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Gifty E. CodjoeAssignment 2 #1 on page 157 Describe how Cheyney Ryan understands thepacifist`s position. Ryan understanding of the pacifist’s position is that itsrequiring respect for other human beings and to consider what brings ustogether as humans.

He opposes the killing of fellow human beings on thegrounds of “ logic of right.” Cheney’s position of a pacifist may bring aboutlinking the act of violence as a result of our love for others. Importantly, when it isdone out of love so why fault a man when it could be you in the same positionto take action. Although an individual who goes beyond to commit violenceshould be monitored closely. As a pacifist Ryan rejects war, which brings aboutkilling. Having victory over an enemy as a result of violence does not resultin justification.  #2 on page 155 what considerations does Wasserstrom think couldjustify war? Describe the limitations each. Wasserstromsay, how Ryan understands just when innocent people are killed despite love ornatural human act.

That doesn’t give a right to take actions, which is unfairto another, human. Wasserstrom believes that it is likely for war to have amoral justification. Even though war is immoral by its definition, murder andother acts which are normally prohibited is acceptable during war but notsaying there is no backings of morality. Wassserstrombelieves that very large number of innocent are people affected by war or that are killed is what could justifyit. It raises a major argument or case whereby anyone may say this is notright. Although it is part of life, it is not good when it affect so manyinnocent people.

Wassserstromassess this argument by first indicating the understanding of war beingsomething that involves killing. Many will die yes but there is a Burden thatrises to the surface to make a legitimate case against the killing innocentpeople, which is not moral.     #2 on page 129 How do you think Scheffler willrespond to someone who believes that one person`s terrorist is another person`sfreedom fighter? In response to” One man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter”.  The definition for a  “ freedom fighter” may be someone who engagesin struggle to achieve political freedom for either themselves or for otherswhereas the term “ terrorist” may be defined as a person who uses terror or violenceas a means of intimidation to attain a political goal. Scheffler sees theact Terrorism as using violence by non-citizen person against noncombatants inorder to attain a political goal.

He has a concern that there is somethingunique about some form of violence, which is suggestive that it is immoral fordiverse reasons. But he is not saying that one act is better than anotherbecause these terms can easily be used confusingly. Scheffler tries to differentiatebetween terrorism and state terror by saying that people you participate interrorism have different motives as compared to those who engage in stateterror. Scheffler believes that even though terrorism will be done forpolitical purposes, there are other terrorists who engage in terrorism for variousreasons, which may include fame, and to gain attention from the public. He states that, Terrorists knows what the subduing impact of fear has on people, therefore, they use it as a weapon against the people they terror and as a result are ableto impart fear in people with the motive of weakening order in the society.

Hementions that terrorism evokes fear on people, and fear can be extremely harshon an individual overall welfare. Also, fear brings about ruin to a person’ssocial life.  In addition fear makespeople turn to the defense of a stable political society in order to avoid theimpact fear on their lives.