

Moral Thinking: An Introduction To Values And Ethics

Prof. Vineet Sahu

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences

Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur

Week - 04

Lecture -21

Applied Ethics: Issues and Dilemmas

Hello everyone. So, today we are coming to a close of the course, and the concluding part of the course. And, we are talking about, Ethics in the Indian Tradition, and Applied Ethics, Issues and Dilemmas. So, let us just go through a brief overview of, what we have covered, as of now. So, these have been the various modules. So, module 1 to 4 is what we have completed till now.

And, these modules talk about, the essential concepts, theories, and problematisation of Ethics. Now, having been equipped with these four modules of understanding, basically problematising, module 1 problematises value theory, to make you see, where are the value troubles, and how do we use valuation, in the world of experience. Then, we come across certain concepts, good, right, duty, justice, equality, love, purusharthas. And then, go on with Egoism, Altruism, Ethical Relativism, and Universalism.

Then, we come to the domain of theories. When we talk about theories, we have talked about, Consequentialist, and Non-consequentialist theories. We have talked about, Hedonism, Utilitarianism, Deontological Ethics, and Ethical Rules, Situation Ethics, Virtue Ethics. Now, having done all this, let us take a step into the world. Having got this conceptual vocabulary, now you should be able to look at the world, look at a moral problem in the world, or look at any problem in the world, out there.

And, unearth its moral assumptions. So, how do you describe it, in terms of moral concepts. And, how do you make an argument, there of. So, both to understand and argue, the fifth module comes the deliverables of the course. So, here is where, Applied Ethics, which is also very interesting, because it is connected to our day-to-day lives.

And yet, it is also deeply theoretical, because it now starts encompassing, what are the theoretical assumptions, what are the concepts, that we can apply, from our learning in moral philosophy. Then, there is also, we leave a parting note of, on Ethics in the Indian

tradition. So, where we talk about, how Ethics has happened in the Indian tradition. Most of what we have learnt till now, is how Ethics has been formulated in the Western tradition. So, paying an ode to our own tradition.

So, if you look at, what the Indian tradition has talked about. And, that is quite an exhaustive topic. I will try to bring a comprehensive rendition of it, so that you can have some awareness of, how has Ethics been done in Indian tradition. So, to preserve the continuity between, what we have done in the first four modules, I will take this Applied Ethics issues and dilemmas, in the first part. And, Ethics in the Indian tradition, as the second part.

Because, you are fresh out of your exposure to moral theories and concepts. So, let us apply them to looking at, Applied Ethics, and what are the issues and dilemmas, that come across there. Well, to start with, what is Applied Ethics. Well, if you look at the word, applications. Applications are there of technology, applications are there of science.

Technology is frequently referred as the, application of science. So, when we look at application, it is looking at a core theory, or a core concept, or a core knowledge body, and its implementation in the world out there, in the world of experience, in the world where we live in. Right. So, Ethics also as a theoretical enterprise, also has an application to it. And that application is called, Applied Ethics.

Now, in Applied Ethics, we have issues and dilemmas. And, how do we think about it. So, how do we employ our moral conceptual vocabulary, to think about issues and dilemmas, that we come across in Applied Ethics. So, let us start with, I have listed out a few issues. And, let us start with a discussion of this.

I am sure, you can come up with many more issues. And, that is what is the objective of the course. That you are able to identify moral problems. You are able to identify moral layers, in regular problems. So, wherever you identify a value problem, you have the conceptual vocabulary to, A, identify it.

B, to think about it. And, C, to make a claim about it. So, this is what is the takeaway of the course, that you should be able to imbibe, from this rather short course. But, to have some familiarity with, how do you understand, or articulate in terms of moral vocabulary. Now, let us look at the first one.

Autonomous Vehicles, or Driverless Cars. Now, in autonomous vehicles, right. Well, we have all been, and especially if you are a student, or you are a technology enthusiast,

you would be aware that, a lot of companies and labs throughout the world, are working on this notion of the driverless car. And probably, it is an idea from science fiction, which is almost on the verge of being true.

Right. So, there goes in a lot of technology, in putting out driverless cars. And, that technology is almost, we are reaching the boundary of it, where it can be ready to be released into the world out there. Right. But, having the technology for driverless cars, is a significant advancement. But nevertheless, it is not the complete requirement, to put these driverless cars, or autonomous vehicles, or AI driven vehicles, on the road.

