and not answers. Virtually, this means that the responsibilities that are encompassed in philosophy are not so much in findings but critical researches. A philosopher can easily make a riddle from any kind of a given answer (De Landa, E. 2006)

References

Manuel De Landa, (2006). A new philosophy of society: assemblage theory and social complexity. UK: Ashford Color Press. Print, (pgs15-80)