

Table of Contents

DIGITAL ETHICS

Google Glass: Flawed Technology or Flawed Ethics?	4
Good Reasons for Hiring a Hacker	5
The Continuing Saga of the Self Destructive Tweet	6
It's an Ad, It's News... It's Native Advertising	7
Should Emoji Hold Up in Court?	8
Mobile Payment Apps and the Price of Convenience	9
The Perils of Predicting Epidemics	10
The Right to Be Forgotten: A Choice Between Privacy and Free Speech?	11
High-resolution satellites: are our privacy expectations too high?	12
Fraud in the Online Age	13
The Internet of Things: A New Network With the Same Old Problems	14
The robots are coming! Ethical implications of robot journalism	15
The Ethics of Video Streaming Apps	17
When Sharing Isn't Caring	18
"Come as You Are?" Moral Concerns with Facebook's Identity Policies	19
Getting Personal: Editorial Judgment in the Digital Public Square	20
Navigating the Ethics of Newsgathering Drones	21
Machines, autonomy, and virtue: Highlights from the 2015 CEPE/IACAP conference ..	22

Digital Kidnapping—A New Kind of Identity Theft	23
Crime and Punishment: The Criminalization of Online Protests	24
CONTEMPORARY MORAL PROBLEMS	
Happiness and Virtue	26
Utilitarianism	28
Master and Slave Morality	31
A Theory of Justice	33
The Debate over Utilitarianism	35
The Categorical Imperative	39
Egoism and Moral Scepticism	41
Religion, Morality and Conscience	44
Trying Out Ones New Sword	46
The Nature and Value of Rights	48
Taking Rights Seriously	50
The Need for More than Justice	53
HENERAL LUNA REFLECTION	55
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE	56
ABOUT THE AUTHOR	57

DIGITAL ETHICS

TITLE: Google Glass: Flawed Technology or Flawed Ethics?

AUTHOR: Nora Dunne

PUBLISHED: Monday, February 16th, 2015

Google Glass

My first impression in the article is I think the article is about criticizing if the google glass is a flawed technology or a flawed ethics because they are evaluating if the google glass a successful technology that will makes people lives comfortable.

“Even if Google was not able produce a stronger device, at least it would have an audience that was ready for Glass, that understood the product’s purpose and felt comfortable using it, rather than perceiving the technology as gimmicky, unnecessary, and ethically concerning.” – The quote in the article that really stuck to me.

I think this essay speaks about how the google glass affect to the people. The essay states that the google glass developed to enhance our society but some says it is a flawed technology, others also say it is a flawed ethics. The article has lots of information that will help us to identify if it is a flawed technology or a flawed ethics. In the flawed technology the article stated that the google glass contains bugs that other people say that it is not comfortable for them to wear it. It will be redesigned again so that it will meet the needs of the people. In flawed ethics I think it is way to the same as the flawed technology because as they convey the flaws of technology there are also ethics in it.

5 Things I’ve learned

1. I learned to be persistent
2. I learned that things should be check properly before showing it to others so that it will not be ruined to public.
3. Obey the guidelines and strictly implement it.
4. Know first the problem before taking actions.
5. Identify the things to improve in the product

5 Interactive Questions

1. What is the problem with the product?
2. How they solve the issue?
3. What are the strategies they are implementing?
4. How it is different with the other product?
5. Why they banned it?

TITLE: Good Reasons for Hiring a Hacker

AUTHOR: Owen King

PUBLISHED: Monday, February 23rd, 2015

Hackers

My first impression in the article, it is very obvious that it is about hackers and what are the good reasons of hiring it. I think it is more on the advantages of hackers not the disadvantages of it.

“I am not claiming that all, or even most, cases of technologically motivated hacking are morally justifiable (though I am tempted to think that many are). Instead, I simply want to guard against a certain sort of systematic mistake we could be making in our evaluations of these cases. If we fail to distinguish technologically motivated hacking from hacking that is circumstantially motivated, we run the risk of assuming that the entity that owns or operates the relevant computer system is more important than it is.”

– The quote in the article that really stuck to me

We all know that hacking is not good, but this article shows that hacking also have advantages and respective reasons on why people doing it. There are lots of hacking style and methods and this article says that if we hire a hacker by also means it will help you track accounts. There are two types of hacking styles with good reasons circumstantially motivated hacking and technologically motivated hacking. These two shows that it is also good but it is for counter attacking the other hackers to invade your privacy.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to be aware of the things that are needed to be secure.
2. I learned know my limitations.
3. Know the dos and donts of being a hacker.
4. I learned to be more responsible in my actions.
5. I learned to show concerns on the information that is private.

5 Interactive Questions

1. What are the reasons why hacker is still good?
2. How they solve the issue hacking?
3. Is hacking will make people responsible on their actions?
4. How hackers differ from there actions?
5. Why they do it?

TITLE: Continuing Saga of the Self Destructive Tweet

AUTHOR: Karen Dybis

PUBLISHED: Wednesday, March 4th, 2015

Tweets

My first impression about this article is I think this article talks about how the tweets malicious and how these tweets destruct the self-confidence of the other people. I think it will deliver information that will make us limit the things we tweet on twitter.

“Think about your audience. Ask yourself whether you’d want your boss, your co-workers, even your Mom to read that tweet. And, if you’re in doubt, come ask.” – The quote that stuck in my mind

This article shows how people will be aware of what they tweet. Like what the quote that stuck in my mind, people should know what they are tweeting they should be responsible on their actions. Like what the motto says “think before you click” know the limitations and think carefully if it is worth to read or it can only hurt others. Like what our country Philippines have the many users of twitter and sometimes others reflect and tweet what they really feel on that moment and some who read it they can join and destruct the emotion. We should know the feelings of that person who tweet because all of have limitations on doing it.

5 Things I’ve learned

1. I learned to be aware of the what I tweet
2. I learned know my limitations.
3. I learned to think carefully before putting actions.
4. I learned to be more responsible in my actions.
5. I learned to show concerns to others.

5 Interactive Questions

1. What are the reasons why people are still tweet bad?
2. How they solve the issue?
3. What are the solutions they implemented?
4. How they prevent the tweets that are destructive?
5. Why is it people should know about this?

TITLE: It's an Ad, It's News... It's Native Advertising

AUTHOR: David Stockdale

PUBLISHED: Thursday, March 19th, 2015

Ad, News or Advertising?

The first impression of when I heard the title I think it conveys how people identify the subject. If it is an Ad, news or an advertising which is very difficult because this entire are types of how information delivered to people.

“One essential factor in the success of a native ad piece is its ability to be indistinguishable from the editorial content with which it is featured.” – The quote from the really stuck in my mind

The article mainly talks about The New York Times because many people can't distinguish if The New York Times is an Ad, news or the native advertising because some can be fooled of what they post on their magazine. They deliver different kinds of news that will make people identify if it is a news magazine or an Ad magazine because they also published Ads from different companies and Advertising that Advertises products to the other people. They promote different kinds of brands. Like here in the Philippines or magazines also portrays the same because our magazine also promotes, reports and advertise.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to be identifying the information if it is an Ad, news or advertising.
2. I learned to show what the information is.
3. I learned to write news article.
4. I learned to be more aware on the media.
5. I learned to show concerns to others.

5 Interactive Questions

1. How can I distinguish if the information is an Ad, news or advertising?
2. How do they differ from each other?
3. What are the strategy do by the New York Times?
4. How they promote ethics on their magazine?
5. Why people are important to them?

TITLE: Should Emoji Hold Up in Court?

AUTHOR: Holly Richmond

PUBLISHED: Thursday, March 26th, 2015

Justice for Emoji

My first impression about this article is funny because it is the first time in my life that I heard that an emoji will make you go in jail. But for me, I think there is still a story behind of this because we know that a person will not go to jail if he or she doesn't have a depravity.

“So whether we like it or not, a cartoon pizza slice now counts as language.” - The quote that really stuck in my mind.

This article mainly shows the use of emoji in a court or justice. We all know that in court or justice all we speak and heard by the judge is very important and they will criticized every bit of it. We should be responsible on how we deliver our words like what in the article says. For example, a person who ruined his life because of a sin that is being told by the other people which is he/she did not do. A single word can affect everyones life. We should know what is right or wrong.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to be responsible for what I relay message.
2. I learned not to judge people easily.
3. I learned to know first the guidelines in the court.
4. I learned to be more aware on what I say.
5. I learned to know the importance of language.

5 Interactive Questions

1. How can I know if it is a message to deliver?
2. Why the emoji leads the person to jail?
3. What are the strategy do the justice did to this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of a language?

