

Mateo, Alberto Nel R.  
OOB

## Chapter 1: Egoism and Moral Scepticism

Amazon Reference: <http://www.amazon.com/Contemporary-Moral-Problems-James-White/dp/0534584306/>

Quote: "The thing to be lamented is, not that men have do great regard to their own good or interest in the present world, for they have not enough."

What I expect to learn:

I expect to learn about the essence of Egoism and Moral Skepticism.

Review:

This chapter focuses on the two kinds of egoism. These are mainly the ethical and the psychological egoism. These two might be synonymous, but they are far different from each other when they are properly analyzed.

Psychological egoism is the perspective wherein humans are selfish in everything they do in which they only act in accordance to their self interest. If we are to analyze it, it may have some sort of truth in it. But going deeper can give us a clue that humans are not always selfish in their acts. A very good example is when someone foregoes his own enjoyment for the sake of helping other people. We can't say that it is an act of selfishness but it can be considered as an act of self-interest if it is in which case. It's because that if the interest of that person is the welfare of others, then that is not acting selfishly. Another thing that would support the idea of humans being unselfish is that when a person get satisfied in helping others. We can't say that it is for his own interest because there will be no selfish person that would become satisfied when helping others.

Ethical egoism on the other hand, tells us that humans are only obliged to act for themselves and nothing else. If we are to find some logical error into it, then there might be none. But there are things that it does which shouldn't be the case. It challenge our moral confidence to a demand of an explanation on the reason of adopting policies in which other's welfare are given importance. Thus it forgets the value of sympathy that every human has. A human without sympathy can't be considered as one. It is to say that in these kinds of arguments, reason alone is not the solution.

What I have learned:

- Both types of egoism have their own pitfalls.
- Humans are not selfish in nature.
- Self interest and Selfishness are two different things.
- There are more things in consideration aside from reason alone.

### Integrative Questions:

- What is the difference between the two types of egoism?
- How can human be unselfish?
- What is the value that is forgotten in ethical egoism
- What are the types of egoism?
- How is self interest differing from selfishness?

### Chapter 2: Religion, Morality and Conscience

Amazon Reference: <http://www.amazon.com/Contemporary-Moral-Problems-James-White/dp/0534584306/>

Quote: "Reflection is morally indispensable."

### What I expect to learn:

I expect to learn about the difference of religion and morality and how they can be related to each other.

### Review:

In this chapter, John Arthur discusses the connection of religion to morality. On the later part, he explained how these two things are different to each other in a detailed manner but somehow can influence each other. He also concludes in this chapter that conscience is in a social means in which where morality became the same. It is the reason as to why morality can be studied and learned.

First, we might be wondering that we are somehow sure that religion is essentially connected to morality. But if we are to think of it again, we can conclude that religion is not important in gaining morality. We can say it by merely observing ourselves when we are making a decision. We create our decision based on different factors but we don't necessarily include religion onto it or maybe we don't mind it at all. Thus, we can conclude that morality does not depend on religion. Another distinction is that morality involves attitude towards different forms of behavior while religion involves worship and beliefs to a supernatural being. See now? Religion can be somehow inside morality because having a religion may differentiate a behavior of a certain person.

These two may be connected in a way that they influence each other. Religion can influence morality in terms of motivation on doing what it right. On the other hand, morality influences religion through the concept and existence of conscience. It is also discussed that morality can't be dependent on religion in applying the divine command theory. It's because a command cannot be associated to what is good or bad. An example is that the parents want us to do well but it doesn't mean that what they command us to do is always good.

As to conclude the argument of Arthur, We can say that morality is social because it depends on social factors like the things we learn from interaction. In line with the conscience, there is the possibility in which God plays a role into it. It is for the reason that putting ourselves in the situation of others helps us to reflect on what is the right thing to do. Thus, we can consider the reaction of others (including God).

This leads to the essence that morality is not only to be taught but a must to be had by every person.

What I have learned:

- Role of God in conscience
- Difference of morality and religion
- Morality as social
- Connection of morality, religion and conscience
- Importance of morality to people

Integrative Questions:

- What are things involved in morality?
- What are things involved in religion?
- How is conscience related to morality?
- Why does God play a role in terms of conscience?
- How the divine command theory is to be disassociated with morality?

Chapter 3: Master and Slave Morality

Amazon Reference: <http://www.amazon.com/Contemporary-Moral-Problems-James-White/dp/0534584306/>

Quote: "The noble type of man regards himself as a determiner of values."

What I expect to learn:

I expect to learn the meaning and gap between the master and slave morality.

Review:

This chapter discusses two types of morality according to what kind of person is holding it. These are the master morality and slave morality. These two things seem to be of the opposite side but both entail right and wrong character which teaches us to be observant on how we will act.

The first type is the master morality. This type is the one which can also be consider as the morality of the ruler. Here, we can say that those people are the ones which they think that they are the ones who identify what is good or evil. This leads to a synonymous term which is the noble and despicable. A noble man considers himself distinguish from others and whatever he says will be praised and acknowledge by the many. He always thinks that everything he has is good and what they don't have is bad. Thus, he labels himself as the determinant of values. We may somehow see this kind of attitude in an egoist. Both of them use morality only for self-glorification. They may be able to help those that are unfortunate, but it is not because of kindness or pity, rather it is because of the superabundance of their resources that they want to find some usage for it rather for it to waste. They always honor themselves in the way that they see themselves powerful and he is the only one who has power over himself. The good thing here is that a noble man knows the manner to speak and to keep silence. The point here is that this type of morality considers that everything that entails them to be more powerful will always be consider as good even it destroys

other people.

The second and last type is the slave morality. This type is also known to be the morality of the ruled. Here there is the despised for the virtue of the powerful and distrust to everything that is considered good for those nobles. In this kind of morality, they consider having power to be of evil since it is the cause of their oppression. They also consider that those who spread fear are the ones who are bad while when it comes to the perspective of master morality, it is considered to be good. In this kind of morality, one can be considered as good when he is good-natured and easily deceived. Thus, they have a characteristic that is not appropriate in our kind of world. It is their stupidity. Even so, they have a great character in which everyone would also have in our world nowadays. It is their desire for freedom. It is a character which helps them to strive for happiness and to find their own liberty. It can't be seen by those nobles didn't endure suffering at the first place.

Even the two types of morality have their own pros and cons. It is just the matter of judgment as to what we retain and what we need to extinguish in order to live a morally good life.

What I have learned:

- Both types of morality have their positive and negative characteristics.
- The two types of morality could be a gauge of power in the society.
- It is power that separates master and slave morality.

Integrative Questions:

- What is master morality?
- What is slave morality?
- What is the other term referring to the slave morality?
- What are the major characteristics of master morality?
- What are the major characteristics of slave morality?