

# Biomedical ethics assignment

[Art & Culture](#)



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Coherence with other knowledge: the theory should agree with things we know from other disciplines. 6. Coherence with our most basic moral Judgments: the theory should agree with our most basic setoffs morals and from this we can pass “ Judgment” based on those morals. 4. Ethical Egoism: an act is right only if it is in the actors best interests. Objections to Ethical Egoism: 1 . Egoism fails the publicity requirements: you won’t want to teach egoism to others because then they will compete with you.

How does Egoism respond to Objection 1: 2. Egoism clashes with our most basic moral Judgments: Fire example and the robber with posterity 5. Divine Command Theory: an act is right only because God commands it. -Objections to DUCT: 1 . The Moral Arbitrariness Objection: If God had moral reasons for his commands then those reasons are the ultimate moral standard, but If God had no moral reasons then his commands are morally arbitrary. DUCT response- 1. Its not possible for God to consult moral reasons prior to Investing morality. 2.

God could have had some good non-moral reasons for choosing one set of commands over another. 6. The Nielsen Objection: 1. To Justify ones acceptance of DUCT, one must test God’s commands against ones most basic moral beliefs 2. Ones most basic moral beliefs comprise a moral standard that’s independent of God and his command. 3. If one test God’s commands against ones most basic moral beliefs, than ones most basic moral beliefs are, for that person, more fundamental moral other than God’s commands, than one can’t be a DC Theorist. 5.

So one can't justify one's acceptance of DUCT without giving it up Responses to Nelson's Objection: -is premise 2 true? Did God give us our basic moral belief? -Is premise 3 true? —Nielsen is presupposing a certain picture of theory justification in ethics. -no theory could survive his argument 7. Modified DUCT: an act is right only because a loving God commands it. Non-moral value concept which we can understand without referring to God or his commands. Problem- are all wrong acts unloving? -If not, then knowing that God is loving won't guarantee that he won't command something that is wrong. If every wrong act is unloving and every right act is loving, then why do we need God's commands? 8. Quantitative Hedonism: pleasures are the same in kind; they only differ in degree Qualitative Hedonism: pleasure differs in kind and degree Utilitarianism: an act is right only if it leaves to the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people. Objections to ITIL. : 1. Ambiguity in the basic definition: what does "the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people" mean? 2. It clashes with our most basic moral beliefs. -The case of Innocent fat man: ITIL.

EX- the intuition against blowing the man up should be rejected. -The case of the scapegoat: ITIL. EX- it's not actually the best thing to give the innocent man up because justice will be prevented in the long run and society will break down. -The parent/child case: ITIL. EX- bite the bullet and preference response (act is right if and only if it maximizes the preference of most people) PC case: you and your child are on a boat and your child falls over and 2 others fall over and you're the only one there to save them you can either save the two or your child. But ITIL. As you need to save the 2 instead of yours because there are two lives instead of one. 9. Categorical Imperative:

act only on that maxim that you can at the same time, and without contradiction in your will, will to become a universal law. Maxim- personal principle of action (“ should I lie in order to obtain a non”) Universal law- the maxim applied to everyone (“ everyone should always lie to obtain loans”) Story: Guy goes to the bank and knows he can’t pay the loan and but should he lie and say he can pay it back because they wont give it to him unless he promises to pay it back.

If everyone lies about paying loans then the bank will stop giving loans. Objections to C’: 1. It’s vague- it’s not clear how broadly or narrowly we should formulate our maxims. EX 1- “ . I should lie” \*” everyone should always —this fails the Categorical Imperative test. EX. 2- “ I shouldn’t lie unless I need o protect an innocent friend” -??+ “ no one should lie unless they need to, to protect an innocent friend “——this passes the Categorical Imperative test. 2. It turns non-moral acts into morally forbidden ones. EX. I should flush the toilet at noon” 10. Demonology: an act is right only if it’s your duty to do it. Rose’s Demonology: Prima Facie Duties- duties that usually are your duties but could be overridden by other factors in a given case. Fidelity: duty to keep your promise Gratitude: duty to express gratitude for kindnesses received Non-Maleficent: duty to help others in need Justice: duty to distribute goods fairly Self-Improvement: duty to better yourself Rose’s answer to these duties: these are obtained from moral intuition Prima Facial: Duties vs..

Actual Duties -the Prima Facial duty you and up following once you’ve combined everything. -gotten from intuition 11 . Virtue Ethics: not concerned so much with acts but, more so with character traits. 2 Major

<https://assignbuster.com/biomedical-ethics-assignment-essay-samples/>

Discontentment: 1 . Act based theories lead to counter intuitive appraisals of characters. 2. Act based theories don't inspire people to do good Difficulty with Virtue Ethics: it seems to lack determinacy. It tells you how to be but often can't say what to do.