TITLE: Mobile Payment Apps and the Price of Convenience

AUTHOR: Nora Dunne

PUBLISHED: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015

Convenience

My first impression on this article is I think it is about how the mobile apps that are not free give convenience to the people despite of having to pay bills just to download it. I also think that this article will tell us the difference between the apps that are free and the apps that weren't.

"Paying for things with your phone seems convenient, but not absolutely necessary." –
The quote that really stuck in my mind

This article mainly conveys that paying apps will make you convenient but it is not necessary because it is still downloadable even if it has a payment. It is only a feature that will allow people to enhance their experience in an app. For example, an app which has a feature that you can chat, send message, and etc. but if you pay it will add another feature that is needed to function it well and make people more comfortable.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to be more practical.
2. I learned to know my priority.
3. I learned to know more about the app and how it can be use.
4. I learned to be more aware on what I pay.
5. I learned to know the importance of convenience

5 Interactive Questions

1. How can I know if it is very useful?
2. It can be downloaded it free or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its rice and convenience?

TITLE: The Perils of Predicting Epidemics

AUTHOR: Nikki Williams

PUBLISHED: Friday, April 10th, 2015

Detecting Epidemics

The first impression in this article is how people detect diseases. I think it will help us to understand how we can identify if it is curable or not.

Strict empirical control is needed to prevent false alarms and widespread panic that can threaten and endanger lives. – The quote that really stuck in my mind.

This article shows how the people know the importance of DDD which allows detecting the diseases. According to the article *“DDD has a lot of structure and regulation to undergo before it can be considered a real, rather than rogue, technology. Most people are familiar with the leper colonies of the past, where infected persons were shunned, and even harmed, for the risk they represented to society.”* It really is because it has lots of features and functions that will help us to distinguish more carefully about the DDD.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to be more aware on the epidemics.
2. I learned to be care for safety.
3. I learned to know more about DDD.
4. I learned to be more aware who infected by the diseases.
5. I learned to know the importance of DDD.

5 Interactive Questions

1. How can I know if it is very useful?
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its importance?

TITLE: The Right to Be Forgotten: A Choice Between Privacy and Free Speech

AUTHOR: Nikki Williams

PUBLISHED: Monday, April 20th, 2015

Free Speech

The first impression in this article is being aware of the privacy. We all have freedom to express ourselves and we must know what it's important is. I think if we are not to judgmental we can be forgotten.

So which is the more important right to protect—freedom of speech or privacy? I suggest we need both. – The quote that stuck in my mind.

This article shows what is the importance and limitations of having freedom. Any kind of freedom is a right for people. We also know the limits of delivering the free speech or the rights to being private because we all know that some things are not good to reveal and it is better to be kept it. It is okay to be private but we should know the things to express it in voice.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to speak for what I feel.
2. I learned to know what is right to protect.
3. I learned to know more about privacy and freedom.
4. I learned to be more aware of my rights.
5. I learned to know the importance of free speech..

5 Interactive Questions

1. How can I know if it is for private?
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its limits?

TITLE: High-resolution satellites: are our privacy expectations too high?

AUTHOR: Kate Baucherel

PUBLISHED: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015

Privacy

The first impression I realize in this article is how people wonders about how high our privacy, if it is high for them or too low. I think this will convey information that will help people identify their rate in privacy.

“Our environment is a clear winner: Observations and inspections from space could help to protect crucial and fragile ecosystems and deepen our understanding of natural disasters or local weather anomalies. Disaster relief suddenly becomes swifter and more effective when up-to-date and detailed satellite imagery reveals changes in the terrain, specific locations to target, and the needs of a population, before implementing response efforts.” – The quote that stuck in my mind.

This article shows how important privacy. We observe nowadays that there are lots of hackers who allegedly hack people just to express their freedom of speech. Like on what Yaya Dub experienced. She was hacked by anonymous PH which leads to make people aware of their social media accounts. Here in the Philippines every secret can be revealed and the security in our country is not that high. We must know how to enhance this kind of matter. We should improve and be aware in our privacy.

5 Things I’ve learned

1. I learned to expect to much.
2. I learned to know what is right to protect.
3. I learned to know more about privacy and freedom.
4. I learned to be more aware of my rights.
5. I learned to know the importance of privacy.

5 Interactive Questions

1. How can I know if it is for private?
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its limits?

TITLE: Fraud in the Online Age

AUTHOR: Kate Baucherel

PUBLISHED: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015

Fraud

The first impression I figured out while staring at the title is I think it delivers the effects of fraud in our modern era which is technology. We should be aware of what is happening in our country.

“I agree. If the first thing a potential employer sees from you was written and edited by someone else, then they have no insight into many crucial skills you should possess. Many of these services work by asking clients to fill out online surveys about their professional and academic backgrounds along with details about the job they are applying for. That is often followed by a phone interview with the writer chosen to work with them, and resumes and cover letters are created using that information. But if I am hiring someone, I want to see how well they can organize information. I want to know if they have problems with spelling and grammar. And in their cover letter I definitely want a sense of how compelling and descriptive they can be in advocating for themselves for the position.” – The quote that stuck in my mind

This article says that every employer should know how to hire people with good intention and skills. The quote above shows how people really love their Facebook and other social media accounts. Fraud occur in this pace because we are all hungry for information and in such way we violated some laws that is needed to consider if we want to know more data. For example, a child who literally asks things they don't know are we not the one to teach them the things that is really important for her or him to learn?

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to expect to be more precise in a question.
2. I learned not to be more good as asking technical terms.
3. I learned to know more about privacy and freedom.
4. I learned to be more aware of my rights.
5. I learned to know the importance of privacy.

5 Interactive Questions

1. How can I know if it is for private?
2. It can really help people or not?

3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its limits?

TITLE: The Internet of things: the same old problems A new network with

AUTHOR: David Stockdale

PUBLISHED: Thursday, May 28th, 2015

New Things

The first impression that made me think is this article I think will make us think of the things that is new but have an old issue that is needed to be fix. I also think that this will enhance the way we think of technology.

“The IoT operates by enabling machines to communicate with users and, perhaps more critically, one another in order to improve efficiency and automation. For instance, IoT devices employed in an urban infrastructure can talk to one another, coordinating energy, transit, and other systems for optimal performance and efficiency without the direct aid of people. Because of this, IoT technology is largely expected to usher in an era of dramatically increased automation. The enhancement of data gathering and, perhaps more importantly, data visualization is a key factor to unlocking this potential.” – The quote that stuck in my mind.

This article shows that IoT is needed to increase the capability of the machines to communicate and to make people use it. It has a goal by which the entire world will be an information system. In this article they predicted that at the year of 2020 internet connection will grow and all the things and devices will be connected to that machine.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to expect to be more aware of the technology that is being introduced to me.
2. I learned not to use my ability to make use of it for the future.
3. I learned to know more about the capability of the machines.
4. I learned to be more aware of what is happening in our country.
5. I learned to know the importance of new network.

5 Interactive Questions

1. How can I know if it is an old problem?
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its effect in our society?

TITLE: The robots are coming! Ethical implications of robot journalism

AUTHOR: Paulina Haselhorst

PUBLISHED: Thursday, June 12th, 2015

Robots

My first impression in this article is obviously this article is about robots. Robots nowadays are very modern they can act as human. Maybe I think this article will show and deliver messages that can affect our society if robots will be implemented in our society.

“Writing software and traditional journalists find and apply data very differently. Robot journalism technology is undeniably more efficient at compiling and sifting through online information about current events. Quakebot, the geological writing platform used by the LA Times, automatically produces articles about tremors as soon as the U.S. Geological Survey issues notice of an earthquake that meets Quakebot’s minimum magnitude requirement.” – The quote from the article that really stuck in my mind.

On this generation we witness all the new technologies that are arising one of this technology is the robots. Robots nowadays can work as a human. We can’t judge them because they are also the creation of human. This article shows how the robot journalism affects the worldwide because all of us are now in the modern world and we want our life to be more convenient.

5 Things I’ve learned

1. I learned to expect to be more updated in the modern news
2. I learned not to be more conscious about on what is happening in our society.
3. I learned to know more robots.
4. I learned to know more on how robots became also a human.
5. I learned to know the importance of technology.

5 Interactive Questions

1. How can I know if it an implication of the robot journalism?
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its effect in our society?

TITLE: The Ethics of Video Streaming Apps

AUTHOR: Mary T. McCarthy

PUBLISHED: Thursday, June 25th, 2015

Video Streaming Apps

My first impression in this article is mainly about video apps that will make you realize what to do right on streaming videos. What are the do's and don'ts.

