

(\*) Every man would give their individual rights to another man or assembly of men as long as everyone else does the same. This sovereign would rule them by the fear of punishment.

12) What are the conditions that lead to the war of all against all for Th. Hobbes? Why is equality among these conditions a problem? How can this state of war be prevented?

The state of war of all against all can essentially be resumed by this equation:

equality of ability + equality of end + Scarcity = "War of all against all"

So 3 elements lead to this state: equality of ability, equality in terms of desires (ends) and Scarcity (limited resources).

Equality among these conditions is a problem for Hobbes because we were created pretty equally (we are the same) and we also want the same things (we have the same aversions and the same desires). Even if some may be sometimes stronger or more intelligent, a less stronger person can subdue or trick the other in order to still "beat" them. Therefore, pretty equal. What is problematic in this equation is the Scarcity factor. Indeed, since we're all equals by ability and ends, we're all competing against each other for the same things and those things are limited. We're therefore trying to get as much of these limited resources as we can. but so are others = always on the defensive. The equality here causes a very brutal fight in order to win over the other.

This state of war could be prevented by what Hobbes call the "Sovereign" meaning someone or an assembly of person that would control each individual rights and would be those men by fear of punishment (\*).  
13) Why does M. Sagoff believe that it is acceptable to for me pursue my own interests and advocate against those interests?

M. Sagoff believes that every individual has 2 sides :

↳ restraint against those interests

- The consumer side which thinks in terms of his own benefit, his self-interest.
- The citizen side who wants to achieve what is best or right for its Society/Community has a whole.

Essentially, those 2 sides can be contradictory but this is <sup>(irrational)</sup> normal. After all, we are social animals. There's one side of us that values personal gain (self interest) that will pursue what is less costly for us and another side (the citizen) that want to make the right decision for the Society. (citizen)

He thinks this is alright because we shouldn't be expected to vote for what we shop for. Indeed, we want what's right for our community but why should we be the only ones to do so? That's where advocating against our own interests as consumers can be explain. We want to do the right thing as long as everyone else does it too. Therefore, we're going to vote (advocate) for something that we would not do if we would only consider ourselves (consumer) because we know that this would be the right decision for the community. Regulation would make this action mandatory for everyone, therefore making it more fair than if only one person's would do so (→ prevent the "free-rider" problem/worry).

14. What is speciesism and how is it analogous to racism? Why P. Singer think that intelligence is not such an important moral value?

Speciesism is an anthropocentric view from which lives of nonhumans is only morally significant if it has an utility for humans. Essentially, we'll judge the morality of our actions on non humans only if it has consequences on us (humans).

It is analogous to racism essentially because it consider humans superior to other species because of superior intelligence (that the other species don't have the same emotional and intelligence capacities). It's essentially the same principle that racism since racist people believed themselves superior to people of colour because they believed they were not capable of the same emotional intelligence (feel pain, pleasure, etc.)

Singer think that intelligence is not such an important moral value because of its utilitarian views. Utilitarian thinks that every situation is either good (pleasurable) or bad (painful, aversion). They therefore think that the moral important value is whether you can feel that pain or that pleasure.

Following that logic, a nonhuman gain moral significance if he can feel pain or pleasure. It's the case of most animals, they'll search the desirable situations and run away the painful ones, the same way an human would. It is not intelligence that is morally significant but the ability to feel pleasure and pain. The question is not can they think nor speak but can they feel the pain (suffer)?

→ (An idea from Jeremy Bentham)



# uOttawa

Faculté des arts  
Faculty of Arts

20/20