What are the other problems? Now, let us imagine, sometime in the future, one of the nation states will be the first one to delve the issue of autonomous vehicles, and give them a permit to drive on roads. Probably, first they may have a few set of limited roads, open to driverless cars, and then gradually see, how they interact, enhance more roads, then let them allow them to be on roads with cars, with human drivers. So, every parliament, or every government, or every institution, will devise its own ways for the implementation of this. But, prior to that implementation, there will be a debate, that will take place. There is a debate, that is already taking place, that can we allow autonomous cars on roads.

And, what is the problem with that. There are many problems, or there are many problems, that need to be resolved. And, let us look at a few things, from the notion of Moral Philosophy. Right. So, the crucial question, that you will have to make sense here, is that of Responsibility.

Now, if we find that, a driverless car is put on the road, who will be held responsible for it. Right. The notion of responsibility, or moral responsibility. When we look at this, whom do we look at, who will be the one, who will be responsible, in case something goes wrong. In the case of a driverless car, in case of a human driven car, we have the human being who is on the driver's seat, who can be held responsible for anything, that goes on with the car, at least with the driving bit of it.

If not, then we can also go to the manufacturer. So, I will put it out as, two levels of problems, that we come across. Right. So, one will be an autonomous driver, and one will be with a general problem with AI.

Right. So, one is autonomy, and the other is with AI. Now, with the autonomous driver, we will find that, we can come across, that the autonomous driver, not being a human, cannot be given responsibility for an error, or what can be given responsibility. The natural urge for us to locate responsibility in human beings, is what is now being upset.

Right. So, for an autonomous car, if a crash occurs, who can be blamed.

Now, one of it can be, that well, the designers of the car can be blamed, who are again human beings. But, here comes the second problem. That if, when we look at Artificial Intelligence, which has the capability to self-learn, self-correct, and absorb information from the environment, and make changes and decisions to its own programming. In that case, even the human programmer to a program, that drives a car, may not be held responsible, may not be even aware of the changes, that the AI brings about to the programming of the car. So, here, what I clearly see is, debate about the notion of moral responsibility.

That who would be given responsibility, for the way the car is driven. So, this is going to be one issue, that comes around with the autonomous vehicles, flying on the road. They may have reached a level of technology, that enables them to be put on roads, with human driven cars. But, there is a social and political debate, that has to take place before sanctioning it to be so. And, here is a notion, where these value problems do surface.

So, now let us come to the, so we look at the question of autonomous vehicles, and see what are the problems of implementation, or the value problems that occur with the implementation of autonomous vehicles, or driverless cars. Now, let us come to another sort of a thought experiment, but also which can be equated with many day realities. And, I call it the, he do not share. Now, what is the he do not share about. The he do not share is, the he do not share as you might guess, is a chair that comes out from the word, Hedonism.

Right. So, if we look at Hedonism, and we can assume that, let us say a chair comes into being, a he do not share, let us call it. Chair which can be plugged into your nervous system. And, it continuously is able to give you pleasurable sensations. So, the whole fact that, we desire pleasurable sensations. And, if this he do not share is plugged in, and gives us pleasurable sensations, should one be seated on such a chair.

Right. Now, imagine your nutritional needs are taken care of. And, you can spend a whole life sitting on this he do not share, and getting pleasurable senses, and your body being nourished by a nutritional pipeline. Right. There are many variations of this example.

If you look at, a brain in the vat. If, this is one example of it. Now, Matrix, the movie, is another example, where one has the option of either being plugged into the matrix, or being free. So, it has very often been contrasted with, being free. There are numerous

examples. There are, if you look at drugs, recreational drugs.

And here also, is the question lies embedded, the question that, what is wrong with drugs. Why should drugs be prohibited. That seems like an obvious claim. But, when we question it, why prohibit it.

Right. So, when we look at these questions. Now, these all are variations of the he do not share example. So, if we are able to get pleasurable sensations, being plugged into a machine, or from biochemical support, then should we, or should we not go for it. Should the government endorse it, or not endorse it. Painkillers, in that matter, are medicines that take away pain and suffering. They are legal, because they are of medical use.

So, let us just look at it, from a moral point of view, that how would we look at, the he do not share. Now, what are the issues over here, in the he do not share. The he do not share, will have first the issues of reality. That means, if we are plugged into a system, and we have pleasurable sensations, somewhere we feel, that is not being a part of reality, rather it is being a part of a simulation.

Right. So, reality versus simulation. And, this again gets us to, the further question of video games, or online gaming, or the whole notion of gaming, Virtual World. Now, the Virtual World enables us, to look at, to experience. And, the more immersive a Virtual World is, we can get an experience of, the kind of experiences, that we want, without the risks, that come with that experience, in the real world. Suppose I am fond of mountaineering. And, now I go into a mountaineering, I also, I go trying to climb the mountain.