“These apps feel like big things, like they matter. And there’s no question that Meerkat and Periscope will serve important purposes going forward. Even though live streaming isn’t new, it’s never been this easy. But does anyone outside of the obsessive tech community truly even care?” – The quote from the article that really stuck to me

The article tackles about the effects of piracy and streaming without concern or without permission from the owner. We all know that nowadays people usually go the sites that are prohibited and usually without the permission to the owner so this article conveys the law by which you can be penalize if you don't abide the rules stated in the article.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to expect to be more aware of the laws about streaming videos.
2. I learned that piracy is a crime.
3. I learned that we usually don't care the things that are important.
4. I learned to know more about the laws concerning ethics in technology
5. I learned to know the importance of technology.

5 Interactive Questions

1. What is piracy and privacy
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its effect in our society?

TITLE: When Sharing Isn't Caring

AUTHOR: Nikki Williams

PUBLISHED: Monday, July 13th, 2015

Sharing Isn't Caring

My first impression in this article is when I read the title it conveys that sharing is not that good because some of the things we share can cause bad impression to others. It will only lead them to misjudgment.

“Children no longer enjoy the protections of an anonymous childhood. The “seen and not heard” child of yesteryear has morphed into a modern celebrity, with 90 percent of American children possessing an online history by the time they turn two.” – The quote from the article that really stuck in my mind.

This article shows that children nowadays are not aware of what they are posting and sharing from different social networking sites. This article wants to warn us that we must protect children from this crime because it will them to mistook their identity or they will not protect their identity for the identity theft.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to expect to be more aware of the laws about sharing different information.
2. I learned that stealing is crime.
3. I learned that we should protect our identity.
4. I learned to know more about the laws concerning ethics in sharing information.
5. I learned to know the importance of identity.

5 Interactive Questions

1. What is the things we should consider to help parents to control the use of their children in social media sites?
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its effect in our society?

TITLE: “Come as You Are?” Moral Concerns with Facebook’s Identity Policies

AUTHOR: Karen Dybis

PUBLISHED: Monday, August 3rd, 2015

Facebook Identity Policies

My first impression in this article is it is about the identity in Facebook that concerning on the policies that should be implemented so that it will prevent from hacking accounts.

“According to Instagram, her name is “Lil Miss Hot Mess.” It also is her Twitter handle, her YouTube tag and her stage moniker. It also is the reason why Facebook kicked her off its platform for a short time. “ – The quote from the article that really stuck in my mind.

This article concerns on how Facebook terminated users with the names that are not good to hear. I used to know someone my high school classmate she make an Instagram account with a name that is not good to hear and I don’t want to mention it then he connected it to his Facebook his Instagram account was terminated because of its malicious words. That’s why you must state your true self because it describes your true identity.

5 Things I’ve learned

1. I learned to show my true self.
2. I learned that malicious words can cause you to be udge by the other people.
3. I learned that we should protect our identity.
4. I learned to know more about the laws concerning ethics in sharing information.
5. I learned to know the importance of identity.

5 Interactive Questions

1. What are the policies regarding the Facebook identity
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its effect in our society?

TITLE: Getting Personal: Editorial Judgment in the Digital Public Square

AUTHOR: Jill Geisler

PUBLISHED: Monday, August 10th, 2015

Editorial Judgement

My first impression about this article is how to make judgement by means of digital public square I don't have any idea of what is that and how it is use but the thing that I know is it is for us to know information.

“Calling this censorship presumes the following: When it comes to information, anything goes. If it’s true, it’s always newsworthy. If it’s out there anywhere, it’s fair game. If publication causes pain, it’s not a problem. If you choose not to share it, you’re a censor.” – The quote from the article that really stuck in my mind.

This article mainly delivers the information about censorship. It is making your information not visible from others. It is very useful when it comes to the politicians and even the private people so that some of their private life becomes hidden and only closest friend and family are the one who knows their identities.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to keep my private self from others like my personal data which may cause an identity theft if I reveal it.
2. I learned that being private is not that bad
3. I learned that we should protect our identity.
4. I learned to know more about the laws concerning ethics in sharing information.
5. I learned to know the importance of identity.

5 Interactive Questions

1. What are the policies regarding the Identity censorship
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its effect in our society?

TITLE: Navigating the Ethics of Newsgathering Drones

AUTHOR: John D. Thomas

PUBLISHED: Tuesday, August 18th, 2015

The Ethics of Newsgathering Drones

My first impression in this article is clueless I don't have an idea about this topic but I surely believe that this is somewhat interesting to read.

“Most of what is contained in the organizations ethical code is sound, and the group admits that it is a work in progress and is soliciting input from others. That’s a good thing because it doesn’t address some of the ramifications that drones could have on the overall future of the profession of journalism.” – The quote from the article that really stuck in my mind.

This article shows how the Newsgathering Drones gathered news. I somehow understand why USA is very good at their army because they have lots of innovative ideas and they really implement it. Now USA gathers there researchers to figure out more about drones. Now I understand a little bit the purpose of the newsgathering drones in USA.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned the Newsgathering Drones and what it is all about.
2. I learned that USA is very good at inventing things and implementing it.
3. I learned that we should be aware of our country
4. I learned to know more about the laws concerning ethics in sharing information.
5. I learned to know the importance of drones.

5 Interactive Questions

1. What is newsgathering drones?
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its effect in our society?

TITLE: Machines, autonomy, and virtue: Highlights from 2015 CEPE/IACAP conference

AUTHOR: Owen King

PUBLISHED: Tuesday, August 25th, 2015

Highlights from 2015 CEPE/IACAP conference

I think this article is more about the highlights of the event CEPE/IACAP conference 2015. It is also my first time to read this article and I hope I will learn a lot if I read it.

“Issues about autonomous machines and sexbots bring out two aspects of the uneasiness we experience as artificial entities become more like humans. For one thing, we care how machines behave.” – The quote that really stuck in my mind

This article mainly tackles about what happen to the conference the topic that I understand when I read it is the two aspects and issues that will make machines control our lives. They only delivering message that the machines that are autonomous now serves as our companion and it will not lead to endanger us but to help our life comfortable and easy.

5 Things I’ve learned

1. I learned the conference and what it is all about.
2. I learned that this conference will make us realized how important machines are.
3. I learned that we should be aware of our technologies.
4. I learned to know more about the laws concerning ethics in sharing information.
5. I learned to know the importance of machines.

5 Interactive Questions

1. What are the most significant highlights in the conference?
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the importance of knowing its effect in our society?

TITLE: Digital Kidnapping – A New Kind of Identity Theft

AUTHOR: Nikki Williams

PUBLISHED: Wednesday, September 2nd, 2015

Digital Kidnaping

My first impression in this article is mainly about identity theft, a new form of stealing account information. It must inform us on how to prevent and secure our accounts.

“The deficiency of guidelines regarding the acquisition of posted photos leaves the onus of providing identity protection, particularly to minors, firmly in the hands of parents. Parents should take the time to fully understand and consider all of the ramifications of posting photos online, including reading and comprehending the privacy policies of each online forum they use.” – The quote from the article that really stuck in my mind that should also be implemented and take actions to prevent account stealing.

This article talks about the new form of account theft or stealing it is the digital kidnapping by which it steals and claim others post and said they were from them. They steal pictures that they like and claim that they are them or somehow they are their relatives. Here in the Philippines it is called “poser” which are posting pictures that are not them but claiming like they are from them.

5 Things I’ve learned

1. I learned to protect my account.
2. I learned that we must be aware of what is happening in our accounts.
3. I learned that we should be aware of the posers reclaiming we are them.
4. I learned to know more about the laws concerning ethics in sharing information.
5. I learned to know the importance of making our account secured.

5 Interactive Questions

1. What are the things we can do to avoid identity theft?
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the things we will do if someone tries to steal our identity?

TITLE: Crime and Punishment: The Criminalization of Online Protests

AUTHOR: Nikki Williams

PUBLISHED: Thursday, September 10th, 2015

Criminalization of Online Protests

My first impression here in this article is that how we can know if the protests are a crime and what are the punishments we should consider for them to know.

“Both sides are wrong to some extent. The problem with internet hacktivists is the veil of anonymity behind which they hide. Real-world political protests require that people stand up for what they believe—physically. They put their faces out there, sign their names on petitions and take responsibility for their views.” – The quote from the article that really stuck in my mind.

This article shows that activists must know some precautions and effects of their rant online. We should consider the things we should do before acting it. Many people use this as a scam to entertain people to join them but other people are not aware of the punishment they will have if they still do it. Rally is not bad but activists must consider the good intentions why they are doing it.

5 Things I've learned

1. I learned to know what I am fighting for.
2. I learned that we must be aware of what is happening in our society.
3. I learned that we should be aware of what we are doing.
4. I learned to know that what we are doing have consequences.
5. I learned to know the importance of making law about protests

5 Interactive Questions

1. What are the things we can do to avoid punishment from online protests?
2. It can really help people or not?
3. What are the strategies did about this matter?
4. How they did ethics on this?
5. What is the things we will do if we already been reported to the police?

