

HOW DIFFERENT PEOPLE HAVE DIFFERENT MORAL PHILOSOPHIES IN LIFE

People do not have different morals and do not live by different moral different cultures live life different ways and different countries have different morals, ethics, and philosophy individuals are left to decide what is real.

It might also keep you from being quick to criticise or distance yourself from others when they fail. For example people will not view their own government as immoral when it takes sales tax from purchases, property taxes from real estate purchases, and income tax from pay checks. Humbly realise that we all exploit ethical wiggle room. My point in all of this is to refute the idea that killing could ever be natural and good because if killing were natural and right then life would naturally try to kill itself when life comes into existence, instead life tries to survive thus survival must be natural and good. But just because a person suspends their morality for a certain need or want does not mean they have different morals than someone else. Descriptive: Different societies have different moral standards. Research in psychology has consistently shown that we often demand higher moral standards of others than we do of ourselves. For the intuitionist: moral truths are not discovered by rational argument moral truths are not discovered by having a hunch moral truths are not discovered by having a feeling It's more a sort of moral 'aha' moment - a realisation of the truth. Other studies show that after we commit a misdeed we temporarily loosen our memory of a moral rule or think that it does not apply to us as strongly. They usually go on to say that ethics is used by the dominant political elite as a tool to control everyone else. Many of the improvements in the world have come about because people opposed the prevailing ethical view - moral relativists are forced to regard such people as behaving "badly" Any choice of social grouping as the foundation of ethics is bound to be arbitrary Moral relativism doesn't provide any way to deal with moral differences between societies Moral somewhere-in-between-ism Most non-philosophers think that both of the above theories have some good points and think that there are a few absolute ethical rules but a lot of ethical rules depend on the culture. The fact that this person chose to punish their significant other with a punch proves that this person values the moral code of keeping promises, specifically the promise not to cheat while in a relationship. In normative ethics, a conclusion is drawn from the observation made above, namely that some action is wrong in one society and is right in another. This abhorrent killing has led to wars in Iraq, Bosnia, and other places when those who disagree with this action resort to military force to correct or stem the tide of ethnic cleansing. The second statement, from normative ethics, does attempt to derive a normative conclusion - namely, that the most moral choices are those which tend to enhance our well-being, or at the very least limit our pain and suffering. Traditionally, most of the field of moral philosophy has involved normative ethics - there are few philosophers out there who haven't tried their hand at explaining what they think people should do and why. AIDS is a sexually transmitted disease, prevalent amongst gays and lesbians. However, despite these apparent similarities, a cognitive gulf remains between humans and animals. If a monkey, ape, wolf, lion or any animal does something like kill another animal or use aggression against another animal, their behaviors can only be looked at as moral or immoral by a being that has the ability to create the idea of morality, thus the animal can never for themselves create morals. Ethical non-realists think that human beings invent ethical truths. Thus, it is an attempt to figure out what people should do or whether their current moral behavior is reasonable. Moral traits, such as being honest, fair and trustworthy, were valued more than other traits, such as being sociable or intelligent, across these roles. Life is most precious. There is a consequence to each one, whether good or bad. This immediately blackened my perception of my friend. Descriptive: People tend to make decisions which bring pleasure or avoid pain. If a human attempts to kill another human they are also attempting to end the survival of another human, which is immoral. There is almost always a prescriptive element in any real-world ethical statement: any ethical statement can be reworked with a bit of effort into a statement with an 'ought' in it. Analytic: Morality is relative. Modern thinkers often teach that ethics leads people not to conclusions but to 'decisions'. The person may have even thought they were doing something good, for example, if their misconduct was thought to benefit others. These statements are true if the person does hold the appropriate attitude or have the appropriate feelings. Many people believe that different people have different morals

HOW DIFFERENT PEOPLE HAVE DIFFERENT MORAL PHILOSOPHIES IN LIFE

because people recognize the fact that socio-paths exist, psycho-paths exist, serial killers exist, kidnappers exist, different cultures live life different ways and different countries have different laws and different penalties for breaking laws. The body seems to be built to survive not to exterminate itself. In a series of studies my colleagues and I have demonstrated that we value moral traits above all else. So, something is good because God says it is, and the way to lead a good life is to do what God wants. When people do this, they often see those who they regard as immoral as in some way less human or deserving of respect than themselves; sometimes with tragic consequences. Moral relativists think that that's just fine, and dispute the idea that there are some objective and discoverable 'super-rules' that all cultures ought to obey. Because of this many people will suspend their own morality, to enable them to do something they want at the moment. Intuitionists think that goodness or badness can be detected by adults - they say that human beings have an intuitive moral sense that enables them to detect real moral truths. Ethics as source of group strength One problem with ethics is the way it's often used as a weapon. There are no moral rules or rights - each case is unique and deserves a unique solution. If we sinned too dramatically, it would shatter this cherished belief.