And, I also take the risks, that come with climbing the mountain. Right. But, when I do it, say in an immersive virtual simulation, I can experience it, as if it is real, but yet not put myself in any jeopardy. Right. So, if that is the situation, should we look at it, as a boon, or shall we find something troublesome, or objectionable with it.

Now, many philosophers have argued that well, the hidden chair, or any of these that you see on the left, are not a desirable sense. Because, they look at redefining the notion, or actually clarifying the notion of happiness, or fulfilment in life. And, happiness and fulfilment is not something, that stands alone as a brain state, that can be replicated by a neural implant, or a chemical drug. Rather, as a holistic state, that comes into being, from taking the risks, taking the journey, taking the difficult journey, towards that state of happiness. So, if I sit in an excellence stimulation, say a metaverse, where I am absolutely engrossed, and have a completely immersive experience of climbing the mountain, and

feel the sense of conquest, when I reach the summit.

And yet, when I unplug, I find that, it was a good experience. It was like a movie, that I watched, totally immersive. And yet, there is something, which is different from the real world, that I inhabit. In the real world, I take the risks. So, risks as being essential, to the fulfilment experience.

So, this is one strain of analysing it. So, what is wrong with drugs. Drugs, in certain parts of the country, marijuana is legal, as a recreational drug. And, there are debates, that go along like this. When we look at, if you can have, you see the classical adage of, no pain, no gain. That seems to be corrected over here, when it says, there can be gain, without any pain.

So, if we look at, there is gain without any pain, what is the harm in it. Let us indulge in it. So, certain level, the virtual worlds, movies, drugs, the matrix kind of implant, brain in a vat. These are all examples, where we can bypass the, no pain, no gain principle. And have gain, without the consequences of the, or the risks of suffering, or pain that ensue with it.

So, the hedon chair, or any pleasure mechanism. There is one thing to research, to find a recreational drug, that reaches it. But, there is another thing to see, whether it is fitting with the human condition. Whether it is morally viable. Whether, does it do something, it gives us a sensation of pleasure, in the short run.

Or does it do so, in the long run also. That is where, the value debate ensues in it. So, a reason why drugs are prohibited. Well, let us say, if they harm your physical body. But, let us imagine, if recreational drug comes, is found, or is designed, which does not harm your body, which in fact provides you nutrition. So, if that is the case, would you think that, such a drug should be legalised, should be made available, or there is something wrong with it.

Now, to look at it on the value denominator, is to look at it, what is the notion of agency. Whether agency requires risks, or agency can be virtual, and we can bypass risks. The whole notion of a conquest or achievement comes, from the risks, that we take, in and around it. So, these are the variations of the, he do not share examples. And, by putting this as an example of Applied Ethics, what I want you to think over, is that, not take a clear stand, right away, on the basis of what I say.

These are much more complicated issues. And, this is just an introduction to you, so that you can take a look at, and think, spot applied ethical issues, in the world around

you. And, beginning to start, have a position, or make an argument on it. Now, let us look at another issue.

And, this issue is taxes. Do the rich owe anything to the poor. That is a question, that we need to now answer. Do the rich owe anything to the poor. Now, let us look at this taxes. If you thought, the taxes was just a financial or economic matter, well, definitely that is not the case. Because, the implementation of it, may be a numerical matter, or a financial matter.

On what basis, do we decide, how much is to be taxed. What is to be taxed, how much. Right. So, the percentage of taxation. And, this comes with the fundamental question, do the rich owe something to the poor. Now, if your answer to this is, yes, and yes a lot, then you would argue for a higher rate of taxation.

I understand, that taxation are also used to maintain, social and infrastructure, and fund the defence and police forces. But, in addition to that, the taxes are significant portions of taxes, go into welfare activities, which is subsidising the lesser affluent parts of society, from contributions, in fact forced contributions, from the more affluent portions of society. Now, there are, I would say, look at it in three steps. No taxes, meaning that well, if the infrastructure is taken care of, the rich do not owe anything to the poor. And therefore, there is no need for them, to have any tax component, the rich to subsidise the poor.

On the other hand, if one argues that well, if the rich are owe a lot to the poor, then the taxation rates are higher. And, the truth or the practice, throughout the world everywhere, is anywhere between these two extremes. So, how much to the rich, or we the society, owe to the lesser affluent, will determine on, what is the rate of taxation. So, if you look at the rates of taxation, across the world, you would get an idea about, what kind of philosophy, that particular country follows. And, that again comes from, what kind of value debate has taken place, in its Parliament, in its Constitution, and its ethos of governance.