CONTEMPORARY MORAL PROBLEMS

Happiness and Virtue

By Aristotle

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) What is happiness according to Aristotle? How is it related to virtue? How is it related to pleasure?

According to Aristotle, all human beings can perceive or identify happiness by the accordance of virtue. For me, it implies that every person can feel and notice happiness by doing good things to others especially when you feel love for what you are doing.

It is related to virtue because as a person we are trained since childhood to do good things so as we do good things you feel the fulfillment, joy and satisfaction. The virtue of courage is the greatest way to highlight happiness. If we don't have courage and determination we will not be successful.

Happiness is also a choice. If we have judgments on our feelings we cannot be happy. We should free ourselves from guilt so that as we grow old we are happy and also we are learning. Material things will not make us truly happy because the true happiness comes from having a good heart.

- 2) How does Aristotle explain moral virtue? Give some examples.

Aristotle explains the moral virtue as the effect of having too much and lacking of something. For example, a person who eats too much and the person who never sleeps and stay at night to play online games.

A person who eats too much is gluttony we all know that it is bad but if that person don't eat too much it will result to malnutrition. As I was implying that we should know our limits we must think of others and know that we are not only in this world. A person who seldom sleeps because of playing games is also one of example because it will result to have a low blood and be Anemic. A person must have discipline on what we are doing because having discipline will make you a better person.

- 3) Is it possible for everyone in our society to be happy, as Aristotle explains it? If not, who cannot be happy?

Yes, everyone in our society is possible to be happy because we are all human beings and have feelings and emotions. We are free to express ourselves. The poor, rich people, animals and all the living things have their own interpretation of being happy.

We must learn the intellect virtue which is to reflect and contemplate. Sometimes people with material things don't feel happy because things don't buy happiness especially the love and attention from love ones. We should know that every person have emotions and we must consider that being in our society we must know how to interact with other people.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- 1) Aristotle characterizes a life of pleasure as suitable for beasts. But what, if anything, is wrong with a life of pleasure?

Aristotle illustrates the life of pleasure as suitable for beasts because if we have pleasure we can't decide on what we truly feel if it is happiness or not. Pleasure will make us think of choices that we don't want to do. A pleasure will only make people do what they think happy for them without knowing the feelings of others. Pleasure is an excess in our life if it is too much.

- 2) Aristotle claims that the philosopher will be happier than anyone else. Why is this? Do you agree or not?

Yes, because as a philosopher he also claims that he is happy on what he was doing. He doesn't have wealth and possessions but for him having philosophy is having enough wealth not on material things but the learnings of a philosopher. Philosophers are happier than anyone else because they know that their philosophies are being known by others and they shared their knowledge to other people.

Utilitarianism

By John Stuart Mill

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) State and explain the Principle of utility. Show how it could be used to justify actions that are conventionally wrong, such as lying and stealing.

The principle of utility is an action by which the happiness or pleasure is proportion on what the person's right deed. It is not suitable for any instances in life such as for lying and stealing. There are different types of lying: lying on purpose/ pleasure and lying for the sake of being excuse. These are actions that are conventionally wrong but people are tending to do it because they feel happiness and fulfillment on doing it. I can say that this principle of utility is not right and cannot be applied on all scenarios.

- 2) How does Mill reply to the objection that Epicureanism is a doctrine worthy only of swine?

Epicureans thought that happiness or pleasure is the highest good. Mill opposed that belief because he considers pleasure as wicked / immoral. For example, a person with power is a pleasure by which some people will be treated unequally. Mill suggested that we must consider the happiness of every individual because every people have a capability to think and act what is right. Mill called the Epicureans as a doctrine worthy only of swine because their belief is only suitable for beasts and other creatures which is lower in human. Human have a higher intellect which beasts don't have so a person must know how to think what the highest good is.

- 3) How does Mill distinguish between higher and lower pleasure?

For me, I think Mill distinguish the higher pleasure as a happiness with a deeper influence and addiction like smoking, taking drugs and doing illegal things. That's the way of people to show their happiness because they think that these tools will make them feel numb and forgets the pain they were experienced. While lower pleasure is a happiness that will only last for a long time like watching television, playing guitar, singing and etc. because as you continuously do these things you will eventually get tired and bored but for some instances you feel fulfillment because you did these things. I consider this as a lower pleasure because it is a happiness or desire which will promote good in you unlike the higher pleasure that will only make your life miserable.

4) According to Mill, whose happiness must be considered?

Mill believes that happiness is for all people. It is the way which all people will be treated equally and at the same time majority of them will not consider themselves as slaves. We will have rights to think for ourselves and no one can dictate us so I think Mill wants all to be happy.

5) Carefully reconstruct Mill's proof of the Principle of Utility?

Mill's proof of the Principle of Utility is said to be not possible till the end. A person that will come to an end will not be truly happy because every person wants to continue his/her life. However we truly need happiness in our lives.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

1) Is happiness nothing more than pleasure, and the absence of pain? What do you think?

For me, happiness is not pleasure and also not an absence of pain because we only need contentment in our lives. We must be contented on the happiness we are experiencing because some people don't have it. Even though they have what they wanted there is always lack on what they have. If a person is contented on what God gave to him I think he really obtains happiness because he really knows how to be satisfied and relax.

2) Does Mill convince you that the so-called higher pleasures are better than the lower ones?

No, because even if the higher pleasure will give me most pleasure I must consider that this happiness will truly affect my life and I know that it is bad because too much pleasure is wicked. Lower pleasure is better because it is a way of good pleasuring me. Lower pleasure carries pleasure in a good way.

3) Mill says, "In the golden rule of Jesus of Nazareth, we read the complete spirit of the ethics of the utility". Is this true or not?

For me, it is true because all people have their own minds to decide if they are doing right or wrong. Also, I think the more people contribute in a literature, will make it more better and good since many knowledge had been put in that literature.

- 4) Many commentators have thought that Mill's proof of the Principle of Utility is defective. Do you agree? If so, then what mistake or mistakes does he make? Is there any way to reformulate the proof so that it is not defective?

I agree on Mill's proof of the Principle of Utility that it is defective because a person's desirable happiness is not evident to the ultimate end. No one desired to die in an early stage because all of us have mission. Mill must emphasize that a person that is still living not from the very end of his/her life. Still there is a way to reformulate the proof that the principle of utility is based on the people's happiness while that person is still living in this world.

Master and Slave Morality

By Friedrich Nietzsche

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) How does Nietzsche characterize a good and healthy society?

Nietzsche characterized a good and healthy society by having a leader that will command the people and have the “will of power”. The principle of master and slave is applied in this society because it mainly focuses the leader that wants the society to be rich and successful.

- 2) What is Nietzsche’s view of injury, violence, and exploitation?

Nietzsche’s view of injury, violence and exploitation is the LIFE. Life is a journey which is the reason why we face these kinds of exploitations.

- 3) Distinguish between master morality and slave morality.

Master morality means the “power, strength, egoism and freedom” while, slave morality is about weakness, submission, sympathy and love. Master morality will make the slave morality have fears in the society because the “master” has the authority to command. Slave morality doesn’t want their master to get angry to them or punished them so they really cooperate on what their leader/commander says. As the slave morality do their duty Master morality gives back a reward on what they did.

- 4) Explain the will to power.

Will to power means craving on power / wants to have an authority in every aspects in life. All people wants will to power but there is always a chance that it will only make our society suffered because if there are masters there are also slaves which will make our society not equal. We want us to be treated equal but we also want to be powerful. The result of having the will to power is injuries, violence and exploitation as stated in the third question.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- 1) Some people view Nietzsche’s writings as harmful and even dangerous. For example, some have charged Nietzsche with inspiring Nazism. Are these charges justifies or not? Why or why not?

I believed that Nietzsche's writings acts as harmful and even dangerous. He inspires people who want to handle our society. Nazism was originally come from Adolf Hitler and has a unique goal by way of making and commanding slaves or killing people that don't have the same nationality as they have. If you are not a German and don't have the quality of German like blue eyes and etc. you will be killed and be a slave. The charges against with Nietzsche are justified in his writing because it suggests that there should be a person who will command and the followers so that the society will be successful.

2) What does it mean to be a "creator of values"?

Creator of values means that a person who has power have an ability to help the poor people because they have an abundance of power. Rich people honor themselves as the most powerful in the society because they can do what they want. People who create values believed in the morality that they already have. They do not need to approve their values because they know that they are powerful and no one can judge them.

