

# Free critical thinking on neurosurgeon

[Sociology](#), [Violence](#)



## **Introduction**

### Question 1

Utilitarianism can be easily understood as a situation whereby there is a need to maximize happiness while reducing suffering. In this case we are introduced to a neurosurgeon that is performing some experiments in his lab. Homeless men are brought to his lab by kidnappers. The main aim of this action is to find a procedure for fixing spinal damage. He wants to perfect in his field of surgery by trying to fix the spinal codes of the homeless men. These homeless men cannot defend themselves since they are not in the position to do so since they have been kidnapped.

Most of the homeless men end up dying or having permanent paradigm. The motive of the neurosurgeon was good because he wanted to introduce the best procedure for fixing spinal codes. In previous science; there has not been a way for fixing the spinal code. The neurosurgeon had to kidnap the men so that he can do a practice to them. His motive was to face humanity from spinal injury. Spinal injury can be very fatal. This is when there is no expertise to perform the operation. The neurosurgeon wanted to perfect in his research work so that he can be amongst those in a position to fix spinal injuries.

He did not care about the homeless men because in this case they were not important to the neurosurgeon. People argued that it was good to use rules instead of calculating the results of an action. This will help a person choose the best action. Calculating the consequences of an action will make a person settle on a lesser action than the preferred one. The important thing to him was to introduce the spinal code fixing procedure. The neurosurgeon

preferred the final results of the operation as compared to the life of the homeless men. Instead of the homeless men to continue living in some harsh conditions it was better for them to be put as a control experiment in order to save humanity and those people who are suffering from spine injuries.

## **Question 2**

Although utilitarianism can be easily accepted, it can be criticized in many occasions. Many critics have developed to criticize the act of utilitarianism. The critics can either have different reasons or have a different target. A critic that have been developed, by a person for a certain reason and assumed by another person for the same reason or for any other reason. This is because utilitarianism ignores justice and does not follow any set rules. The action is said to be very crude which have led to various philosophers to object it. It encourages issues of brutality and evils to humanity. It will be very unusual to subject a person to oppression and brutality simply because of the general good of any kind. This is an unjust system of punishment.

Some people argue that the consequences of the act could have been realized later to prevent the repetition of the same act or incidence from happening again. It is advisory to apply moral principles and rational thinking before doing anything. Utilitarianism requires great sacrifices of those who are well off and the person doing it. In this context, the surgeon performs an operation to the homeless men without minding the effects of the action. He kidnaps the homeless men and does a control experiment on them. His aim is to introduce a method for fixing the injured spinal code. The general results according to him could have been of great importance to the society.

According to ethics, the action was not good at all. We are told that those men who he operated either died or had permanent paralysis. This action was against humanity. His aim was to make the future humanity to not suffer at an expense of kidnapped homeless people. The surgeon should have looked for other methods to perfect his work and research.

The surgeon's actions should be strongly rejected. The homeless men are very important phenomena as compared to the results of the spinal fixation. In fact, they were subjected to suffering even if they had no any complications in them hence the results of the experiment, though not successful, did not help them in any way.

### **Question 3**

According to Kant's defense, some arguments arose as a result of self ownership. It was argued that individuals are an end and not a means. The individuals must have been notified that they are to be sacrificed. If people act for the right reasons then they are morally right and worth. If the intended consequences are good then the action is moral.

Even if the final consequences are not good, we say that the plan is worth because since the intended consequences were good the worthiness of an action can be assessed by the initial motivation of the action in this case, we see the surgeon doing an operation on the homeless men leading to their death. His motives were good since he wanted to explore the field of spinal fixation. The general results could have been of great importance to humanity in general. Despite the fact that the homeless men died, we can say that his motives were good because the results could have been of great importance. The final results are taken into consideration.

## Question 4

Kant argues that for us to taste an action by the way it approaches and upholds humanity. Kant argued that actions that caused death and theft should be prohibited. This is even if the final results were meant to cause more happiness. He argues that if some actions do not lead to the achievement of goals by human beings then they should not happen. If the action does not reflect any form of rationality then they should be abolished. He argued that perception is not knowledge. In this context, we observe that the surgeon was not interested in the consequences of the surgery. The consequences were accompanied by death of the homeless men. When the homeless men were kidnapped, the kidnappers had only one mission. Their mission was to develop a spinal code fixing procedure. They did not focus on the possible consequences of their actions.

The surgeon was finding a way to make him happy at the expense of the homeless men. This action led two bad consequences to the homeless men. Firstly, they died at the expense of a mere experience. Secondly, they were kidnapped which was not to their consent. This in other words is causing great torture and harm to humanity. The surgeon could have done his research in another field that respects humanity. He should of have done his research in a field that causes harm to humanity without judging the initial results of his actions.