

# an introductory

---

# GUIDE TO **ETHICS**

---

## GS PAPER IV

This is a supplementary study material to help in the preparation for  
ethics paper ( GS Paper IV )

version 1.0

# 1. INTRODUCTION TO ETHICS

## WHAT IS ETHICS?

- ❖ Ethics is a system of moral principles. Ethics is concerned with what is good for individuals and society and is also described as moral philosophy.
- ❖ The term is derived from the Greek word *ethos* which can mean custom, habit, character or disposition.
- ❖ Concepts of ethics have been derived from religions, philosophies and cultures. They infuse debates on topics like abortion, human rights and professional conduct.
- ❖ Ethics covers the following dilemmas:
  - ✓ how to live a good life
  - ✓ our rights and responsibilities
  - ✓ the language of right and wrong
  - ✓ Moral decisions - what is good and bad?

## APPROACHES TO ETHICS:

Ethical theories are divided into three areas: meta-ethics, normative ethics and applied ethics.

- ✓ **Meta-ethics** deals with the nature of moral judgement. It looks at the origins and meaning of ethical principles.
- ✓ **Normative ethics** is concerned with the content of moral judgements and the criteria for what is right or wrong.
- ✓ **Applied ethics** looks at controversial topics like war, animal rights and capital punishment

## USES OF ETHICS:

<b>ETHICS CAN PROVIDE A MORAL MAP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Philosophers offer us ethical rules and principles that enable us to take a cooler view of moral problems like abortion and euthanasia.</li> <li>❖ So ethics provides us with a moral map, a framework that we can use to find our way through difficult issues.</li> </ul>
<b>ETHICS CAN PINPOINT A DISAGREEMENT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Using the framework of ethics, two people who are arguing a moral issue can often find that what they disagree about is just one particular part of the issue, and that they broadly agree on everything else.</li> </ul>
<b>ETHICS DOESN'T GIVE RIGHT ANSWERS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ For many ethical issues there isn't a single right answer. Ethics just provides us a set of principles that can be applied to particular cases to give those involved some clear choices.</li> <li>❖ All ethics can do is eliminate confusion and clarify the issues. After that it's up to each individual to come to their own conclusions.</li> </ul>
<b>ETHICS CAN GIVE SEVERAL ANSWERS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Many people want there to be a single right answer to ethical questions. They find moral ambiguity hard to live with because they genuinely want to do the 'right' thing.</li> <li>❖ But often there isn't one right answer - there may be several right answers, or just some least bad answers - and the individual must choose between them.</li> </ul>

**ETHICS AND PEOPLE:**❖ **Ethics is about the 'other':**

- ✓ Ethics is a concern about something or someone other than ourselves and our own desires and self-interest.
- ✓ Ethics is concerned with other people's interests, with the interests of society, with God's interests, with "ultimate goods", and so on.
- ✓ So when a person 'thinks ethically' they are giving at least some thought to something beyond themselves.

❖ **Ethics as source of group strength:**

- ✓ If a group believes that a particular activity is "wrong" it can then use morality as the justification for attacking those who practice that activity.

❖ **Good people as well as good actions:**

- ✓ Ethics is not only about the morality of particular courses of action, but it's also about the goodness of individuals and what it means to live a good life.
- ✓ Virtue Ethics is particularly concerned with the moral character of human beings.

❖ **Searching for the source of right and wrong**

- ✓ Ethics leads people not to conclusions but to 'decisions', that is, the role of ethics is limited to clarifying 'what's at stake' in particular ethical problems.
- ✓ Ethics can help identify the range of ethical methods, conversations and value systems that can be applied to a particular problem. But after these things have been made clear, each person must make their own individual decision as to what to do, and then react appropriately to the consequences.

**SOURCES OF ETHICS:**❖ **Supernaturalism:**

- ✓ **Supernaturalism (God-based ethics)** makes ethics inseparable from religion. It teaches that the only source of moral rules is God. So, something is good because God says it is, and the way to lead a good life is to do what God wants.

❖ **Intuitionism:**

- ✓ **Intuitionists** think that good and bad are real objective properties that can't be broken down into component parts. Something is good because it's good; its goodness doesn't need justifying or proving.
- ✓ They say that human beings have an intuitive moral sense that enables them to detect real moral truths. The basic moral truths of what is good and bad are self-evident to a person who directs their mind towards moral issues.

❖ **Consequentialism**

- ✓ It bases morality on the consequences of human actions and not on the actions themselves.
- ✓ **Consequentialism** teaches that people should do whatever produces the greatest amount of good consequences. One famous way of putting this is 'the greatest good for the greatest number of people'.
- ✓ Despite its obvious common-sense appeal, consequentialism turns out to be a complicated theory, and doesn't provide a complete solution to all ethical problems. Two problems with consequentialism are:
  - it can lead to the conclusion that some quite dreadful acts are good
  - predicting and evaluating the consequences of actions is often very difficult

❖ **Non-consequentialism or deontological ethics**

- ✓ Non-consequentialism is concerned with the actions themselves and not with the consequences. It's the theory that people are using when they refer to "the principle of the thing".
- ✓ It teaches that some acts are right or wrong in themselves, whatever the consequences, and people should act accordingly.

❖ **Virtue ethics**

- ✓ This school deny that there can be such things as universal ethical rules.
- ✓ Virtue ethics is particularly concerned with the way individuals live their lives, and less concerned in assessing particular actions.
- ✓ It develops the idea of good actions by looking at the way virtuous people express their inner goodness in the things that they do.
- ✓ Virtue ethics teaches that an action is right if and only if it is an action that a virtuous person would do in the same circumstances, and that a virtuous person is someone who has a particularly good character.

❖ **Situation ethics**

- ✓ **Situation ethics** rejects prescriptive rules and argues that individual ethical decisions should be made according to the unique situation.
- ✓ Rather than following rules the decision maker should follow a desire to seek the best for the people involved. There are no moral rules or rights - each case is unique and deserves a unique solution.

❖ **Ethics and ideology**

- ✓ Here ethics is the codification of political ideology, and that the function of ethics is to state, enforce and preserve particular political beliefs.

**ARE THERE UNIVERSAL MORAL RULES?**

One of the big questions in moral philosophy is whether or not there are unchanging moral rules that apply in all cultures and at all times.

- ✓ Moral absolutism argues that there are some moral rules that are always true, that these rules can be discovered and that these rules apply to everyone.
- ✓ Moral relativists say that "good" refers to the things that a particular group of people approve of.
- ✓ Most non-philosophers think that both of the above theories have some good points and think that there are a few absolute ethical rules but a lot of ethical rules depend on the culture

**TYPES OF ETHICS****SUPERNATURALISM (GOD-BASED ETHICS)**

## ❖ This theory makes ethics depend on God. It teaches that:

- ✓ the only source of moral rules is God
- ✓ something is good because God says it is
- ✓ the way to lead a good life is to do what God wants

The Ancient Greek philosopher Plato concluded that God desires a thing *because it is good*. God's desire doesn't make a thing good - the thing would be good regardless of God.

❖ **Discovering God's will** : There are several ways in which believers try to find out God's will in ethical matters:

- ✓ reading scripture - both to see what God says, and to find relevant examples
- ✓ listening to religious teachers
- ✓ prayer and meditation
- ✓ seeing what is consistent with God's general advice on how to live
- ✓ listening to the inner, God-driven, voice
- ✓ discussion with teachers and followers of the religion concerned

**Many religious people use a combination of these in their approach to moral problems.**

#### Issues with supernaturalism

<b>ETHICAL ATHEISTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ If religion is the only basis of ethics, it would seem that people who have no faith can have no basis for their moral judgements, and nowhere to turn for guidance on how to live. But atheists do behave in a consistent moral way.</li> <li>❖ The supernaturalism might say that not believing in God does not mean the atheist would have no awareness of a God-based ethics, and hence they agree on moral rules.</li> </ul>
<b>CONSTRUCTIONISM DEVALUES GOD-BASED ETHICS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ God-based ethics are no different from humanly constructed ethics based on cultural traditions and rituals.</li> </ul>
<b>DIFFERENT GODS LEADS TO MORAL DISAGREEMENT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Since there are many different religions, with different understandings of God and different moral codes, God-based ethics is bound to produce moral disagreement.</li> <li>❖ God-based ethics provides no way of dealing with ethical conflicts between different religions.</li> </ul>
<b>FEARING GOD AS A BASIS FOR GOOD BEHAVIOUR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ People may follow the rules of God-based ethics because they are fearful of being punished by God in this life or in some afterlife.</li> <li>❖ People may follow the rules of God-based ethics simply because they wish to behave in a way that pleases God.</li> </ul>
<b>DISTORTION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ It is accepted by many believers that the ways of discovering God's will set out above don't give direct access to God's will, but involve working through intermediaries. Hence the information is passed through social, cultural, religious and psychological filters that can distort it.</li> </ul>

#### SUBJECTIVISM

**Subjectivism (relativism)** teaches that there are no objective moral truths out there. Moral judgements are dependent on the feelings and attitudes of the persons who think about such things

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ it reflects the close relationship between morality and people's feelings and opinions - indeed it can cope with the contradictory moral views we often find ourselves wrestling with</li> <li>❖ it reflects the communication of approval and disapproval that seems to go along with the everyday making of moral statements</li> <li>❖ subjectivism may enable people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The problem with subjectivism is that it seems to imply that moral statements are less significant than most people think they are - this may of course be true without rendering moral statements <i>insignificant</i>.</li> <li>❖ By and large if a person says something is wrong we usually get the message that they disapprove of that something, but most of us probably think that the other</li> </ul>

disagreeing over the rightness or wrongness of some issue to see that the real dispute is not about objective truth but about their own preferences	person is doing more than just telling us about their feelings. ❖ <b>How can we blame people if moral truths are always subjective?</b>
---	--

## CONSEQUENTIALISM

**Consequentialism or results-based ethics is defined as** -of all the things a person might do at any given moment, the morally right action is the one with the best overall consequences.

