

MORE ETHICAL THEORIES

//

CLASS 5

FALL 2015 / SECTION 02 / HOLLY BUCK

adapted from slides by Dr. Cynthia Matuszek

TODAY'S CLASS

- Turn in:
 - Reading Journal 3 (Tavani ch. 2)
- Short introductory lecture
- Case discussions – mix & match groups

ETHICAL APPROACHES - REVIEW

- **Consequentialism/utilitarianism** (consequence based)
Evaluate based on *results of decisions*.
- **Deontology** (duty based)
Evaluate based on *adherence to duties or laws*.
- **Contractualism** (contract based)
Evaluate based on *promoting the world you want to live in*.
- **Virtue** (character based)
- **Natural rights** (rights based)
- **Just Consequentialism** (reading for Monday)

RIGHTS-BASED

- Goodness: rights-sustaining vs. rights-violating
- Negative Rights: cannot ethically be taken away
 - Voting: I can't stop you from going to the polls.
 - But, I don't have to drive you.
- Positive Rights: ethically must be provided
 - Positive rights are *extremely* rare.
 - Must be provided by who, exactly?
- Natural Rights: possessed by virtue of being human
- Legal Rights: possessed because we all agree on it

RIGHTS-BASED

- Education
- Food
- Emergency health care
- Health care
- Ownership
- Privacy
- Employment

	Negative	Positive
Natural		
Legal		Education

VIRTUE-BASED

- It is ethical to be a person of good character

~~“What should I do?”~~

“What kind of person should I *be*?”

Implied: what would that person do?

- Pros: outside of philosophy classes, we *live* our choices.
 - Make ethical behavior and thought a habit
 - Corresponds better to moral intuition
- Cons?

SUMMARY: NO PERFECT ANSWERS

Rights (can) play into all frameworks.

	Pros	Cons
Consequence-based	Promotes happiness and utility	Justice for minority populations
Deontological / duty - based	Promotes duty and respect for individuals	Underestimates happiness, social utility
Contract-based	Motivates morality	Itself only minimally moral
Character / virtue-based	Stresses moral development	Requires homogenous standards

Tavani, *Ethical Concepts and Ethical Theories*, Table 2-3

OTHER TOPICS

- Moral intuition: an *unreasoned* reaction (not *unreasonable*)
 - Our “intuitive awareness of value”
 - Intrinsically motivating
 - Retractable; fallible; unavoidable
- Consequence vs. intent
 - What should you have foreseen?
- Temptation
 - When are you responsible for the actions of others?
(Answer: not never.)
- Moral discourse stoppers

DISCOURSE STOPPERS

Stopper #1

People disagree on solutions to moral issues.

1. Fails to recognize that experts in many areas disagree on key issues in their fields.
2. Fails to recognize that there are many moral issues on which people agree.
3. Fails to distinguish between disagreement about principles and disagreement about facts.

Stopper #2

Who am I to judge others?

1. Fails to distinguish between the act of judging and being a judgmental person.
2. Fails to distinguish between judging as condemning and judging as evaluating.
3. Fails to recognize that sometimes we are required to make judgments

Stopper #3

Ethics is simply a private matter.

1. Fails to recognize that morality is essentially a public system.
2. Fails to note that personally-based morality can cause major harm to others.
3. Confuses moral choices with individual or personal preferences.

Stopper #4

Morality is simply a matter for individual cultures to decide.

1. Fails to distinguish between descriptive and normative claims about morality.
2. Assumes that people can never reach common agreement on some moral principles.
3. Assumes that a system is moral because a majority in a culture decides it is moral.

DISCUSSION – THREE SCENARIOS, FIVE THEORIES

1. Each team member receives a role – one of 5 ethical approaches
2. Go join the others who have your role in one corner of the room, and spend ~10 minutes discussing what guidance that theory / approach would have for the 3 scenarios provided. *Every* person should write down a position, or at least notes, from what you collectively decide to be your position.
3. Return to your normal teams and present your position's viewpoints. Then, deliberate: Which approach is the most useful? Which is most ethically right? What would your group choose to do?

FOR NEXT CLASS...

RJ 4: Moor's Just Consequentialism