Jennifer Garcia

9/10/2013

Professor : Jeffrey Hinzmann

Promt 1

Morality is such a sensitive term to digest and define. It can

involve so many ways of definition depending on each person who decides to

tackle such a subject. A few factors that can be easily be involved in morality are culture, religion, and the way of nurturing. Although James Rachels description of “ the minimum conception of morality” seems a hundred percent precise there will be others to contradict his definition of morality. But when you compare for example the article written by Thomas Nagel who speaks in terms of “ Moral Luck”. In this reading one will realize that Nagel’s aspect of morality is different to Rachels mindset of morality.

When carefully read and analyzed Rachels way of describing “ the minimum conception of morality “ the conclusion is simple being that of a person to make decisions or take actions but with a conscience of what or who it will affect. I believe the best way to express his meaning to minimum conception of morality is where he states “ who is willing to “ listen to reason” even when it means revising prior conviction; (Rachels, 13). I feel that I would be one to easily relate to his definition of minimum conception of morality because for the most part in life things can develop and work easier if everyone would just take a second to take in what they are about to react to before making an action they may regret after is said or done. The best example to me is the one occurrence with the conjoined twins Jodie and Mary who were born. Now in this situation I would have to say that I would have considered what the doctor recommends simply because doctors are well aware on what will happen. I can’t see myself putting my religion in place for something so sensitive as this where in the end I could have that chance to at least have one live child in my arms. There again this is my way of morality and what I feel is right. I do believe that if the circumstances where to involve more time and opportunity to reason within the entire family that in the end the parents would have made the right choice.

Comparing Nagel’s train of thought on how he feels about morality versus Rachels mindset means two different worlds. The understanding to Nagel’s definition to morality is as he states it to be “ Moral luck”. In more details to Nagel’s understanding, he explains that moral luck is basically reacting and making choices at random not having any conscience and risking the outcome when it comes to light. A good example to Nagel’s term of Moral luck is where two drivers made the same wrong choices in drinking and driving and one driver didn’t come out so lucky at the end of the night because he ended hurting a pedestrian. It’s amazing how reading two different train of thoughts can have you thinking twice on morality overall. There is a part where Nagel’s goes about saying “ But is not enough to say merely that our basic moral attitude towards ourselves are determined by what is actual; for they are also threatened by the sources of that actuality, and by the external view of action which forces itself on us when we see everything we do belongs to a world that we have not created (Nagel, 582). Rachels comparison to Nagel’s term of morality is much simpler and to the point. He focuses it simply by making an understanding that morality works by justifying some ones behavior by reasoning and giving that fair judgment on what may have been the cause of the results to it.

In conclusion to it all my thoughts into if both Nagel and Rachels terms of morality relate are not so. I do think they disagree and one would survive this world much better than the other. I understand Nagel wants to point it out that overall the actions of someone and the judgment of that person should be judged in a certain manner. “ Moral judgment of a person is judgment of not what happens to him, but of him (Nagel, 581). As for Rachels terms of morality the judgment involves more than just the direct people involved in situation. In results it is out in the hands of others to judge and at times affects and overrides the persons actions they want to see occur. Reasoning over all takes a bigger part to Rachels terms of minimum conception of morality.