- ❖ Consequentialism is based on two principles:
  - ✓ Whether an act is right or wrong depends only on the results of that act
  - ✓ The more good consequences an act produces, the better or more right that act
- ❖ It gives us this guidance when faced with a moral dilemma: A person should choose the action that maximises good consequences
- ❖ It gives this general guidance on how to live: People should live so as to maximise good consequences.
- ❖ Different forms of consequentialism differ over what the good thing is that should be maximized.
  - ✓ **Utilitarianism** states that people should maximise human welfare or well-being (which they used to call 'utility' - hence the name).
  - ✓ **Hedonism** states that people should maximise human pleasure.
  - ✓ Negative consequentialism is the inverse of ordinary consequentialism. Good actions are the ones that produce the least harm. A person should choose the act that does the least amount of harm to the greatest number of people.
  - ✓ Other forms of consequentialism take a more subtle approach; for example stating that people should maximize the satisfaction of their fully informed and rational preferences.
- ❖ In practice people don't assess the ethical consequences of every single act (that's called 'act consequentialism') because they don't have the time. Instead they use ethical rules that are derived from considering the general consequences of particular types of acts. That is called 'rule consequentialism'. So, for example, according to rule consequentialism we consider lying to be wrong because we know that in general lying produces bad consequences.

### **Significance:**

Results-based ethics plays a very large part in everyday life because it is simple and appeals to common sense:

- It seems sensible to base ethics on producing happiness and reducing unhappiness
- It seems sensible to base ethics on the consequences of what we do, since we usually take decisions about what to do by considering what results will be produced
- It *seems* easy to understand and to be based on common sense

### Act consequentialism

Act consequentialism looks at every single moral choice anew. It teaches that a particular action is morally good only if it produces more overall good than any alternative action.

Pros	Cons
❖ Act consequentialism	❖ it's a very difficult system to apply to real life moral decisions because:



is flexible and can take account of any set of circumstances, however exceptional.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ every moral decision is a completely separate case that must be fully evaluated</li> <li>✓ individuals must research the consequences of their acts before they can make an ethically sound choice</li> <li>✓ doing such research is often impracticable, and too costly</li> </ul> <p>❖ Some people argue that if everyone adopted act consequentialism it would have bad consequences for society in general this is because it would be difficult to predict the moral decisions that other people would make, and this would lead to great uncertainty about how they would behave.</p>
--	--

### Rule consequentialism

- ❖ Rule consequentialism bases *moral rules* on their consequences. This removes many of the problems of act consequentialism.
- ❖ An action is morally right if and only if it does not violate the set of rules of behaviour whose general acceptance in the community would have the best consequences--that is, at least as good as any rival set of rules or no rules at all.

Pros	Cons
❖ individuals can shortcut their moral decision-making they are much more likely to make decisions in a quick and timely way	❖ Because rule consequentialism uses general rules it doesn't always produce the best result in individual cases

### Issues with consequentialism:

Consequentialism has both practical and philosophical problems:

1. it's hard to predict the future consequences of an act
2. **Measuring and comparing the 'goodness' of consequences is very difficult**
3. choosing different groups of people may produce different consequences
4. Results-based ethics is only interested in the consequences of an act. The intentions of the person doing the act are irrelevant so an act with good results done by someone who intended harm is as good as if it was done by someone who intended to do good.
5. Simple forms of consequentialism say that the best action is the one that produces the largest total of happiness. This ignores the way in which that happiness is shared out and so would seem to approve of acts that make most people happy, and a few people very unhappy, or that make a few people ecstatically happy and leave the majority at best neutral.
6. **It can be inconsistent with human rights**

A billionaire needs an organ transplant. He says that if he is given the next suitable organ he will fund 1000 hip-replacements a year for 10 years. Giving him the next available organ means Mr X, who was top of the list, will die - but it also means that thousands of people will be very happy with their new hips. Consequentialism might be used to argue that Mr X's human rights (and his and his family's happiness) should be ignored, in order to increase the overall amount of human well-being.

## INTUITIONISM

Intuitionism teaches three main things:

- There are real objective moral truths that are independent of human beings.
- These are fundamental truths that can't be broken down into parts or defined by reference to anything except other moral truths.
- Human beings can discover these truths by using their minds in a particular, intuitive way.

Intuitionism does not mean that all moral decisions are reached by relying on intuition. Intuition enables the discovery of the *basic* moral truths, and everyday moral decision-making then involves thinking about the choices available and making moral judgements in an ordinary sort of way.

### Issues with intuitionism

- ❖ Many philosophers don't think that there are such things as objective moral truths.
- ❖ The idea that human beings have something called moral intuition is superficially attractive, but doesn't easily stand up to inspection.
- ❖ Seeming right may not be the same as being right.
- ❖ If there are real objective moral truths, then they are presumably the same for everyone. Yet different people come to different conclusions faced with the same ethical problems.

## EMOTIVISM

- ❖ Like subjectivism it teaches that there are no objective moral facts.
- ❖ Emotivists teach that:
  - Moral statements are meaningless.
    - ✓ Moral statements try to persuade people to do, or not to do, what the speaker approves or disapproves of
    - ✓ In Emotivism a moral statement isn't literally a statement about the speaker's feelings on the topic, but expresses those feelings with emotive force.
  - Moral statements only express the speaker's feelings about the issue. By expressing the speaker's feelings about a moral issue moral statements may influence another person's thoughts and conduct.

### Issues with Emotivism

- ❖ In practical terms, Emotivism falls down because it isn't very satisfying. Even (most) philosophers think moral statements are more than just expressions of feeling.
- ❖ Non-philosophers also think there is more to ethics than just the expression of an attitude or an attempt to influence behavior.

## DUTY-BASED OR DEONTOLOGICAL ETHICS

- ❖ Under this form of ethics you can't justify an action by showing that it produced good consequences, which is why it's sometimes called 'non-Consequentialist'.
- ❖ The word 'deontological' comes from the Greek word *deon*, which means 'duty'.
- ❖ Duty-based ethics are usually what people are talking about when they refer to 'the principle of the thing'.



- ❖ Duty-based ethics teaches that some acts are right or wrong because of the sorts of things they are, and people have a duty to act accordingly, regardless of the good or bad consequences that may be produced.
- ❖ Some kinds of action are wrong or right in themselves, regardless of the consequences.
- ❖ Deontologists live in a universe of moral rules, such as:
  - ✓ It is wrong to kill innocent people
  - ✓ It is wrong to steal
  - ✓ It is wrong to tell lies
  - ✓ It is right to keep promises
- ❖ Someone who follows Duty-based ethics should do the right thing, even if that produces more harm (or less good) than doing the wrong thing. So, for example, the philosopher Kant thought that it would be wrong to tell a lie in order to save a friend from a murderer.

### **Positives of duty based ethics:**

- ❖ Duty-based ethical systems tend to focus on giving equal respect to all human beings. This provides a basis for human rights.
- ❖ Consequentialist ethical theories bring a degree of uncertainty to ethical decision-making. Duty-based ethics don't suffer from this problem because they are concerned with the action itself - if an action is a right action, then a person should do it, if it's a wrong action they shouldn't do it - and providing there is a clear set of moral rules to follow then a person faced with a moral choice should be able to take decisions with reasonable certainty.

### **Issues with duty based ethics:**

- ❖ Duty-based ethics sets absolute rules. The only way of dealing with cases that don't seem to fit is to build a list of exceptions to the rule.
- ❖ Because duty-based ethics is not interested in the results it can lead to courses of action that produce a reduction in the overall happiness of the world.
- ❖ Duty-based ethics doesn't deal well with the cases where duties are in conflict.

### **KANTIAN DUTY-BASED ETHICS (IMMANUEL KANT)**

- ❖ Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) was arguably one of the greatest philosophers of all time.
- ❖ Kant thought that it was possible to develop a consistent moral system by using reason.
- ❖ If people were to think about this seriously and in a philosophically rigorous manner, Kant taught, they would realize that there were some moral laws that all rational beings had to obey simply because they were rational beings, and this would apply to any rational beings in any universe that might ever exist:

### **What is good?**

- ❖ Although Kantian ethics are usually spoken of in terms of duty and doing the right thing, Kant himself thought that what was good was an essential part of ethics.
- ❖ Kant asked if there was anything that everybody could rationally agree was always good. The only thing that he thought satisfied this test was a good will.
- ❖ All Kant means is that a good will alone must be good in whatever context it may be found.
  - ✓ It is not good in one context and bad in another.
  - ✓ It is not good as a means to one end and bad as a means to another.
  - ✓ It is not good if somebody happens to want it and bad if he doesn't.
  - ✓ Its goodness is not conditioned by its relation to a context or to an end or to a desire.