So, taxes are again an example, that do the rich owe anything to the poor. And, one way of looking at it is, yes. Another way is, no. And, the bulk of the way is between, yes, but to what extent. In fact, there have been philosophers like, Robert Nozick, who have argued taxation as slave labour.

And how do they justify this, taxation as slave labour. Because, if you pay 20% taxes, you work for 100 days. So, your salary or your income is for 80 days. The rest 20 day salary or income, you give it, as a part of the taxes. So actually, you have worked 80

days for yourself, and the other 20 days, you have worked as a slave labour, to pay taxes.

This is an interesting rendition of taxation. And I think, I share it, so that, it can provoke you to think in another less taken perspective, a hard right perspective, that talks about taxation as something as, unfair and slave labour, to the ones who are paying taxes, especially higher rates of taxation. So, do the rich owe something to the poor, is a question to be decided in the Parliament, to be decided by the nation state. And once that is decided, how much do we owe, or how much does the society owe, then we go around and modify the details of the system. So, the foundational questions are answered by the value positions taken. And thereafter, how to implement those value positions, into the debate, is what takes place by the details of the policy, so the taxation policy.

Now, let us come to another issue. Let us say, the issue of capital punishment. Now, capital punishment, right, is life sentencing. Life is our foundational fundamental resource, that we have. Now, if you look at life itself, and can the state take away our life, or whatever crime we may have done. So, capital punishment believes that, yes, the state in the interest of justice, has the power to take away one's life. Whether capital punishment should be a form of punishment, or it should be banned as a form of punishment.

If you look at countries, throughout the world, many nation states have done away with capital punishments. Many states have continued to keep capital punishment. Now, the value question beneath it is that, what can we think as the questions, that we have beneath it here is that, can people improve, can people be forgiven. And, how much can one be punished for one's violations.

Is life imprisonment, a better option. And, a state that cannot give life, does it have the right to take life. So, there are various, and this is a widely debated issue, I am sure you must have heard of it. So, there are variations of this issue also, that makes a lot of deep and profound debate. So, look at an example, which I can think of right now.

Is, imagine a criminal, who is convicted of his crime, or her crime. And thereafter, she or he genuinely loses her memory. She or he, no more remembers the crime, or the presidencies. Right. Has had some brain anomaly, and has forgotten the entire issue, has forgotten his or her entire life, suffers from a form of amnesia.

Can that person, that physical person, still be held responsible for that crime. Can the person still be punished. Right. Some insanity, which is very often cited, in cases of people turning insane. So, now the answer to this, if intuitively or instinctively, may be yes, no.

Somebody has, there is a crime being done, and somebody has been convicted. So, irrespective of their memory, they have forgotten. But, imagine from the perspective of that person, that that person is no more cognizant of the crime, that has been done, has completely lost memory, and will find oneself incarcerated, or punished, for no reason, that he can know of. So, memory as a sense of agency. How important is memory, to this sense of agency.

So, there are various layers to this question. And, I am just throwing around a few layers, that you can think of. And, I am sure, you can add many more. And, if you read around, there will be much more to that. Now, let us go to another question, that do grown children, owe anything to their parents. Now, that seems to be again a question, that can be answered, obviously in the affirmative, that of course, children owe something to their parents.

Now, the counter view to this, and these questions matter, because even our Legislatures and Parliaments world over, debate whether, parents are entitled to a support, financial or otherwise, from children. India itself has had made laws regarding this. So, one argument, one strain, there is an interesting paper of the same name. And, if you look around, maybe I will put it up in the reference, you can take a look at it. One strain of argument, less taken, but interesting to spread the debate, is that well, children were neither asked to be born.

And therefore, for parents, children are not investments, that should yield return. So, it is good, that children look after their parents, and they do something for their parents. But, it is not obligatory. This is one line of argument. If this is the argument, that is to be held, then legally also, or morally, we cannot expect grown children, to support their parents, as something which is mandatory. This sounds very counterintuitive, but hear it through, as an alternative judgement, or alternative line of reasoning.

Then let us come to this question of, what do citizens owe to the nation, immigration and emigration. Now, we are all born in a particular country, we have a citizenship, that is not chosen. Now, if it is not chosen, then are we required to be loyal to it. So, does that, if it is not chosen, do we have any sense of loyalty to it, or should we have any sense of loyalty to it.