A Theory of Justice

By John Rawls

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) Carefully explain Rawls's conception of the original position.

The original position means that justice depends on the primitive condition of the country. This also means that the person does not know his status, place in the society and etc. which strengthen the word justice. This wants to ensure that there is no one who has advantage on someone else and disadvantage because of his status. The understanding of original position is about fairness that each and every one should have if there is justice.

- 2) State and explain Rawls's first principle of justice.

The first principle states that "Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others." Based on the definition, the first principle wants to say that there each and every one should be equal to one another and all the people have the right to be heard by all people. Thus, no matter what is your status in life, you are given a chance to be heard in the court for your testimony.

- 3) State and explain the second principle. Which principle has priority such that it cannot be sacrificed?

The second principle states that "Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage, and attached to position and offices open to all.". The second principle is said to apply to the first principle because of the distribution of income and wealth that makes us different among the rest of the people. It is also said that everyone's income is not need to be equal, but justices must or should be accessible to all the people. The principle that has priority is the first principle since according to this chapter that the principles of justice's ordering is based on the priority level since the equality of rights is the first principle, I can say that it should not be sacrificed. The distribution of wealth should be the same with the equal opportunity of one another.

DISCUSSION QUESTION:

- 1) On the first principle, each person has an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty as long as this does not interfere with a similar liberty for others. What does this

allow to do? Does it mean, for example, that people have a right to engage in homosexual?

The first principle allows the people to have basic equal basic rights. Thus, we should have equal opportunity same with other people. When it comes to gender issues, I think there is not much problem especially in this 20th century, when all things are allowed. I believed that each of us should be given rights or opportunities. They should have a right to engage in homosexual even though we are catholic, still there should be equality. We should allow this because there are also human. We should let homosexuals to do what they would like to do as long as it is still not hindering human and moral rights.

The Debate over Utilitarianism

By James Rachels

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) Rachels says that classical utilitarianism can be summed up in three propositions. What are they?

One of the three proposition is first actions are to be judged right or wrong solely in virtue of consequences. This is like doing karma. If we did well to everyone else, then we will receive blessing from God. But if we have made wrong doings, then our action will be judged in the society and even punished us because of doing that certain action. Doing good things to people have the best consequences.

Second of three proposition is what matters is the greater amount of happiness than the unhappiness of the cause of doing that action. We should make sure that happiness is greater than unhappiness. If happiness is greater than unhappiness then we can say that our action is correct. But if it is other way around, then we can say that our action is morally wrong.

Third proposition is we should measure the happiness of everyone else. Everyone will be equally calculated based on their happiness. If many people would be happy, then we can say that the action is right. This also means that majority in the society is important in the decision of the society.

- 2) Explain the problem of hedonism. How do defenders of utilitarianism respond to this problem?

Hedonism believed that happiness is the ultimate good while, unhappiness is the ultimate evil. The problem with was discussed by way of giving examples. First example is a young artist who was injured. Because of that injury, he might not play piano which he loves very much. The problem is the young artist did not injure himself, but the misfortunes or fate that the world brought to him. Certainly, he would be unhappy because of that accident. But, this chapter says that we cannot eliminate tragedies because it is not in our hands. Utilitarian tried to respond in this problem by way of different kind of utilitarianism. Some would say they need to put down things that they will regard as good in themselves. But also some would suggest that there are three good things such as pleasure, friendship and enjoyment. Others also suggests ideal utilitarianism which means that right actions are the ones that has the best results, however goodness is measured. In addition to that, many believed in preference utilitarianism which means that we should act on maximizing the satisfaction of people.

3) What are the objections about justice, rights and promises?

These objections were explained through an example. First, it tackles about justices of an innocent man. The given scenario is if we are utilitarian and we have played a vital scene in the event. What happened is a riot between the whites and blacks. The blacks were accused of doing immoral thing such as rape to a white woman. Even though, we all know that the black really did not do the accusation, but if we are utilitarian, we can bear false witness by telling them that the black really rape the white woman. We based our action because to promote happiness to the majority of whites. We don't consider the innocent man who we will accused for doing that action. There is no justice if we believed in utilitarian because we will be forced to bear false witness or lie. This is not fair to the minority people.

Second, it talks about the rights when Ms. York was photographed without any dress. The setting was taken in the police department and the guilty people are the policemen. With this event, Ms. York filed a case against the policemen for doing that immoral action. Certainly, Ms. York won the case. If we consider utilitarianism, what happen to Ms. York is correct since according to utilitarianism, we should consider the people who will be happy or unhappy with that action. The action is taking a picture of Ms. York who was forced to undress. The policeman, who is Mr. Story, made that action just for the sake of being happy. With that happiness, he spread the picture to all his other colleagues which we can say maybe happiness for them. Thus, this action is morally correct if we believed in utilitarianism.

Third, it discusses the promises of one's person to his friend. In fact, that person will meet his friend in a certain place. But when the time comes, he realized that he would be happy if he finished all his assignments for that day rather than meeting his friend in the place. If we believed in utilitarianism, we might not fulfill our promises since utilitarian believed that the right action is in proportion with the happiness it brings. Since doing assignments is greater than fulfilling our promises, then we will not fulfill our promise to our friend which is considered as morally wrong. We made promises so we should fulfill also our promises.

4) Distinguish between rule and act utilitarianism. How does rule-utilitarianism reply to the objection?

Rule utilitarianism is the new version of utilitarianism whereas; the old version is called the act utilitarianism.

Rule utilitarianism is based on the rules established by the principle, while the act utilitarianism based on that principle of utility. Rule-utilitarianism will answer not by way of defining utilitarianism, but by way of asking questions like "what are the general rules of conduct tend to promote the greatest happiness?" Because we know that lying and

bearing false witness is a crime, then we can say that it is morally wrong. Thus, that utilitarian should also consider the rules in order to promote happiness.

5) What is the third line of defense?

The third line of defense does not care much of the justice, right and promises. They say that they don't need to make sure that their feelings are correct. To relate the example of justices, utilitarian believed that the person who will bear false witness is just doing the interest of many people. He believed that the action is preferable than having faced by other conflicts. Thus, act-utilitarianism is a perfect defensible doctrine that does not need to modify to be rule utilitarianism.

DISCUSSION QUESTION:

1) Smart's defense of utilitarianism is to reject common moral beliefs when they conflict with utilitarianism. Is this acceptable to you or not? Explain your answer.

I believed that example of justice; a utilitarian who will bear false witness should also consider the fact that he need to tell the truth. Even though by telling the truth will cause many deaths (like what the third defense is telling). As a citizen, we should tell the truth even though it will hurt other people because we are just saying the truth. I don't believe that if a person will be faced by conflicts against utilitarianism, he should act as a utilitarian.

2) A utilitarian is supposed to give moral consideration to all concerned. Who must be considered? What about nonhuman animals? How about lakes and streams?

I believed that we should also give moral consideration to all the people even the animals because I believed that they should also have freedom just like people. For example, we should also not kill animals because they have also one life to live. If we killed them, they will also be unhappy just like people. Also, even the lakes and streams who does not have life should also consider since what we did in the lakes such as throwing dirt will have a corresponding consequence to us. Whatever we do to our environment will also return to us because that will promote unhappiness to all the people.

3) Rachels claims that merit should be given moral consideration independent of utility. Do you agree?

I agree that merit should be given moral considerations because it just for the welfare of everyone else. If there is merit, all the people will try to do good things to everyone else.

But if there are no merits, then I can say they are free to do harm other people and even environment. A person who worked hard each and every day should have merit in order for him to continue his good attitude.

The Categorical Imperative

By Immanuel Kant

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) Explain Kant's account of the good will.

Good will also means good determination. If we are determined to get what we want, then we can get it. In life, it is difficult to really get what you would like to have, but if you are determined, patient and have good motive, then you would be successful in your chosen career. According to Kant, good will can be bad because the more people strive to become rich, powerful and famous, the higher chance that we will have conflicts with other people who also want to become rich and so on.

- 2) Distinguish between hypothetical and categorical imperative.

Hypothetical imperative means that we don't know what it contains, but rather we know what the condition it sets before what is the contain. While, categorical imperative means that he would know what it contains, there are no conditions applied.

- 3) State the first formulation of the categorical imperative (using the notion of a universal law), and explain how Kant uses this rule to derive some specific duties toward self-and others.

The first formula which is the notion of a universal law is just a part of categorical imperative. The best example would be self-love. Self-love means to shorten our lives because of the pains and undertakings in our lives. Then we can say is this morally wrong or morally right. The answer would be morally wrong since it cannot act as universal law. A law can be universal law if it applies to all the people. Who is on the right mind to commit suicide if they are happy and even had misfortunes. Thus, universal laws are morally correct. Kant uses the rule in order to let the people know their duties in their self and also others.