**Kant's Categorical Imperative:**

- ❖ Kant's version of duty-based ethics was based on something that he called 'the categorical imperative' which he intended to be the basis of all other rules (a 'categorical imperative' is a rule that is true in all circumstances.)
- ❖ Different aspects of the categorical imperative:
  - ✓ Always act in such a way that you would be willing for it to become a general law that everyone else should do the same in the same situation.
  - ✓ Kant thought that all human beings should be treated as free and equal members of a shared moral community.
  - ✓ Kant is saying that people should always be treated as valuable - as an end in themselves - and should not just be used in order to achieve something else. They should not be tricked, manipulated or bullied into doing things.
  - ✓ Kant is saying that people should always be treated as valuable - as an end in themselves - and should not just be used in order to achieve something else. They should not be tricked, manipulated or bullied into doing things.

**ROSSIAN DUTY-BASED ETHICS**

- ❖ Kantian ethics seems pretty uncompromising and not really suited to the untidiness of many moral choices that people have to make. The 20th Century philosopher W. D. Ross [Sir David Ross] (1877-1971) suggested that it would be helpful to look at two kinds of duty:
  - ✓ Prima facie duties
  - ✓ Actual duties
- ❖ **Prima facie duties** are self-evident and obvious duties (*prima facie* is a Latin expression meaning 'on first appearances' or 'by first instance'). It are "responsibilities to ourselves and to others". Ross listed seven prima facie duties:
  - ✓ Fidelity
  - ✓ Reparation
  - ✓ Gratitude
  - ✓ Justice
  - ✓ Beneficence
  - ✓ Self-improvement
  - ✓ Non-maleficence (avoiding actions that do harm)
- ❖ **Actual duties:** This is the duty people are left with after they have weighed up all the conflicting prima facie duties that apply in a particular case.

**Problems with the Rossian approach**

- ❖ How can we tell which prima facie duties are involved in a particular case?
- ❖ How can we compare and rank them in order to arrive at a balance which will guide us as to our actual duty?
- ❖ Ross thought that people could solve those problems by relying on their intuitions.

**VIRTUE ETHICS (CHARACTER-BASED ETHICS)**

- ❖ A right act is the action a virtuous person would do in the same circumstances.

- ❖ Virtue ethics is person rather than action based: it looks at the virtue or moral character of the person carrying out an action, rather than at ethical duties and rules, or the consequences of particular actions.
- ❖ Virtue ethics not only deals with the rightness or wrongness of individual actions, it provides guidance as to the sort of characteristics and behaviours a good person will seek to achieve.
- ❖ In that way, virtue ethics is concerned with the whole of a person's life, rather than particular episodes or actions.
- ❖ A good person is someone who lives virtuously - who possesses and lives the virtues.
- ❖ The way to build a good society is to help its members to be good people, rather than to use laws and punishments to prevent or deter bad actions.
- ❖ Virtue ethics teaches:
  - ✓ An action is only right if it is an action that a virtuous person would carry out in the same circumstances.
  - ✓ A virtuous person is a person who acts virtuously
  - ✓ A person acts virtuously if they "possess and live the virtues"
  - ✓ A virtue is a moral characteristic that a person needs to live well.

❖ For virtue theory to be really useful it needs to suggest only a minimum set of characteristics that a person needs to possess in order to be regarded as virtuous. Being virtuous is more than having a particular habit of acting, e.g. generosity. Rather, it means having a fundamental set of related virtues that enable a person to live and act morally well.

## ❖ Lists of the virtues

Most virtue theorists say that there is a common set of virtues that all human beings would benefit from, rather than different sets for different sorts of people, and that these virtues are natural to mature human beings - even if they are hard to acquire. The traditional list of cardinal virtues was:

- ✓ Prudence
- ✓ Justice
- ✓ Fortitude / Bravery
- ✓ Temperance

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It center's ethics on the person and what it means to be human</li> <li>• It includes the whole of a person's life</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ It doesn't provide clear guidance on what to do in moral dilemmas although it does provide general guidance on how to be a good person.</li> <li>❖ There is no general agreement on what the virtues are and it may be that any list of virtues will be relative to the culture in which it is being drawn up.</li> </ul>

## SITUATION ETHICS (CONTEXTUALISM)

- ❖ In situation ethics, right and wrong depend upon the situation. There are no universal moral rules or rights - each case is unique and deserves a unique solution.
- ❖ Situation ethics rejects 'prefabricated decisions and prescriptive rules'. It teaches that ethical decisions should follow flexible guidelines rather than absolute rules, and be taken on a case by case basis.

- ❖ So a person who practices situation ethics approaches ethical problems with some general moral principles rather than a rigorous set of ethical laws and is prepared to give up even those principles if doing so will lead to a greater good. For example, lying is ordinarily not in the best interest of interpersonal communication and social integrity, but is justifiable nevertheless in certain situations.
- ❖ Its important principle is –“Only one thing is intrinsically good, namely, love and nothing else’
  - ✓ Love, in this context, means desiring and acting to promote the wellbeing of people
  - ✓ Nothing is inherently good or evil, except love (personal concern) and its opposite, indifference or actual malice
  - ✓ Nothing is good or bad except as it helps or hurts persons
  - ✓ The highest good is human welfare and happiness (but not, necessarily, pleasure)
  - ✓ Whatever is most loving in a situation is right and good—not merely something to be excused as a lesser evil

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Situation ethics is a personal approach</li> <li>❖ Situation ethics is sensitive to circumstances, context, particularity, and cultural traditions. Every moral decision is required to demonstrate respect for individuals and communities and the things that they regard as valuable.</li> <li>❖ Because moral decisions are treated on a case-by-case basis, the decision is always tailored to particular situations.</li> <li>❖ Situation ethics teaches that right acts are those motivated by the wish to promote the well-being of people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <b>It excludes most universal moral truths.</b> By doing this it seems to remove any possibility of guaranteeing universal human rights, and satisfying human needs for a useful ethical framework for human behaviour.</li> <li>❖ Although the notion of love used in situation ethics seems attractive, it's pretty vague and can be interpreted in many ways.</li> <li>❖ Situation ethics seems to be little more than a form of act consequentialism, in that a person can only choose the right thing to do if they consider all the consequences of their possible action, and all the people who may be affected.</li> <li>❖ Situation ethics produces a lack of consistency from one situation to the next.</li> <li>❖ Situation ethics teaches that particular types of action don't have an inherent moral value - whether they are good or bad depends on the eventual result.</li> </ul>

## SOME ETHICAL CONCEPTS

### ○ AN END-IN-ITSELF

- ❖ The philosopher Immanuel Kant said that rational human beings should be treated as an end in themselves and not as a means to something else. The fact that we are human has value in itself.
- ❖ If a person is an end-in-themselves it means their inherent value doesn't depend on anything else - it doesn't depend on whether the person is enjoying their life, or making other people's lives better. We exist, so we have value.
- ❖ We shouldn't treat ourselves as a means to our own ends; instead we should respect our inherent worth. This **can be used as an argument against euthanasia**, suicide and other behaviours that damage ourselves.
- ❖ The idea also shows up in discussions of animal rights, with the idea that if they have rights, **animals must be treated as ends in themselves.**

## 2. DOCTRINE OF DOUBLE EFFECT

- ❖ This doctrine says that if doing something morally good has a morally bad side-effect, it's ethically OK to do it providing the bad side-effect wasn't intended. This is true even if you foresaw that the bad effect would probably happen.
- ❖ This might seem counter-intuitive, but the principle is used in serious argument about some important issues in ethics.

### Examples:

- ✓ **Euthanasia:** Although euthanasia is illegal in the UK, doctors are allowed to administer potentially lethal doses of painkilling drugs to relieve suffering, provided they do not primarily intend to kill the patient. This is known as the doctrine of double effect.
- ✓ **War and civilian deaths:** In modern warfare it's difficult to ensure that only soldiers get hurt. Despite the effectiveness of precision weapons, **civilians are often hurt and killed.**
- ✓ **Abortions when the mother's life is in danger:** In cases when saving the life of a pregnant woman causes the death of her unborn child. By this argument, the death of the foetus is merely the side-effect of medical treatment to save the mother's life.

### ❖ CRITICISMS :

- ✓ We are responsible for all the anticipated consequences of our actions. If we can foresee the two effects of our action we have to take the moral responsibility for both effects - we can't get out of trouble by deciding to intend only the effect that suits us.
- ✓ Some people take the view that it's sloppy morality to decide the rightness or wrongness of an act by looking at the intention of the person who carries it out. They think that some acts are objectively right or wrong, and that the intention of the person who does them is irrelevant.

