

# Andrews discussion 3

[Science](#), [Social Science](#)



Andrews Discussion 3 al Affiliation) ment What's right depends on the culture you are in How would you reformulate this statement to make it more precise?

Statement 2: " The perception of what is right is limited to cultural backgrounds."

2. Has your rating of this statement changed after reading chapter 2 of the ethics textbook? If your rating has not changed, are your reasons for the rating any different now from when you first responded to this statement?

The rating of the initial statement lies at ' strongly agree.' It does not change after reading the text because the meaning can only get stronger. The text offers additional insight to the significance of culture as a component in defining ethics. As such, the initial statement points out the fact that culture is a significant component of defining what is right. In the second statement, the point of diversion for defining what is right lies at culture; hence, a significant component of ethics. The reasons for rating the statement as ' strongly agree' lie on the fact that every individual has a cultural background that forms the basis for early education. Such education governs what such an individual considers as right. On the other hand, the text indicates that peers expose individuals to early childhood education in the society (Andrews, Pruitt, & Durham, 2003). As such, the reasons as to why culture influences what is considered as right do not change after obtaining additional insight.

Statement 3: " No one has the right to intervene when they think someone else has done something morally wrong."

1. When, if ever, do you think intervention is morally justified? Morally

required? Give examples of actual situations.

According to the doctrine of utilitarianism, it is required that individuals maximize good to the greatest population and minimize suffering.

Intervention is morally justified if an individual performs acts that compromise good for the greatest population. As such, if acting on self-interest enhances suffering among the population, intervention is morally required. However, if there is no compromise to the doctrine, "no one has the right to intervene when they think someone else has done something morally wrong." For example, the act of a member of the Senate embezzling public funds may warrant an intervention because it causes suffering for the greatest population (the public). In addition, if a person litters, he or she may be held for an intervention because littering causes pollution and has adverse environmental and health effects for the greatest population, in the long run.

2. Has your rating of this statement changed after reading chapter 2 of the ethics textbook? If your rating has not changed, are your reasons for the rating any different now from when you first responded to this statement? The rating stands at 'strongly agree' before and after reading the text. The text provides information about the principles that govern morals. As such, the doctrine of utilitarianism is profound after the additional reading. In the initial case, the reasons for agreeing with the statement focused on the aspect of whether the immoral act causes harm to anyone. If it does not, the statement holds. In addition, the doctrine of utilitarianism, as depicted in the text, indicates that suffering must be experienced by the greatest population for the immoral act to warrant an intervention (Bykvist, 2009).

## References

Andrews, C., Pruitt, P., & Durham, D. (2003). Gilded age legal ethics.

Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama School of Law.

Bykvist, K. (2009). Utilitarianism. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.