- 4) State the second version of the categorical imperative (using the language of means and end) and explain it.

Persons are said to be not subjected to end since their existence of their wellbeing has value for us. Thus, we can call them as objective ends which means things whose existence in itself an end and because of their existence, they would serve as means.

DISCUSSION QUESTION:

- 1) Are the two versions of the categorical imperative just different expressions of one basic rule, or are they two different rules? Defend your answer.

I think these two versions of the categorical imperative are just different expressions of one basic rule. I think they have similar views and that is we should base our action the same treatment with everyone else by not simply acting as means. The same treatment that I used here is the first formulation about universal law. While, acting simply the means is the second formulation about means and ends

- 2) Kant claims that an action that is not done from the motive of duty has no moral worth. Do you agree or not? If not, give some counterexamples.

I agree with Kant's claim that an action that is not done from the motive of duty has no moral worth since everyone should consider their duty as an individual. The example that the book gave is the retailer who equally charged all his customer the real same price which I can say she is doing his duty as a retailer. She has the duty to act fairly in all his customers. Thus, I can say that she has the moral worth.

- 3) Some commentators think that the categorical imperative (particularly the first formulation) can be used to justify non moral or immoral action. Is this a good criticism?

Certainly yes, I think that commentators have good arguments about categorical imperative. I also think that the first formula can justify if the action of one's person is morally correct or wrong. It can be a good arguments because after reading the portion of the first formula, the idea that pops out in my head is "is the self-love can be justify as morally wrong because it does not apply as universal law?" But nonetheless, I think it has a good criticism.

Egoism and Moral Scepticism

By James Rachels

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) Explain the legend of Gyges. What questions about morality are raised by the source?

The legend of Gyges is about a shepherd named Glaucon, who found a magic ring. The ring is said to be magic because it makes the person invisible. Because of that, he decided to seize the throne of the king by way of seducing the queen and asking the queen to kill the king. There are two rings which he had given, namely to a man of rogue and a man of virtue. The rogue will use it without moral constraints since he knows that the ring will protect him from people. While, the man of virtue is likewise be the same with the rogue's action since a man would do anything what he likes if he does not have any fears. The moral issue in this story that was raised is a person would not be moral if he will not benefit. Rogue and the man of virtue will not do good things while having that ring, if they don't believe in any morality. But if one person believed that doing good things to everybody is good, then he would likely use the ring for the advantage of being good.

- 2) Distinguish between psychological and ethical egoism?

Psychological egoism means that all men are selfish whatever they do is in line with their own self. A person who believes psychological egoism will base their actions to only themselves, and not by helping other people. While ethical egoism means that men have no obligations to do anything except their own interests. Thus, a person is doing actions just for the sake of their interests.

- 3) Rachel's discusses two arguments for psychological egoism. What are these arguments, and how does he reply to them?

The first argument for psychological egoism is about a person never volunteers to do any actions, if they don't want to do it. They must be doing what he wants to do. According to Rachel's, this is wrong since a person sometimes have no option, but to do it. For example, a student who wants to passed the exam by way of studying. Even though the person does not like to study, still he needs to study in order to pass the exam. In addition to that the argument said that a person who only cares his own benefits or interest is sometimes called as selfish act. The example that was raised in this argument is a person who chose to help his friend rather than resting in his house.

The person is said to choose to help his friend because he is merely doing what he most wants to do rather than resting in his house and he is doing “unselfish act”.

The second argument for psychological egoism is that unselfish actions produced a self-satisfaction in the person doing the act. Even though the person who tends to help his friend rather than resting, does not have regret that he chose to help since it gives him self-satisfaction. Our conscience will be the one to blame us if we don't do anything to help our friend. If a man is selfish then this means that he will not bother to listen to their conscience. Thus, this is doing unselfish act.

4) What three commonplace confusions does Rachel's detect in the thesis of psychological egoism?

The first is about the confusion of selfishness with self-interest. If a person who has growing wisdom tooth seeks a dentist then this is called as self-interest. But this will not be called as selfish since he is not hurting other people. Selfish and self-interest is a different term. A selfish act if you are not sharing your excess food to other people, but self-interest is just eating the food that you must eat in order to be healthy.

Second is about the confusions that every action is based either from self-interest or other motives. One example of this is a person who is smoking even though he knows that it is bad in his health, still he continues to smoke because that is pleasure for his part. Then, we can conclude that his action is not based on his self-interest.

Third is confusion is that a concern for one's own welfare is incompatible with any genuine concern for the welfare of others. This is not true since we would like that everybody including me is happy. There is no selfish act if we are thinking for the sake of everyone else.

5) State the argument for saying that ethical egoism is inconsistent. Why doesn't Rachel's accept this argument?

The argument that is saying ethical egoism is inconsistent is the third one which states that it is a false assumption that a concern for one's own welfare is incompatible with any genuine concern for the welfare of others. There is no inconsistency because the ethical egoism does not apply to all scenarios. There can be sometimes a conflict with what you desire and the welfare of other people, but I can say that it depends to the person to choose the right decision. Rachel's does not accept this argument since the word others can also mean our family and friends. Sometimes, we based our decision regarding their decision. Thus, I can say that we are not selfish if we listened to what our families and friends want us to do.

6) According to Rachel's, why shouldn't we hurt others, and why should we help others? How can the egoist reply?

According to Rachel's, we should not hurt others and we should help others because we are living in the same society with other people. If we are doing the right thing by not doing crimes, then we are secured. It is our advantage that we are respecting the rules and obligations of the society. If we do our role in our society, then we are creating happy and secure life in the society. It is our own advantage if we are doing what is right.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- 1) How did Rachel answer the question raised by Glaucon, namely, "Why be moral?" If so, what exactly is his answer?

When Glaucon said that why man should be moral if he will not have an advantage of it, Rachel answered it by way of explaining that everybody has an advantage of doing all good things. If a person commits crime, it is his own sake that will be put to prison. But if a person follows the rules and regulations of the society, then he will have a happy and secured life.

- 2) Are genuine egoists rare, as Rachel claims? Is it a fact that most people care about others, even people they don't know?

I believed that genuine egoists are rare since the majority of people are fulfilling their obligations in their society. A genuine egoist is said to be a person who is selfish and thinks of their self-interest. I also believed that we care for other people even though we don't know a person sometimes we tend to help them as much as we could.

- 3) Suppose we define ethical altruism as the view that one should always act for the benefit of others and never in one's own self-interest. In such a view, is it immoral or not?

I believed that ethical altruism is immoral. We should also care for ourselves and not only benefit other people. It is immoral if we will just follow what others are saying. The right thing to do is to balance your self-interest with benefiting other people.

Religion, Morality and Conscience

By John Arthur

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

1) According to Arthur, how are morality and religion different?

Morality is tending to follow our conscience in our different actions. While, religion believes that there is an almighty and powerful God that has control the nature by way of worshipping and praying to him.

2) Why isn't religion necessary for moral motivation?

Religion is not necessary for moral motivation because religion is not enough, there must be ethics so that we would know what is right and wrong. A religion is said to be important so that people will do right. Religion will not give us answers to issues that morality can only give. Religion provides motivation to do the right thing. With religion, it helps us to be a decent person, not to commit crimes in which we will regret after. But it is clear that our motives doing the right thing are not related with religion.

A person is doing the right thing because it is the right thing. Even though people have different religions, still it is not their basis why they are doing the good things.

3) Why isn't religion necessary as a source of moral knowledge?

Religion is not necessary as a source of moral knowledge because in religion, we need first to read all the articles about our religion. For example, a catholic person requires reading a bible for him to know his religion. Also, some passages in the bible do not mean that there is a specific action that we must do in order for us to be considered doing the right thing. Passages will give us stories that accounts for doing right thing.

4) What is the divine command theory? Why does Arthur reject this theory?

Divine command theory states that "religion is necessary for morality because without God there could be no right or wrong. God, in other words, provides the foundation or bedrock on which morality is grounded." Arthur rejects this theory because people can be knowledgeable without any understandings about God. Most people are doing the right thing because they know what is right and wrong and without any knowledge about God. Also, divine command theory also means that all actions are correct if it was commanded by God. Arthur defends it by saying that anyone else or God cannot make a thing right just by commanding it. For example, if God or parents commands us to jump, we should not jump because we might be hurt if we do that action.

5) According to Arthur, how are morality and religion connected?

Morality and religion are connected first by way of historical influence that led for the development of morality. Many senators who are writing laws for the country are religious people that help them to base their laws in their religion. Morality also influenced religion by way of gender issues, feminist issues and etc.

6) Dewey says that morality is social. What does this mean, according to Arthur?