## 3. THE SLIPPERY SLOPE

- ❖ The slippery slope argument views decisions not on their own, but as the potential beginning of a trend.
- ❖ In general form, this argument says that if we allow something relatively harmless today, we may start a trend that results in something currently unthinkable becoming accepted.
- ❖ **The slippery slope argument is used in discussing euthanasia** and similar topics. For example, people worry that if voluntary euthanasia were to be made legal, it would not be long before involuntary euthanasia would start to happen.

## 2. CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

- ❖ Capital punishment is the practice of executing someone as punishment for a specific crime after a proper legal trial.
- ❖ Capital punishment is used in many countries around the world. According to Amnesty International as at May 2012, 141 countries have abolished the death penalty either in law or in practice. There is now steadily increasing support for abolishing capital punishment.
- ❖ In 2008, the United Nations adopted resolution that calls for a moratorium on the use of the death penalty.

### IN FAVOUR OF THE DEATH PENALTY

**RETRIBUTION OR JUSTICE** ❖ Real justice requires people to suffer for their wrongdoing, and to suffer in a way appropriate for the crime.

**DETERRENCE** ❖ Capital punishment is often justified with the argument that by executing convicted murderers, we will deter would-be murderers from killing people.

**REHABILITATION** ❖ Of course capital punishment doesn't rehabilitate the prisoner and return them to society. But there are many examples of persons condemned to death taking the opportunity of the time before execution to repent, express remorse, and very often experience profound spiritual rehabilitation.

**PREVENTION OF RE-OFFENDING** ❖ It is undeniable that those who are executed cannot commit further crimes.

**A JAPANESE ARGUMENT** ❖ The argument goes that the death penalty reinforces the belief that bad things happen to those who deserve it. This reinforces the contrary belief; that good things will happen to those who are 'good'.

❖ In this way, the existence of capital punishment provides a psychological release from conformity and overwork by reinforcing the hope that there will be a reward in due time.

### AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY

**VALUE OF HUMAN LIFE** ❖ Human life is so valuable that even the worst murderers should not be deprived of the value of their lives.

**THE RIGHT TO LIVE** ❖ Everyone has an inalienable human right to life, even those who commit murder; sentencing a person to death and executing them violates that right.

**EXECUTION OF THE INNOCENT** ❖ The death penalty legitimizes an irreversible act of violence by the state and will inevitably claim innocent victims. As long as human justice remains fallible, the risk of executing the innocent can never be eliminated

**RETRIBUTION IS WRONG** ❖ Many people believe that retribution is morally flawed and problematic in concept and practice.

✓ We cannot teach that killing is wrong by killing.

✓ To take a life when a life has been lost is revenge, it is not justice.

**FAILURE TO DETER** ❖ The death penalty doesn't seem to deter people from committing serious violent crimes.

❖ In 1988 a survey was conducted for the UN to determine the relation



## IT BRUTALISES SOCIETY

## CRUEL, INHUMANE OR DEGRADING IT'S UNNECESSARY

## FREE WILL

between the death penalty and homicide rates. It concluded:

- ✓ The evidence as a whole still gives no positive support to the deterrent hypothesis.
- ✓ The key to real and true deterrence is to increase the likelihood of detection, arrest and conviction.
- ✓ The death penalty is a harsh punishment, but it is not harsh on crime.
- ❖ Statistics show that the death penalty leads to a brutalisation of society and an increase in murder rate.
- ❖ It has implications for the state's relationship with all citizens. The state's power deliberately to destroy life is a manifestation of the hidden wish that the state be allowed to do anything it pleases with life.
- ❖ Capital punishment is said to produce an unacceptable link between the law and violence.
- ❖ Regardless of the moral status of capital punishment, some argue that all ways of executing people cause so much suffering to the condemned person that they amount to torture and are wrong.
- ❖ The state does have an obligation to punish crime, as a means to preserve an orderly and contented society, but it should do so in the least harmful way possible. Capital punishment is the most harmful punishment available.
- ❖ The idea that we must be punished for any act of wrongdoing, whatever its nature, relies upon a belief in human free will and a person's ability to be responsible for their own actions. It is argued that human beings never act freely and thus should not be punished for even the most horrific crimes.

## 3. EUTHANASIA

- ❖ Euthanasia is the termination of a very sick person's life in order to relieve them of their suffering. The term is derived from the Greek word *euthanatos* which means easy death.
- ❖ A person who undergoes euthanasia usually has an incurable condition. But there are other instances where some people want their life to be ended.
- ❖ The issue has been at the centre of very heated debates for many years and is surrounded by religious, ethical and practical considerations.

### THE ETHICS OF EUTHANASIA

Euthanasia raises a number of agonizing moral dilemmas:

- Is it ever right to end the life of a terminally ill patient who is undergoing severe pain and suffering?
- Under what circumstances can euthanasia be justifiable, if at all?
- Is there a moral difference between killing someone and letting them die?
- Should human beings have the right to decide on issues of life and death?

At the heart of these arguments are the different ideas that people have about the meaning and value of human existence.

## Ethical problems of euthanasia

WHY EUTHANASIA SHOULD BE ALLOWED?	WHY EUTHANASIA SHOULD BE FORBIDDEN?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Those in favour of euthanasia argue that a civilized society should allow people to die in dignity and without pain, and should allow others to help them do so if they cannot manage it on their own.</li> <li>❖ They say that our bodies are our own, and we should be allowed to do what we want with them. So it's wrong to make anyone live longer than they want.</li> <li>❖ It's immoral, they say to force people to continue living in suffering and pain.</li> <li>❖ They add that as suicide is not a crime, euthanasia should not be a crime.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Religious opponents of euthanasia believe that life is given by God, and only God should decide when to end it.</li> <li>❖ Other opponents fear that if euthanasia was made legal, the laws regulating it would be abused, and people would be killed who didn't really want to die.</li> <li>❖ Euthanasia is illegal in most countries.</li> </ul>

### PRO-EUTHANASIA ARGUMENTS:

#### 1. ARGUMENTS BASED ON RIGHTS:

- ❖ People have an explicit right to die
  - ✓ Each person has the right to control his or her body and life and so should be able to determine at what time, in what way and by whose hand he or she will die.
  - ✓ Behind this lies the idea that human beings should be as free as possible - and that unnecessary restraints on human rights are a bad thing.
  - ✓ Human beings are independent biological entities, with the right to take and carry out decisions about themselves, providing the greater good of society doesn't prohibit this. Allied to this is a firm belief that death is the end.
- ❖ A separate right to die is not necessary, because our other human rights imply the right to die.
  - ✓ The right to life is not a right simply to exist, it is a right to life with a minimum quality and value. Death is the opposite of life, but the process of dying is part of life.
  - ✓ If the dying process is unpleasant, people should have the right to shorten it, and thus reduce the unpleasantness.
  - ✓ Right not to be killed is sufficient to protect against misuse of euthanasia, as any doctor who kills a patient who doesn't want to die has violated that person's rights.
  - ✓ The rights to privacy and freedom of belief give a person the right to decide how and when to die.
- ❖ Death is a private matter and if there is no harm to others, the state and other people have no right to interfere (a libertarian argument)
  - ✓ If an action promotes the best interests of everyone concerned and violates no one's rights then that action is morally acceptable. Euthanasia promotes the best interests of everyone involved and violates no one's rights. Therefore morally acceptable

#### 2. PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS:

- ❖ It is possible to regulate euthanasia

- ❖ Euthanasia may be necessary for the fair distribution of health resources

### 3. PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENTS

- ❖ Euthanasia satisfies the criterion that moral rules must be universalisable
  - ✓ According to Immanuel Kant only those ethical principles that could be accepted as a universal rule (i.e. one that applied to everybody) should be accepted.
  - ✓ A rule is universalisable if it can consistently be willed as a law that everyone ought to obey. The only rules which are morally good are those which can be universalised.
  - ✓ The person in favour of euthanasia argues that giving everybody the right to have a good death through euthanasia is acceptable as a universal principle, and that euthanasia is therefore morally acceptable.
- ❖ **Euthanasia happens anyway, so better to make it legal and regulate it properly (a utilitarian or consequentialist argument)**

### 4. ARGUMENTS ABOUT DEATH ITSELF

- ❖ **Is death a bad thing?**
  - ✓ People are usually eager to avoid death because they value being alive, because they have many things they wish to do, and experiences they wish to have.
  - ✓ Obviously, this is not the case with a patient who wishes to die - and proper regulation will weed out **people who do not really want to die.**

### ANTI-EUTHANASIA ARGUMENTS

#### 1. ETHICAL ARGUMENTS

- ❖ Euthanasia weakens society's respect for the **sanctity of life**
  - ✓ The philosopher Immanuel Kant said that rational human beings should be treated as an end in themselves and not as a means to something else. The fact that we are human has value in itself.
  - ✓ We shouldn't end our lives just because it seems the most effective way of putting an end to our suffering. To do that is not to respect our inherent worth.
- ❖ Accepting euthanasia accepts that some lives (those of the disabled or sick) are worth less than others
  - ✓ Able-bodied people look at things from their own perspective and see life with a disability as a disaster, filled with suffering and frustration. Some societies have regarded people with disabilities as inferior, or as a burden on society.
  - ✓ Dying is not the same as never having been born.
- ❖ Voluntary euthanasia is the start of a slippery slope that leads to **involuntary euthanasia** and the killing of people who are thought undesirable
- ❖ Euthanasia might not be in a person's best interests
- ❖ Euthanasia affects other people's rights, not just those of the patient

