Reflection paper

The central issues highlighted in Lovin and Reynold’s “Cosmogony and Ethical Order” is of ethical order and its implications of the society. It discusses the principles and premises behind the social issues of good and evil. Tatayku in “Theological Implications” addresses the core issues of right and wrong or good and evil. Applying the theological and religious views for understanding the complex problem of ethics is the central focus of this reading. It also discusses the existentialist problem and how it is related to this world. The question of proper moral reasoning is a core issue discussed on both readings. Both readings offer some similar insights into solving the problem of ethics or moral dilemma. The most convincing point made by Tatayku is of the socio-economic and environmental factors having significant impacts on the ethics and state of people’s mind. Lovin and Reynold have also highlighted this core issue by stating that social relationships and role of ethics is sometimes misunderstood. Both studies have thus focused on solving the problem of how ethics can be used in real life scenario and also in relationships. Lovin and Reynold have addressed the issue by comparing the two extremes such as the rich and the poor. While Tatayku has attempted to solve the moral dilemma by relying on the theologian and religious views.

I was surprised to learn how each reading share its concerns on ethical problems. The reading of Lovin and Reynold stresses on uncovering the truth and reality of evil and good. I was previously unaware about the role of ethics in transforming or defining the social relations. I was surprised about the Andréa cosmogonies, which provides practical implications of moral dilemma and its impacts on the people. These cosmogonies don’t offer moral or ethical codes which I believe makes it complicated for the common people to understand the role of ethics. I was also surprised to learn Tatayku ‘s view which states “no religious interpretation can be thoroughly neutral with respect to current cosmovisions”. The definition of religion on ethics is based on the needs and existentialism in the society. I also learned that the religion interpretation is not neutral. This means a common man has to rely on self reasoning which is complex. This allowed me to learn that not all humans are capable of understanding ethics.

I have been challenged by these readings when I relate them to personal growth. As mentioned by Lovin and Reynold it is difficult for people to interpret the role of ethics in creative situations. When I consider my personal growth it is even more challenging for me to examine situations ethically because my ultimate goal is to address my personal needs. I am also challenged by the reading of Tatayku which states that the role of ethics changes in cultures and religions. I personally believe that irrespective of differences among cultures there are some universal ethical principles such as hurting others or lying in any situation is wrong. Both readings have allowed me to change some of my thoughts on ethics.

I am still wondering do ethics change according to situations? Is there any role of situations or factors on ethics? These are the questions that comes to my mind after reading these sources. I believe that Lovin and Reynold have focused to some extent on the role of external factors such as the socio-economic aspects. While in Tatayku’s reading there is more emphasis on the theologian and religious views. This raises more questions and I have to rely on personal capability for solving the ethical dilemma.