Morality is social. This means that how a person interacts with people will also reflect that people will also do it for them. For example, a person killed somebody. Then people will have a bad image for him because of that certain action. If you are good with everyone, then all the people would also be good at you.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

1) Has Arthur refuted the divine command theory? If not, how can it be defended?

He refuted the divine command theory because for him morality will not be right if a person will just command it. For example, our parents said that we should kill a person. If we believed that divine command theory is right, then we can say that it is right. But, according to Arthur that it is not right since a person or somebody will not make issues right just by commanding it.

2) If morality is social, as Dewey says, then how can we have any obligations to nonhuman animals?

We have obligations to nonhuman animals because there are also living creatures that is in our society. They must have fair treatment same with human. I think that people are also interacting with animals, the same with people. Also, we should consider that animals are not the highest being of creation. Thus, we should consider their capability to interact with us and their actions.

3) What does Dewey mean by moral education? Does a college ethics class count as moral education?

Moral education means that we can also learn what is right and wrong by way of studying it in our class. I believed that each school has its responsibility to clarify the morality issues especially we are matured enough to think the right or wrong things. Yes, a college ethics counts as moral education.

Trying Out Ones New Sword

By Mary Midgley

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) What is “moral isolationism”?

Moral isolationism means that a person cannot criticize cultures that he is not belong since he does not understand very well the custom or practices in that society. Even though, we are free to make opinions, still moral isolationism condemns the people who are criticizing other cultures especially if their opinions are not too good. If we will try to read the definition, the purpose of this moral isolationism is really good. But there are exceptions to it. (See the third question)

- 2) Explain the Japanese of custom of tsujigiri. What questions does Midgley ask about this custom?

The Japanese’s custom of tsujigiri which means “to try out one’s new sword on a chance warfarer”. A samurai should first try his sword because of the chance that war will happen. But according to Midgley, this is not good because the samurai need to test his sword just to practice. We must not take one life just for the sake of winning in the war and also practicing. Even though it is for the benefit of many people, it is still immoral to let the man been experimented. That’s why cloning and experimenting condemned in a Christian society because they know that it is immoral.

One of the questions that he asked about the custom is “are we qualified to criticize other culture or qualified to criticize the custom named tsujigiri?” Another question is “does the isolating barrier between cultures block praise as well as blame”. Last question is “What is involved in judging”. These are some questions that Midgley explained in this chapter and left us with these questions to think more deeply.

- 3) What is wrong with moral isolationism, according to Midgley?

Regarding the first question, moral isolationism is wrong because it prohibits us for criticizing other cultures even though their custom or way of belief is not moral. For example, the custom tsujigiri, we all know that we’ll need to take away one’s life because we need to practice them for the chance of war. That is immoral because life is important in one’s person. And only God can take it from us since he is the one who gave us the life we are nurturing. Also, the Japanese before need to practice tsujigiri because they don’t want to put shame their emperors which is for me not good since they must not give it importance or not consider the shame that they will give if ever they failed. Since we all know that it is bad, we cannot criticize the custom of tsujigiri because of moral

isolationism. Even though moral isolationism has also good motive, but I think it is not appropriate to all cultures especially if the way of belief is immoral. Also, we must be free to talk, to criticize one's culture if it is a fact regarding them. But if not a fact, we should not first criticize easily.

4) What does Midgley think is the basis for criticizing other cultures?

The basis of criticizing other culture is the fact or truth that the society believes in. We should avoid criticizing first if we are not sure that what we are saying is correct. We must make sure that everything we learned from them are all truth. Also, we don't need to criticize other culture if it is morally correct. We should also base our critics in the cultures which is moral. Also, we should try to avoid bad criticisms, because having that will make war in the culture that you are criticizing and your own culture.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

1) Midgley says that Nietzsche is an immoralist. Is that an accurate and fair assessment of Nietzsche? Why or why not?

No, I think it is not fair that Midgley says that Nietzsche is an immoralist because first he need to know deeper the side of Nietzsche through reading all his books and etc. Second, Nietzsche has different culture when compare to Midgley. Midgley should consider that different cultures will cause the people different in their views especially in morality. Also, we should also consider moral isolationism which means that we should not criticize other cultures that we do not understand. In addition to that, the criticisms of Midgley are not good because he could use other words just to make it not hurting to the part of Nietzsche.

2) Do you agree with Midgley's claim that the idea of separate and unmixed cultures is unreal? Explain your answer.

I agree that Midgley's claim that the idea of separate and unmixed culture is not real because we only think that we are separate. Thus, we should not criticize other cultures. But actually many people are also criticizing us. So, we have also the right to criticize other people based on the truth. If culture is unmixed, then I can say that some people will not comment to one another.

The Nature and Value of Rights

By Joel Feinberg

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) Describe Nowheresville. How is this world different from our world?

I imagine Nowheresville, a place where each and everyone knows their duty and obligations to one another. I don't envision a place where it is ugly so I think nowheresvilleans respect each other which is unlikely to happen. Nowheresville is different from our world in a way that in that place there is no imposed rights. Thus, all the people has no claim rights which we have in the real world.

- 2) Explain the doctrine of the logical correlativity of rights and duties. What is Feinberg's position on the doctrine?

The doctrine of the logical correlativity of rights and duties means that all duties requires rights and also all rights entails duty. Thus, we can say that rights and duties are the same. Feinberg's position in the doctrine is in both yes and no. He believed that duties can be rights and duties can be different from rights.

- 3) How does Feinberg explain the concept of personal desert? How would personal desert work in Nowheresville?

Based on the example given in this chapter, I think personal deserts are way for a person to claim a right. In nowheresville, the students were not obligated to do their best. They are only obligated to perform, not being too less and not being too much. If their performance meets the expectation, they will not claim for rewards of their performance. Students should be happy because they are given rewards. Also, they don't have rights if they don't like the rewards. People who have no knowledge of rights will be proud of his own deserts. They don't have claim rights because they are no imposed rights in Nowheresville.

- 4) Explain the notion of a sovereign right-monopoly. How would this work in Nowheresville according to Feinberg?

The notion of a sovereign right –monopoly means that if one country self-governed us, we have no right to complain since we are not knowledgeable of our rights. There can be duty of the sovereign to treat us well or treat well the people, but if he harm us, we have no right to complain. It is also said that the sovereign only have sinned to God, but not in us. In a sovereign right-monopoly, he can do all things, and incur obligations or duty toward one another, but this duty is not directly promised to each other, but rather to God only. In Nowheresville, this will work because there are no rights and only duties or obligations are imposed.

5) What are claim-rights? Why does Feinberg think they are morally important?

Claim-rights means a person have claim to the rights. For example, a person gets our right, then we can claim by way of complaining that our rights were neglected. I believed that claim-rights are morally important because if we don't claim our rights, people would abuse us. For example, a person who abuse our rights, if we will not complain about it, then maybe he would repeat it again and again. Claim-rights is important for the people to know that we are equal and should be given equal rights no matter what are our status in life. Also, if we will not talk, they will not know our sides as a person who is victim of the rights.

DISCUSSION QUESTION:

1) Does Feinberg make a convincing case for the importance of rights? Why or why not?

I think Feinberg really made a convincing case for the importance of rights because I have now convinced that rights are important for each of us. Also, making use of Nowheresville, I have realized that having rights make us more knowledgeable on what should we claim to other people.

2) Can you give a noncircular definition of claim-rights?

For me, claim-rights mean that we are given the rights to assert because it is our own rights. We can complain over our rights since it is our own rights.

Taking Rights Seriously

By Ronald Dworkin

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) What does Dworkin mean by right in the strong sense? What rights in the sense are protected by the U.S Constitution?

According to Dworkin view, if a person has the right thing to do, we should not interfere with his action. Thus, we can say that there is respect on the dignity of one's person. The rights that are covered in the U.S constitution are free speech, equality, due process and etc. These are some rights that the constitution is being protected.

- 2) Distinguish between legal and moral rights. Give some examples of legal rights that are not moral rights, and moral rights that are not legal rights.

Legal rights are a constitutional right which means they are already stated in the law. While, moral rights are ethical rights that should be respected on one another. The legal rights are following the laws such as if there is a sign of no parking; we should not park our car in that certain prohibition. The example of moral right is to respect one another by way of not interfering to other's work.

- 3) What are the two models of how a government might define the rights of its citizen? Which does Dworkin find more attractive?

The first model states that there should be a balance between the individual right and the rights of the government. If the government stops the right to freedom of speech, then it has done wrong in individual's right. This is said to be false because it is difficult to balance these two components such as the people and the government.

While, the second model states that each and every one should respect the rights of people.