#### 2. PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS

- ❖ Proper **palliative care** makes euthanasia unnecessary

- ✓ Palliative care is physical, emotional and spiritual care for a dying person when cure is not possible. It includes compassion and support for family and friends.
- ✓ Competent palliative care may well be enough to prevent a person feeling any need to contemplate euthanasia.
- ✓ You matter because you are you. You matter to the last moment of your life and we will do all we can to help you die peacefully, but also to live until you die.
- ✓ The key to successful palliative care is to treat the patient as a person, not as a set of symptoms, or medical problems.
- ❖ There's no way of properly regulating euthanasia
- ❖ Allowing euthanasia will lead to less good care for the terminally ill
  - ✓ Allowing euthanasia undermines the commitment of doctors and nurses to saving lives
  - ✓ Euthanasia may become a cost-effective way to treat the terminally ill
  - ✓ Allowing euthanasia will discourage the search for new cures and treatments for the terminally ill
  - ✓ Euthanasia undermines the motivation to provide good care for the dying, and good pain relief
- ❖ Euthanasia **gives too much power to doctors**
- ❖ Euthanasia **exposes vulnerable people to pressure to end their lives**
  - ✓ Moral pressure on elderly relatives by selfish families
  - ✓ Moral pressure to free up medical resources
  - ✓ Patients who are abandoned by their families may feel euthanasia is the only solution

### 3. HISTORICAL ARGUMENTS

- ❖ Voluntary euthanasia is the start of a **slippery slope** that leads to **involuntary euthanasia** and the killing of people who are thought undesirable

### 4. RELIGIOUS ARGUMENTS

- ❖ Euthanasia is **against the word and will of God**
  - ✓ Every human being is the creation of God, and that this imposes certain limits on us. Our lives are not only our lives for us to do with as we see fit.
- ❖ **Suffering may have value**
  - ✓ We should relieve suffering when we can, and be with those who suffer, helping them to bear their suffering, when we can't. We should never deal with the problem of suffering by eliminating those who suffer.

#### RELIGIONS AND EUTHANASIA

- ❖ Most religions disapprove of euthanasia. Some of them absolutely forbid it. The Roman Catholic Church, for example, is one of the most active organizations in opposing euthanasia.
- ❖ Virtually all religions state that those who become vulnerable through illness or disability deserve special care and protection, and that proper end of life care is a much better thing than euthanasia.
- ❖ Religions are opposed to euthanasia for a number of reasons.

- ✓ God has forbidden it
- ✓ Human life is sacred
- ✓ Human life is special

## 4. HONOUR CRIMES

- ❖ Honour killing is the murder of a person accused of "bringing shame" upon their family.
- ❖ Victims have been killed for refusing to enter a marriage, committing adultery or being in a relationship that displeased their relatives.
- ❖ In many instances, the crimes are committed by family members against a female relative.
- ❖ Honour killing is believed to have originated from tribal customs where an allegation against a woman can be enough to defile a family's reputation - 'a life without honour is not worth living.'

### A global problem

- ❖ Honour violence occurs worldwide, from South America to Asia. The exact figures of how many men and women have been killed in the name of 'honour' is unknown.
- ❖ Not all countries keep official statistics and it's a crime that can be difficult to detect. But it's believed that the number of deaths are in the thousands.
- ❖ In 2000, Asma Jahangir, a UN special rapporteur, reported that the practice of honour killings was growing.
- ❖ The tougher punishments may have inadvertently contributed to more female suicides occurring at the instigation of men who want to avoid longer imprisonments.

### 'Tradition, not religion'

- ❖ None of the world's major religions condone honour-related crimes. But perpetrators have sometimes tried to justify their actions on religious grounds.
- ❖ "People try to blame Muslims, Hindus or Sikhs but it tends to happen in families where there are the strongest ties and expectations. It's a very strong cultural issue."
- ❖ Leaders of the world's faiths have also strongly denounced a connection between religion and honour killings.

## 5. ETHICS OF WAR

- ❖ The Ethics of War starts by assuming that war is a bad thing, and should be avoided if possible, but it recognises that there can be situations when war may be the lesser evil of several bad choices.
- ❖ War is a bad thing because it involves deliberately killing or injuring people, and this is a fundamental wrong - an abuse of the victims' human rights.

- ❖ The purpose of war ethics is to help decide what is right or wrong, both for individuals and countries, and to contribute to debates on public policy, and ultimately to government and individual action.
- ❖ War ethics also leads to the creation of formal codes of war (e.g. The discussion of the ethics of war goes back to the Greeks and Romans, although neither civilisation behaved particularly well in war. At various times in history, rules have been laid down to govern the conduct of war - more specifically to say what behaviour is forbidden.
- ❖ **The three key questions are:**
  - ✓ Is it ever right to go to war?
  - ✓ When is it right to wage war?
  - ✓ What is the moral way to conduct a war?

## Doctrine of the Just War

### Introduction

The just war theory is a largely Christian philosophy that attempts to reconcile three things:

- ✓ taking human life is seriously wrong
- ✓ states have a duty to defend their citizens, and defend justice
- ✓ protecting innocent human life and defending important moral values sometimes requires willingness to use force and violence

### Purpose

The aim of Just War Theory is to provide a guide to the right way for states to act in potential conflict situations. It only applies to states, and not to individuals (although an individual can use the theory to help them decide whether it is morally right to take part in a particular war).

### Origins

The principles of a Just War originated with classical Greek and Roman philosophers like Plato and Cicero and were added to by Christian theologians like Augustine and Thomas Aquinas.

### Elements

There are two parts to Just War theory, both with Latin names:

- ✓ **Jus ad bellum:** the conditions under which the use of military force is justified.
- ✓ **Jus in bello:** how to conduct a war in an ethical manner.

A war is only a Just War if it is both justified, and carried out in the right way. Some wars fought for noble causes have been rendered unjust because of the way in which they were fought.

### What is a Just War?

Six conditions must be satisfied for a war to be considered just:

- ✓ The war must be for a just cause.
- ✓ The war must be lawfully declared by a lawful authority.
- ✓ The intention behind the war must be good.



- ✓ All other ways of resolving the problem should have been tried first.
- ✓ There must be a reasonable chance of success.
- ✓ The means used must be in proportion to the end that the war seeks to achieve.

### 'Just causes' of war

- ❖ A war is only just if it is fought for a reason that is justified, and that carries sufficient moral weight. The country that wishes to use military force must demonstrate that there is a just cause to do so.
- ❖ The main just cause is to put right a wrong. Sometimes a war fought to prevent a wrong from happening may be considered a just war.
- ❖ In modern times wars to defend the innocent are increasingly regarded as just.

### Just causes

- ✓ Self-defence
- ✓ Assisting an invaded friendly nation.
- ✓ Human rights violations:
- ✓ To punish an act of aggression.

### FEATURES OF DOCTRINE:

<b>WAR MUST BE THE LAST RESORT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ War must be the last resort</li> <li>❖ A state should only go to war if it has tried every sensible, non-violent alternative first.</li> <li>❖ The use of force is ethical only when it is really necessary and when no reasonable alternative is left.</li> </ul>
<b>LAWFULLY DECLARED BY LAWFUL AUTHORITY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Only a war lawfully declared, by a government with the authority to declare war, can be a just war.</li> </ul>
<b>RIGHTFUL INTENTION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ A war is only a Just War if it is waged from the right motives. Good intentions could include:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ creating, restoring or keeping a just peace</li> <li>✓ righting a wrong</li> <li>✓ assisting the innocent</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>WHOM CAN YOU FIGHT?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The general rule is that only those people fighting you are legitimate targets of attack. Those who are not fighting should not be attacked as this would violate their human rights.</li> <li>❖ The Geneva Convention lays down that civilians are not to be subject to attack. This includes direct attacks on civilians and indiscriminate attacks against areas in which civilians are present.</li> <li>❖ This can be developed into two principles:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ it is unjust to attack non-combatants</li> <li>✓ it is unjust to attack indiscriminately, as non-combatants may be</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	killed
<b>ARE ALL CIVILIANS A LEGITIMATE TARGET?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Civilians who are helping the war effort - these are people working to supply the troops and to provide them with weapons or helping in other ways. They aren't combatants in the sense of bearing arms, but they are an essential part of the war machine and constitute a threat to the other side.</li> <li>❖ Some philosophers say that there are no non-combatants in war, and that every citizen of an enemy state is a legitimate target.</li> </ul>
<b>IMPLICATIONS FOR WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The principle of not targetting non-combatants is the reason most people think the use of mass bombing or nuclear weapons is unethical. There is still a great deal of controversy about the morality of the atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the fire-bombing of Dresden and Berlin.</li> <li>❖ The doctrine of double effect can't be used to defend the use of weapons of mass destruction, such as non-precision nuclear weapons, area bombing, or chemical or biological weapons used against a population in general, since these are so indiscriminate in effect that civilian casualties can't be regarded as a secondary result.</li> </ul>
<b>IMPLICATIONS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ If a country wishes to wage war ethically it has the responsibility to impose certain obligations on its soldiers.</li> <li>❖ Soldiers must be instructed to avoid injuring civilians whenever possible and this means that soldiers must be prepared to put their own lives at risk in order to limit civilian casualties</li> </ul>
<b>THE WAR MUST BE IN PROPORTION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The goal of the war should be in proportion to the offence. Thus a state should not set itself a goal that is out of scale to the wrong to be righted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ So if country A invades part of country B, it is ethical for B to go to war to get the captured territory back, but it would not be ethical for B to go to war to conquer country A and take over all of it.</li> </ul> </li> <li>❖ The benefits of waging the war must be in proportion to the costs, so: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ it must prevent more evil than it causes</li> <li>✓ it must prevent more human suffering than it causes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>ONLY WINNABLE WARS ARE JUST</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ A State should only go to war if it has a reasonable chance of winning. Going to war for a hopeless cause may be a noble act, but it is an unethical one.</li> <li>❖ This comes from the idea that war is a great evil, and that it is wrong to cause suffering, pain, and death with no chance of success.</li> <li>❖ So it would be unethical for a state to sacrifice the lives of its people (and the lives of its enemy's people) in a futile gesture that would not change anything.</li> <li>❖ However, this condition can be dealt with by forming alliances with other countries in order to make an unwinnable war winnable by ganging up on</li> </ul>

