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By employing the thought experiment about the ‘Trolley Problem’, I will consider the most debated concerns and will analyze the moral, legal and ethical consequences of each scenario. Although the same and confused, there is a clear difference between morals and ethics. Moral largely deals the affairs among individuals, however ethics are a ‘prescribed code (Marino 2010)’ workable almost in all situations. To understand the differences between the meaning and concept of ethics and moral here, I can employ the understanding put forwarded by Lord Patrick Dalvin and Adolphus Hart. They both have worked extensively on moralism (Foot 2002). Despite the differences, I will use the ideas suggested by these theorists since their ideas represent the two differential point of views; which I plan to explain all through the essay.

As mentioned earlier, I will use the problem developed by Philippa Foot to consider the problems related to ethical concerns and theories in order to suggest the solution for this. The trolley problem; the car is confronting a situation where killing one passenger can save the lives of five pedestrians. So should the program be focused over sacrificing the passenger or the pedestrian? For a moment, every individual thinks, that stopping the trolley and emptying the track is the best option, however, the situation at here requires an unconventional approach. The individual can often think that since keeping the car on the same track will make it inevitable the killing of each person on the same track, therefore, the track should be changed and the persons on the previous track should be evacuated. However, the only available options remain is to either not play a role which can result in the death of the five persons or flip the car to sacrifice the one passenger. Here the programmer faces the moral dilemma since it has to be decided on the basis of ethical decisions which can create negative outcomes. Finally, the outcome of the decision will definitely be right or wrong.

By considering the two possible actions for the individual involved, I will now analyze the trolley problem. I will first explain the theories of Lord Devlin and Hart. I will then relate this problem to these theories. Hart, as being a totalitarian believed that each individual has some certain rights (Raz 1984), therefore considering his view, the flip action which might end the life of an individual is unacceptable. In any situation, Hart’s theory cannot be interpreted as killing the only person on the road is an acceptable option. For him, it is by all means morally wrong to decide the fate of an individual’s life. He appears of the view that no individual has the right (by any mean) to interfere in the life of others, whatsoever are the consequences. The totalitarian approach in the sociological context don’t care for the outcomes, it just focuses on some certain initial action which should earn a positive outcome.

In contrast to this, the Utilitarian approach offered by Devlin considers the flip side as an argument. This approach of Devlin interpret each cause of the intended action and sums up the debate by suggesting to choose the best outcome (Dworkin 1966). A participant who is the follower of this approach will consider the most suitable option, which considering the case study is to switch the car toward one passenger. As argued by Philippa's foot, ‘the greatest good should be for the greater number of people (Dworkin 1966)’. This thought is derived from the ‘greater happiness principle’ again crafted by foot. The application of this principle suggests choosing the flip action. The participant involved choosing this option will justify his actions by referring to the lifesaving of five people. They will suggest that saving five lives is far better option compared to the second option. Although, by all means it is wrong to pick and choose between whom to kill or not, the utilitarian approach has reasoning behind this. The utilitarian principle suggests that ‘morality is based on the quantitative maximization (Dworkin 1966)’. However, this approach is misinterpreted many times.

Another factor which appears important is the reference toward the legal implications of this. Since it will be an injustice to explain and interpret moral and ethical problems in certain kind of the situation, without mentioning its legal interpretation. It appears pertinent to refer to the difference between moral and legal rules. The concept of law in this situation suggests that ‘(Hart et al. 2012)if any individual becomes involve in the action which is large and by law considered wrong, irrespective of the fact that it goes with morals and ethics, the individual will be held accountable ’. Hart also explains this situation as ‘if an individual breaks the law or commit an act which goes against the prescribe law, by all means, he or she will be held accountable, and will be punished legally (Hart et al. 2012).’ Now relating such interpretation of law with the trolley incident, were saving the lives of five people and killing one is considered morally and ethically right, but whatsoever the situation is, it goes against the law and the individual will be held accountable for the loss of one life.

Now one is right to think that the relationship which links any state law and moral or ethical values is by no means simple. Legal and moral rules, however, collaborate at very little places. Hart believes ‘morals and ethics share a little habit of obedience, but it remains within a society where they are easily applicable (Raz 1984)’. These both differ in many ways. For example, the rules which are ethically and morally right does not conform in any way to the legal aspects and it is vice versa. Then there are some cases where both rules overlap, since law applies to each individual of the society, whereas morals are relevant to personal dealings and can be applied to certain number of people or any specific group of the society. Similarly, there are specific areas or social classifications where morals and ethics are relevant to some certain times or in certain dealings, otherwise the mutual affairs can either conform to moral and ethical obligations or to the legal aspects.

I will now consider the ethical issues involved in this case. We need to put two theoretical approaches here to consider this aspect. For example, we may consider the French episode of wearing religious symbols; we can also consider a twin case which involves both the interpretation of the legal aspect and that of the moral and ethical concept. These examples will help to come up with the most suitable legal option, which will be the perfect outcome for both of the two situations mentioned in the scenario. In the first case, mentioned above, the French government banned wearing religious symbols which were interpreted badly by Muslim, since it all started with the ban on veil in the schools. Although, it was step toward preventing the Christian values, however, the Muslim community felt aggrieved and betrayed. The utilitarian approach now considers this as greater happiness for greater people but totalitarian will see this as an act to target certain people (Lama 2012).

The second case involves religion and medicine. The case suggests that a couple from Malta hired the services of a hospital-based in Manchester to complete a complicated delivery. The daughters were joined by abdomen and the possible situation required to ending the life of the weaker child, in order to ensure that other child gets complete body parts before the delivery takes place or right after they come into the world. The couple which was a roman catholic wanted both children to be separated in the finest way possible and; the consequences (irrespective of the fact that they will be bad) must be left to God. The hospital administration took the case to court, which decides that the weaker child must be medically terminated, just in order to ensure a biologically complete birth of the second child.

In light of the court orders to end the life of the weaker child, one may consider the fact that court-ordered to ensure the life of one with strong chances of survival. Although religiously, ethically and morally wrong, but court’s decision was much relevant to the fact that in going against this decision, the life of both children would have been at risk (West 1991). Similar is the case with the scenario opted for this situation.

I will switch the trolley car on the track where the minimum loss is expected, since the modern science provides us the option to predetermine some consequences, therefore, the law, ethics, morals, and the situational circumstances permit drifting the car over second track where five people will sustain their lives, however, unfortunately, one person will lose the life. The utilitarian approach is the most suited option since it assures the safety and survivability of five persons. The limit of laws are rigid but after some deliberations they, however, make the space for the right decision. Since it is not possible to complete the track without making someone sacrifice, therefore one person will be sacrificed to ensure the lives of five.
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