Thus, the government should first understand the rights of the people, while the people should also respect the government. This is the most attractive because this is much acceptable in the society.

- 4) According to Dworkin, what two important ideas are behind the institution of rights?

According to Dworkin, the two important ideas that are behind the institution of rights are faith and respect. Faith means we should believe that the lawmakers are knowledgeable on the rights we have. They know what moral rights should be

considered as part of constitution and what moral rights that should not be considered are. Second is respect. We should respect the law in a way that we should try to avoid to break the law. Even though law is said to be not perfect, we should try to follow the rules or laws that are embarked in the constitution.

DISCUSSION QUESTION:

1) Does a person have the right to break a law? Why or why not?

For me, a person has the rights. Therefore, they have the right to break the law. But first, they should be knowledgeable on laws that they would break since it is their way to defend themselves. Also, each and every one should be accountable for the actions they did. For example, a person who breaks the law should know the consequences of doing that action.

2) Are rights in the strong sense compatible with Mill's utilitarianism?

I think the rights that Ronald Dworkin is saying is compatible with Mill's utilitarianism because according to Mill, utilitarianism means that a person's right action is based on their happiness. Thus, a person who wants to spend his money is can be considered as his rights because it is still his money. In the same with Mill's theory, the spending of money is considered as right action because he is happy or enjoying.

3) Do you think that Kant would accept the rights in the strong sense or not?

I think Kant would not accept the rights in the strong sense because Kant believed that it is moral to interfere with other people especially if that person knows that he is in that right position to interfere. While, Dworkin believed that it is not good to interfere with other people right. Each and every one should be accountable for the actions they did. For example, a person who breaks the law should know the consequences of doing that action.

4) Are rights in the strong sense compatible with Mill's utilitarianism?

I think the rights that Ronald Dworkin is saying is compatible with Mill's utilitarianism because according to Mill, utilitarianism means that a person's right action is based on their happiness. Thus, a person who wants to spend his money is can be considered as his rights because it is still his money. In the same with Mill's theory, the spending of money is considered as right action because he is happy or enjoying.

5) Do you think that Kant would accept the rights in the strong sense or not?

I think Kant would not accept the rights in the strong sense because Kant believed that it is moral to interfere with other people especially if that person knows that he is in that right position to interfere. While, Dworkin believed that it is not good to interfere with other people's right.

The Need for More than Justice

By Annette Baier

REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- 1) Distinguish between justice and care perspectives. According to Gilligan, how do these perspectives develop?

Justice perspective means adhering to laws, rules and regulations of the society. While, care perspective means the love, care and etc. Males are more on justice perspective, while female tends to focus on care perspective. These perspectives were developed through moral development which focuses on the development of female and male. As the female and male grows, they have seen that these perspectives are visible in our lives.

- 2) Explain Kohlberg's theory of moral development. What criticisms do Gilligan and Baier make of this theory?

Kohlberg's theory of moral development starts from pre-conventional level to a post-conventional. The example would be when we were starting to went to school and we tried to fit in the community. In order for that child to fit in the group, he used to answer the tests and exams. Gilligan and Baier find out that Kohlberg's questionnaires are mostly verbal. Thus, it can be fictional. Gilligan believed that the development of female and male are different with each other. Gilligan find out that female's idea about morality is different with males. They conclude that females are more matured by way of realizing care perspective rather than justice perspective.

- 3) Baier says that there are three important differences between Kantian liberals and their critics. What are these differences?

The important differences between Kantian liberals and their critics have seen in the chapter. The first was the relationship between equals. The power of the parent and child is different since they should not be equal. But now, we consider teenagers like adults since in some countries, if a child is 18 years old, he or she should be independent from her family. Second is its freedom of choice. It is said that a child can't choose his family just because she has the freedom of choice. Gilligan find out that women tried to choose if she will abort his child or not and enter to being a mother. Last is the authority over emotions. A parent should not strictly imposed rules if the child can't follow it.

- 4) Why does Baier attack the Kantian view that the reason should control unruly passion?

Baier believed that we should not worry about the passions the person have, as long as they can control it. Kantian's view is that unruly passion tends to less useful when we fill the role of being a parent. It is said that being a father, they should control their violence by way of loving their children. For example, the child failed in the test, the parents especially the father should control even though his focus is on the legal sense. Kantian theories on controlling emotions, rather than on growing desirable emotions are the challenged that Baier wants to attack.

DISCUSSION QUESTION:

- 1) What does Baier mean when she speaks of the need "to transvalue the values of our patriarchal past"? Do new values replace the old ones? If so, then do we abandon the old values of justice, freedom, and rights?

Based on how I understood it, it means that to replace our values in the past, we should replace with the new value that is based on morality. I don't think we can't abandon the values of justice, freedom and rights. I can say that we just replace it by way of improving the values of the old justice, freedom and rights.

- 2) What is wrong with the Kantian view that extends equal rights to all rational beings, including women and minorities? What would Baier says? What do you think?

Kantian view is wrong in a way that they don't believe on equalities. I believed that males and females should be equal. Baier also believed that female should be given opportunity same with males.

- 3) Baier seems to reject the Kantian emphasis on freedom of choice. Granted, we do not choose our parents, but still don't we have freedom of choice about many things, and isn't this very important. Definitely, we have freedom of choice. But I think when morality comes to our life like abortion of our child is still I consider as immoral since a person should be responsible for her action. I believed that we have choice on things which does not have conflicts with morality. But if there is conflict, we should do the right thing to do. Freedom of choice is vital in our lives. That is why we should decide on the right thing to do.

HENERAL LUNA

(Movie Reaction Paper)

The movie Heneral Luna is about the life and how Heneral Antonio Luna saved our country even if his friends are traitors. I became more aware that our country has a lot of hidden story from the past. We thought things are right but the truth is the perception that we believe is wrong. I also understand why Filipinos are greedy of power. Even in the past there is a thing politics which many people killed someone just to maintain their power.

What I really like in the movie is that it tells the truth and what really happen in our country. When I watched that I am somehow angry on the past presidents because some of them were not that good model. This movie tells that in the past, if you are brave enough and you are in the right path to fight for what is correct, others say that you are a traitor or you are being arrogant.

I really admire this movie because it is historical and it is very entertaining because despite of the theme of the movie (action-historical) there is a little bit comedy. Actors and actresses are very good in acting. I learned a lot and I realized that once in a life time there is a brave man who fights for the justice of our country.

“If all the scientific knowledge were to be destroyed and only one sentence can be passed on to the next generations what will you pass?”

If all the scientific knowledge were to be destroyed and only one sentence can be passed on to the next generations I will pass the words “an atom is the source of all the things that happens in this world”. This statement I mention is not literally or not exactly the words that have been said by my professor. Our professor explained that all the things here in Earth come from an atom. It is the source of all things here in the universe. There are theories that will prove about this but if knowledge will be gone all people will start to be curious and they will know how to discover how they became human.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

AN ORACLE

Oracle as an artificial intelligence, it is a super intelligent ways which makes the AI function well. For example, if you will think of an object that/on how that object functions you will find ways and its meaning like what the google does. In a short span of time you can know the definition/meaning of what you want to know or to find. Oracle is an accurate way of an artificial intelligence because it shows the real and the literal meaning of what you want to find. Complexity of words are also shown in oracle because as the words or questions become deep you will find a way to answer that, because it stores a lot of answers and words.

A GENIE

As I read the definition of Genie, Artificial Intelligence functions as a Genie because as a human we are bound to execute command and action. We also have our own mind to determine our own action and also we have our own mind to come up an action which our brain thinks. A Genie is also a way of an AI which led us to perform high-level of performance according to Nick Boston. It is also a way for us to think for the next step and the best way to perform the task. It will make the task or an object to be better because it has steps on performing it. It will be the one to perform the next task of the object.

A SOVEREIGN

Artificial Intelligence as a sovereign, I think this way of an AI describes the learnings we want to share to the world, because as an Artificial Intelligence sovereign will be the one to operate and conduct an actions that will make the decisions best. Like for example, inventions of the scientists. They have this kind of way which helps them improve their experiments. They have tried several hypotheses that will make their inventions run and become useful. It is also a way which can help human like sovereign people have this kind of super intelligent without people there will be no AI because people are the one who analyze and make this kind of way to make human life more comfortable and easier.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Jenell Bernardino was born in Baguio City, Benguet. She is currently living at Caloocan City. She studies at De La Salle-College of Saint Benilde and taking up Bachelor of Science in Information Systems. This is her first ever book made.

DEDICATION

*“I dedicate this book to my parents and friends who motivated and helped me to be inspired. They are the one who help me pursue my dreams and take courage to finish this book. To my parents, friends and also to our God **THANK YOU!**”*