	a common enemy.
--	-----------------

## AGAINST THE THEORY OF THE JUST WAR

Some people argue that the Just War doctrine is inherently immoral, while others suggest that there is no place for ethics in war. Still others argue that the doctrine doesn't apply in the conditions of modern conflicts. Here are some of the arguments that have been put forward:

- ❖ All war is unjust and has no place in any ethical theory
  - ✓ morality must always oppose deliberate violence
  - ✓ just war ideas tend to make violence OK, rather than restrain it
- ❖ War so disrupts the normal rules of society that morality goes out of the window.
- ❖ The just war theory is unrealistic and pointless
  - ✓ in a conflict "the strong do what they will, and the weak do what they must"
  - ✓ the decision to wage war is governed by realism and relative strength, not ethics
  - ✓ morality thus has no use in war
- ❖ The existence of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons of mass destruction requires a different approach to the problem.
- ❖ Terrorists are inherently uninterested in morality, so following any ethical theory of war handicaps those whom terrorists attack - thus a different approach is needed

## Against war

### Non-violence

- ❖ Non-violence doesn't just mean not doing violence; it's also a way of taking positive action to resist oppression or bring about change.
- ❖ The aim of non-violent conflict is to convert your opponent; to win over their mind and heart and persuade them that your point of view is right. An important element is often to make sure that the opponent is given a face-saving way of changing their mind. Non-violent protest seeks a 'win-win' solution whenever possible.
- ❖ In non-violent conflict the participant does not want to make their opponent suffer; instead they show that they are willing to suffer themselves in order to bring about change.
- ❖ Non-violence has great appeal because it removes the illogicality of trying to make the world a less violent and more just place by using violence as a tool.

### GANDHI

- ❖ One of the most famous leaders of a non-violent movement was Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948), who opposed British imperial rule in India during the 20th century.
- ❖ Gandhi took the religious principle of ahimsa (doing no harm) common to Buddhism, Hinduism and Jainism and turned it into a non-violent tool for mass action. He used it to fight not only colonial rule but social evils such as racial discrimination and untouchability as well.
- ❖ Gandhi called it "satyagraha" which means 'truth force.' In this doctrine the aim of any non-violent conflict was to convert the opponent; to win over his mind and his heart

and persuade him to your point of view.

- ❖ Gandhi was firm that satyagraha was not a weapon of the weak - "Satyagraha is a weapon of the strong; it admits of no violence under any circumstance whatever; and it always insists upon truth."

### Pacifism

- ❖ There are several different sorts of pacifism, but they all include the idea that war and violence are unjustifiable, and that conflicts should be settled in a peaceful way.
- ❖ People are pacifists for one or some of these reasons:
  - ✓ religious faith
  - ✓ non-religious belief in the sanctity of life
  - ✓ practical belief that war is wasteful and ineffective
- ❖ Many believe that pacifism is more than opposition to war. They argue that it must include action to promote justice and human rights.

### Religion and Pacifism

- ❖ Some religions, such as Buddhism, promote pacifism. Others have strong pacifist elements, such as Christianity, but have accepted that war is inevitable and sought to provide moral guidance in dealing with conflict.
- ❖ Judaism, like other religions, is strongly opposed to violence, and where violence is permitted the minimum necessary should be used.

## 6. ABORTION

### THE ABORTION DEBATE

- ❖ The abortion debate deals with the rights and wrongs of deliberately ending a pregnancy before normal childbirth, killing the foetus in the process.
- ❖ Abortion is a very painful topic for women and men who find themselves facing the moral dilemma of whether or not to terminate a pregnancy. It's one of the most polarising moral issues - most people are on one side or the other, very few are undecided.

### THE PRIMARY QUESTIONS

The moral debate about abortion deals with two separate questions:

#### 1. Is abortion morally wrong?

- ✓ If we conclude that abortion is not morally wrong, that doesn't mean that it's right to have an abortion; we need to ask whether having an abortion is the best thing (or least bad thing) to do in each particular case.

- ✓ If we conclude that abortion is morally wrong, that doesn't mean that it's always impermissible to have an abortion; we need to ask whether having an abortion is less wrong than the alternatives.

## 2. Should abortion be legal or illegal?

On one side are those who call themselves 'pro-life'. They say that intentionally caused abortion is always wrong (although it may on very rare occasions be the best thing to do).

On the other side are those who call themselves 'pro-choice' or 'supporters of abortion rights', and who regard intentional abortion as acceptable in some circumstances.

### The issues

- ✓ What gives a being the right to life?
- ✓ Is a foetus a human being?
- ✓ Is a foetus the sort of being that has a right to life?
- ✓ Is a foetus a separate being from its mother?
- ✓ If the foetus has a right to life, does that right take priority over the mother's right to control her own body?
- ✓ Does the foetus have a right to be carried in the woman's womb until it's ready to be born?
- ✓ Under what circumstances, if ever, can we take an 'innocent' human life?
- ✓ Is any other right more important than the right to life - for example, a woman's right to decide what to do with her own body?
- ✓ If the woman's life is in danger because of the pregnancy, how do we decide whose rights should prevail?

### ARGUMENTS AGAINST ABORTION

#### ❖ Killing people is wrong

- ✓ Killing innocent human beings is wrong. **Human life begins** at conception therefore the foetus is an innocent human being. therefore killing the foetus is wrong and abortion is always wrong

#### ❖ A foetus is a person

- ✓ A foetus has a unique genetic code
- ✓ A foetus is a unique individual

#### ❖ Killing potential people is wrong

- ✓ From conception onwards the foetus is a **potential human being** . Therefore it is wrong to destroy the foetus.
- ✓ it is wrong to kill beings that would have a **future like ours** if they lived

#### ❖ Causing pain is wrong

- ✓ A foetus is sufficiently developed to feel pain by 18 weeks. therefore it is wrong to carry out an abortion after 18 weeks of pregnancy

#### ❖ Increasing tolerance of killing is wrong

- ✓ Allowing abortion is legalizing killing and legalizing killing reduces people's respect for life.

- ✓ Reducing society's respect for life is a bad thing - it may lead to euthanasia, genocide and increased murder rates. therefore abortion is always wrong

#### ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF ABORTION

- ❖ Most of these arguments are to be read in the context of the first two arguments above. People who don't believe abortion is always morally wrong use arguments like this:
- ❖ The foetus is not necessarily a 'person' with the right to live .As a collection of human cells does not have the right to live just because it is of the human species, otherwise amputating a limb would be murder
- ❖ It is not always wrong to end the life of an innocent person
- ❖ 'Potential human beings' don't have rights , only 'actual' human beings have rights
- ❖ the pregnant woman has the right to life - where not aborting the foetus would put the mother's life or health in danger, she has the moral right to abort the foetus

#### PHILOSOPHICAL AND ETHICAL CONCERNS

<b>ABORTION AND DISABILITY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Some ethicists dislike the argument that abortion should be allowed where the baby, if born, would suffer from physical or mental handicaps.</li> <li>❖ They say that allowing this as a reason for abortion is offensive to disabled people; because it implies that they, and their lives, are less worthwhile than the lives of 'normal' people.</li> </ul>
<b>ABORTION AND EUGENICS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Abortion has been used in the past to stop the growth of population groups, or racial groups regarded as genetically 'inferior'. This is now regarded as a most serious breach of human rights and a criminal act.</li> </ul>
<b>ABORTION AND GENDER SELECTION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ For sociological and economic reasons parents in some cultures prefer to have boy babies. When parents can discover the gender of the foetus in advance, they sometimes request the termination of a pregnancy solely because the foetus is female.</li> </ul>
<b>FATHERS' RIGHTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The most common case concerning fathers and abortion is when the father wants the mother to have an abortion and she doesn't.</li> <li>❖ But sometimes the mother wants an abortion and the father wants her to have the baby. Is an abortion ever morally wrong because it transgresses the father's rights?</li> </ul>
<b>WHEN DOES A FOETUS GET THE RIGHT TO LIFE?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ A key debate for those involved in drafting laws regulating abortion is "when does life begin?"</li> <li>❖ Unfortunately there's no agreement in medicine, philosophy or theology as to what stage of foetal development should be associated with the right to life.</li> <li>❖ Nonetheless, as a matter of practicality many abortion laws lay down a stage of pregnancy after which abortion is unlawful (because the foetus has a right to life), and the dates chosen are usually based on viability.</li> </ul>
<b>POTENTIAL HUMAN, POTENTIAL</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Some people say that the foetus has the <b>right to life</b> because it is a 'potential human being'. The 'potential human being' argument gives the right to life to the unborn from the very earliest stage of</li> </ul>



<b>RIGHTS</b>	<p>development - the moment when the egg is fertilized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ This right to life seems to flow from the potential that the newborn has to become a 'moral person', and this in turn seems to support the argument that a potential 'moral person' has the right to life.</li> <li>❖ But some don't think that potential properties are the same as actual properties, or that potential rights are the same as actual rights. Children are potential adults, but that doesn't give them the same rights or obligations as adults</li> </ul>
---------------	--

## THE RIGHT OF THE MOTHER

<b>WOMEN'S RIGHTS ARGUMENTS AGAINST ABORTION</b>	<b>WOMEN'S RIGHTS ARGUMENTS AGAINST ABORTION</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Some people oppose abortion because it can damage the long-term physical and emotional health of women who have an abortion.</li> <li>❖ Some feminists oppose all forms of violence, including abortion, because they are inconsistent with the core feminist principles of justice, non-violence and non-discrimination.</li> <li>❖ <b>Abortion is a male plot</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ women have a moral <b>right to decide what to do with their bodies</b></li> <li>❖ the right to abortion is vital for <b>gender equality</b></li> <li>❖ the right to abortion is vital for individual women to achieve their full potential</li> <li>❖ banning abortion puts women at risk by forcing them to use illegal abortionists</li> <li>❖ the right to abortion should be part of a portfolio of <b>pregnancy rights</b> that enables women to make a truly free choice whether to end a pregnancy</li> </ul>

## Religion and abortion

- ❖ All the religions have taken strong positions on abortion; they believe that the issue encompasses profound issues of life and death, right and wrong, human relationships and the nature of society, that make it a major religious concern.
- ❖ People involved in an abortion are usually affected very deeply not just emotionally, but often spiritually, as well. They often turn to their faith for advice and comfort, for explanation of their feelings, and to seek atonement and a way to deal with their feelings of guilt.
- ❖ Because abortion affects heart as well as mind, and because it involves life and death, many people find that purely intellectual argument about it is ultimately unsatisfying.
- ❖ For them it's not just a matter that concerns a human being and their conscience, but something that concerns a human being and their God.

## 7. LYING

### A LIE

- ❖ Lying is a form of deception, but not all forms of deception are lies. **Lying is giving some information while believing it to be untrue, intending to deceive by doing so.**
- ❖ A lie has three essential features:
  - ✓ A lie communicates some information
  - ✓ The liar intends to deceive or mislead
  - ✓ The liar believes that what they are 'saying' is not true
- ❖ Some say that what makes a lie a lie is that the liar intends to deceive (or at least to mislead) the person they are lying to. That is it is nothing about whether the information given is true or false.

### Why is lying wrong?

There are many reasons why people think lying is wrong; which ones resonate best with you will depend on the way you think about ethics.

- ❖ Lying diminishes trust between human beings. if people generally didn't tell the truth, life would become very difficult, as nobody could be trusted and nothing you heard or read could be trusted - you would have to find everything out for yourself.
- ❖ It treats those who are lied to as a means to achieve the liar's purpose, rather than as a valuable end in themselves.
- ❖ It makes it difficult for the person being lied to make a free and informed decision about the matter concerned.
- ❖ It cannot sensibly be made into a universal principle.
- ❖ It's a basic moral wrong.
- ❖ it's something that Good People don't do
- ❖ It corrupts the liar.
- ❖ Some religious people argue Lying is bad because it misuses the God-given gift of human communication
- ❖ Some philosophers say lying is bad because language is essential to human societies and carries the obligation to use it truthfully

### Lying and ethical theory

<b>CONSEQUENTIALISTS (UTILITARIANS)</b>	❖ Consequentialist theories are concerned with the consequences of lying and if telling a lie would lead to a better result than telling the truth, they will argue that it is good to tell the lie. They would ask:
<b>DEONTOLOGISTS</b>	❖ Deontologists generally accepted moral law - 'do not tell lies'. if that is the law then lying is always wrong - even if telling the truth would produce far better consequences
<b>VIRTUE ETHICS</b>	❖ Virtue ethics looks at what good (virtuous) people do. If honesty is a virtue in the particular system involved, then lying is a bad thing.

	❖ The difficulty with this approach comes when a virtuous person tells a lie as a result of another virtue (compassion perhaps). The solution might be to consider what an ideal person would have done in the particular circumstances.
--	--

### Philosophers on lying

<b>Immanuel Kant</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Some philosophers, most famously the German Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), believed that that lying was always wrong.</li> <li>❖ He based this on his general principle that we should treat each human being as an end in itself, and never as a mere means.</li> <li>❖ Lying to someone is not treating them as an end in themselves, but merely as a means for the liar to get what they want.</li> </ul>
<b>St. Augustine</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ God gave human beings speech so that they could make their thoughts known to each other; therefore using speech to deceive people is a sin, because it's using speech to do the opposite of what God intended. The true sin of lying is contained in the desire to deceive.</li> <li>❖ Augustine believed that some lies could be pardoned, and that there were in fact occasions when lying would be the right thing to do. He grouped lies into 8 classes, depending on how difficult it was to pardon them. Here's his list, with the least forgivable lies at the top: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Lies told in teaching religion</li> <li>✓ Lies which hurt someone and help nobody</li> <li>✓ Lies which hurt someone but benefit someone else</li> <li>✓ Lies told for the pleasure of deceiving someone</li> <li>✓ Lies told to please others in conversation</li> <li>✓ Lies which hurt nobody and benefit someone</li> <li>✓ Lies which hurt nobody and benefit someone by keeping open the possibility of their repentance</li> <li>✓ Lies which hurt nobody and protect a person from physical 'defilement'</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Thomas Aquinas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Thomas Aquinas also thought that all lies were wrong, but that there was a hierarchy of lies and those at the bottom could be forgiven. His list was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Malicious lies: lies told to do harm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Malicious lies are mortal sins</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Jocose lies': lies told in fun <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ These are pardonable</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 'Officious' or helpful lies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ These are pardonable</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## 8. SPORTS ETHICS

### THE DRUGS DEBATE

- ❖ Some people are prepared to argue, often quite forcefully, in favour of legalising performance-enhancing drugs.
- ❖ Some feel that existing rules are meaningless when they are regularly flouted. They do not (necessarily) argue that rulebreaking is ethical, but they think that if authorities have any chance of being obeyed, they must take into account what is happening in reality.
- ❖ Some people advocate separate categories in each sport: one for 'clean' competitors and one for those who want to make use of performance-enhancing substances. Bodybuilding already has these categories.
- ❖ This, it is argued, could stop drug-taking athletes being so widely condemned and make sport look less hypocritical. It would not solve the problem of policing the 'clean' category.

### Arguments for allowing performance-enhancing drugs

- ❖ The audience has an interest in seeing the best performances possible
- ❖ Admiration of a sport can even be reduced if the competitors could perform better on drugs
- ❖ It is misleading to say it disadvantages poorer teams, because they are already disadvantaged by other factors - equipment, expertise and so on
- ❖ Evidence shows that people do not lose interest in sports that are known to be tainted by drugs - viewing figures remain as high as ever
- ❖ The rules banning drugs are left over from amateur sport, and irrelevant to professional sport
- ❖ We should not stop athletes from taking drugs if they are willing and know the health risks: that's being paternalistic
- ❖ Many of the banned substances have not even been proven to improve performance
- ❖ Legalizing drugs would save the money currently spent on testing
- ❖ Drugs testing does not work -- it probably catches the innocent more than the guilty
- ❖ The boundary between athletes and their equipment is being blurred. Clothes, and equipment like racquets, are often designed especially for an athlete and customized to his or her body shape
- ❖ Banning drugs is discriminatory against athletes
- ❖ New technology like genetic engineering will spell the end for drug regulation
- ❖ Genetic engineering could help fair play, by allowing all competitors to create an optimal body type for sport

### Arguments against allowing performance-enhancing drugs

- ❖ It's the taking part that counts, not the winning. Allowing drugs would focus more on winning, not taking part
- ❖ Drugs are against the spirit of sport, even if the rules don't ban them. If the 'spirit of sport' includes the idea of hard work, taking drugs may be seen as a way of succeeding with less effort
- ❖ Many performance-enhancing drugs pose severe health risks
- ❖ Allowing drugs promotes unhealthy and dangerous behavior

- ❖ If drugs are allowed, drug advertising and sponsorship will presumably be allowed

## 9. ANIMAL ETHICS

- ❖ Animal ethics is a complex subject. Rational argument about the right and wrong way to treat animals is made more difficult by the deep love that many of us feel for animals.
- ❖ For philosophers it raises fundamental questions about the basis of moral rights.
- ❖ The statement that is agreed in animal ethics is that higher animals have a moral status and there are right and wrong ways of treating them.

### Controversies

- ✓ Experiments on animals
- ✓ Rearing and killing animals for food
- ✓ Rearing and killing animals for fur/leather goods
- ✓ Hunting
- ✓ Entertainment
- ✓ Zoos
- ✓ Pet-keeping

### Philosophical issues

- ✓ Why do non-human animals deserve protection?
- ✓ Do non-human animals have rights?
- ✓ If they do have rights, why do they have rights?
- ✓ If they do have rights, what does this mean for humanity?
- ✓ Which non-human animals have rights?
- ✓ What's the difference between 'animal rights' and 'animal welfare'?
- ✓ If non-human animals don't have rights, do they deserve protection anyway?
- ✓ How should we balance the relative interests of human and non-human animals?
- ✓ The morality of direct action to protect non-human animals

### ANIMAL RIGHTS:

- ❖ Animal rights supporters believe that it is morally wrong to use or exploit animals in any way and that human beings should not do so.
- ❖ Animal welfare supporters believe that it can be morally acceptable for human beings to use or exploit animals, as long as: the suffering of the animals is either eliminated or reduced to the minimum and there is no practicable way of achieving the same end without using animals.
- ❖ For people who think like this, the suffering to animals is at the heart of the issue, and reducing the suffering reduces the wrong that is done.
- ❖ Supporters of animal rights don't think that doing wrong things humanely makes them any less wrong.

- ❖ There is much disagreement as to whether non-human animals have rights, and what is meant by animal rights. There is much less disagreement about the consequences of accepting that animals have rights.

<b>DO ANIMALS NEED RIGHTS?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Animals don't need rights to deserve protection; a good moral case can be made for treating them well and considering their interests that doesn't involve accepting animal rights.</li> </ul>
<b>WHY ANIMAL RIGHTS?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Many animal lovers think animals don't just deserve protection in a paternalistic way. They say that animals have rights that must be respected.</li> <li>❖ If animals do have rights then there are certain things that human beings should not do to animals, because doing them would violate the animal's rights.</li> <li>❖ If humanity must suffer some disadvantage as the consequence of respecting animal rights, then that's the way it has to be.</li> </ul>
<b>WHICH ANIMALS HAVE RIGHTS?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Animal rights should be restricted to those animals that "have a biography, not merely a biology."</li> <li>❖ This means that only the higher animals would have rights - those animals that are conscious, can remember, and can form intentions and plan and act for the future.</li> </ul>
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS VERSUS ANIMAL RIGHTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ No-one suggests that animals should have all the same rights as human beings.</li> <li>❖ There are many rights that are entirely irrelevant to animals, such as freedom of religion, freedom of speech, the right to vote, the right to an education and so on.</li> </ul>
<b>THE HUMAN CONSEQUENCES OF ANIMAL RIGHTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Accepting that non-human animals have rights requires human beings to accept that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ non-human animals are conscious beings not machines or objects</li> <li>✓ non-human animals have interests of their own</li> <li>✓ human beings should respect the interests of non-human animals</li> <li>✓ human beings should not exploit non-human animals</li> <li>✓ human beings should not treat non-human animals as objects</li> <li>✓ human beings should not kill non-human animals</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## The case for animal rights

- ❖ The case for animal rights is usually derived from the case for human rights. Humans and animals have similar levels of biological complexity, conscious, know what is happening to them, prefer some things and dislike others, make conscious choices and live in such a way as to give themselves the best quality of life. Thus adult mammals have rights in just the same way, for the same reasons, and to the same extent that human beings have rights.
- ❖ There is no morally relevant difference between human animals and adult mammals. Human beings and adult mammals have rights because they are both 'subjects-of-a-life'.



- ❖ All beings with inherent value are equally valuable and entitled to the same rights. Their inherent value doesn't depend on how useful they are to the world, and it doesn't diminish if they are a burden to others.

### The case against animal rights

- ❖ A number of arguments are put forward against the idea that animals have rights.
  - ✓ Animals don't think
  - ✓ Animals are not really conscious
  - ✓ Animals were put on earth to serve human beings
  - ✓ Animals don't have souls
  - ✓ Animals don't behave morally
  - ✓ Animals are not members of the 'moral community'
  - ✓ Animals lack the capacity for free moral judgment
- ❖ St Thomas Aquinas taught that animals acted purely on instinct while human beings engaged in rational thought. This distinction provided the frontier between human beings and animals, and was regarded as a suitable criterion for assessing a being's moral status.

## 10. TORTURE

- ❖ Torture involves deliberately inflicting physical or mental pain on a person without legal cause. This includes threats to family members and loved ones.
- ❖ Before you object that there can't ever be a legal cause for inflicting pain, consider painful medical treatments, soldiers wounded in a legally declared war, or contestants in a boxing match.
- ❖ Torture has been used as a punishment, to intimidate or control people, to get information or just to gratify sadistic impulses.
- ❖ Governments have used torture to keep themselves in power, to enforce their particular political philosophy, to remove opposition and to implement particular policies.
- ❖ Torture is regarded as wrong for several reasons (expanded later in this section):
  - ✓ It's cruel
  - ✓ It treats people as means rather than ends
  - ✓ It is not an effective way of obtaining information
- ❖ Since the middle of the last century torture has generally been regarded as wrong, so wrong in fact that the UN Convention Against Torture allows no exceptions, even in circumstances such as war or while fighting terrorism.

### THE ETHICAL PROBLEM OF TORTURE

- ✓ In recent decades the absolute wrongness of torture has begun to be questioned, following repeated terrorist acts and the fear that terrorists have access to weapons of mass destruction.

- ✓ In this context some people argue that torture, while wrong, is the lesser of two evils, and that it should be allowed if it is the only way to prevent a greater wrong. For example, they say, it might be OK to torture a person to get information that would enable the authorities to prevent a bombing.
- ✓ Others argue that it is a 'moral absolute' that torture is always wrong, and so can never be justified by any form of ethical 'cost-benefit analysis'.

### Why is torture wrong?

- ✓ Torture treats the victim as a means to an end and not an end in themselves
- ✓ Torture is sometimes used to destroy the autonomy of the victim
- ✓ Torture violates the rights and human dignity of the victim, including
- ✓ Torture is a slippery slope - each act of torture makes it easier to accept the use of torture in the future
- ✓ Torture is an ineffective interrogation tool
- ✓ Torture damages the humanity of the torturers
- ✓ Torture damages the institution that carries it out
- ✓ Torture can create or strengthen opposition

### PRAGMATIC APPROACHES TO TORTURE

- ❖ More than 100 of the 140 nations that have ratified the Convention against Torture .This means that many countries that are publicly opposed to torture.
- ❖ But now the individual ability to wage war on societies is so great that individual liberties may have to be restricted. So there has to be a reconsideration of the balance of liberties.
- ❖ Furthermore, this argument goes, the legal codes banning torture were written before the rise of terrorism, and so those rules may be out of date and don't apply to the new realities. Therefore, it's argued, it is necessary to permit some forms of treatment that are arguably cruel in order to combat terrorism.
- ❖ If we accept this point of view then a pragmatic approach to the ethics of torture suggests that it may be useful to move away from arguing about whether torture is or is not unethical, and move towards working out the best way to minimise the harm done by torture.
- ❖ If the harm done by torture is to be minimised then torture itself needs to be removed from secret dungeons and brought out into the open. Two ways of making people willing to acknowledge that torture does take place might be:
  - ✓ to accept that although torture is wrong and illegal, under some circumstances there is no need to punish those involved in torturing
  - ✓ to accept torture in certain circumstances and regulate it by law
- ❖ One solution is to remove punishment for torture in some circumstances, by permitting 'official disobedience' in those cases. Torture is always wrong, and it should always be illegal but note that these cases would only be where it was necessary to prevent some catastrophic event, and not where it was to obtain information about a crime that had already happened. These cases would have to be very rare in order not to bring the system into disrepute.

- ❖ Another possibility is to regulate torture by the use of so-called 'torture warrants' on the grounds that forcing torture into the open would reduce its use and particularly its misuse.
  - ✓ Torture is always wrong except where permission is obtained in advance (and perhaps in public) from a court of law
  - ✓ Regulating torture officially would guarantee accountability, record-keeping, standards, and limitations.

ForumIAS