So, some people who emigrate from one nation to the other, should that be seen in a moral compass. There are nations, which welcome immigrants, at a cost. So, if you make a deposit into their banking systems, or into their national systems, you are welcomed with a citizenship to their country. There are countries, which are strict about

emigration. They do not allow people to emigrate.

So, countries which are open about citizens, leaving their citizenship, and taking up a new citizenship. So, there is again a value component, to this whole notion of citizenship loyalty, to the nation. At a very instinctive, or not even intuitive, but I would say instinctive level, one would say that, one should be loyal to one's country. Which is also true, but what is the reason for it, and what is the reason not to validate it. So, why should a country suddenly now stop emigration at all.

So, it should deny all its citizens to emigrate. Say, North Korea does not allow emigration. If I remember correctly, China perhaps does not allow emigration, or not in a smooth fashion. So, why should a nation allow or disallow emigration. Why should a nation allow or disallow emigration. Now, these are questions of loyalty.

These are questions of agency, of choices that one has not made, and yet one has to be committed to it. So, I am generally giving you an alternative line of argument, which gets you to think that well, which contests are intuitive or instinctive position on this, so that it spreads the debate. So, emigration is fine, if one can pay duties of reparation, as Ross would have said, that well, we have consumed. And, our country of birth has given, our nation of birth has given us, so much of support. And, we can as well as compensate, or pay the expenditure, it has invested in us.

And then, feel free from the obligation, to continue in the same nation. Do these things seem reasonable, unreasonable, far-fetched, or futuristic, or downright wrong. This is how, you would think about this particular issue and debate. Now, let us look at another issue in Applied Ethics. Something that may be close to many of your hearts, if you have been a student, or you are a student. That is, the reservation policy in India, which in Philosophical Literature, is often referred to as something called, Affirmative Action.

And, this Affirmative Action is based on the duties of reparation. Now, the fundamental question here is, does one generation inherit the, I think inherit the consequences of the acts of the previous generation. Please pardon my handwriting, because it is already not great. And, with the screen, it turns out to be even more challenging to write legibly. But, I hope it is legible. So, the essential question here is, before you jump to the opinion that you have, look at what is the debate beneath it.

What has been the justification about it. So, does one generation inherit the consequences of the acts of the previous generation. Now, instinctively, one might say, no. If one is looking at it, from the reservation or affirmative action angle. But, if one stops, and also looks at the advantages, one gets from the acts of the previous generation.

Say, your ancestors have built a house for you. So, your property comes from your ancestors, without your active role in that. The kind of culture, that your family has set up, you inherit that culture. So, if you inherit the advantages, do you also need to inherit the disadvantages. So, and if you inherit the disadvantages, then does the oppressed owe something to the oppressor, even in the next generation.

So, duties of reparation is, what is invoked in affirmative action. So, does the collective owe it, does the oppressor owe it. So, the notion of affirmative action, world over, or reservation as known in India, is typically when, this duties of reparation are hold as something, which is sacred, and which needs to be settled. That each generation, does not have a break-even, and things are carried forward. So, when they are carried forward, there is the next generation, which owes, without actually being the perpetrator of the oppression.

This can be seen in various societies, in Indian societies, or caste based oppression. In different societies, there has been race based oppression, there has been colour based oppression. So, all of these oppressions, to make good these oppressions, or to compensate for earlier oppressions. So, this is the crucial word, oppressions across generation.

Can they be forgotten. Because, even the notion of oppression, across phases of life. So, somebody who is, may have been a cruel tyrant. Let us say, the famous story that we know of the conversion of King Ashok, from the Chandashok to the Dharmashok. From where, from an aggressive conqueror, who spilled a lot of blood on war grounds, to a religious Ashokar, Dharmashok, who abode violence, and shunned away violence.

Can that Dharmashok be still seen, be held responsible, for what he did as Chandashok. Absolutely yes. And, that is also the reason why, across not just a human life, but across generations also, duties or oppressions, and reparations are carried over. This is one aspect of the, or the lesser taken aspect of the notion of reparation. So now, let us go into another aspect of Applied Ethics, Sexuality and Morality. This is quite a crucial aspect of Morality.

Because, well, the fundamental question here is, is there anything moral about Sexuality. Perhaps, I will do a small interesting paper on this, to further bring about this debate as an Applied Ethics issue. That is, there anything moral about Sexuality. Now, you might have an immediate answer, that comes to you, because that is the position that you have been holding. But, if you could just suspend that judgement, and go and look at the question, as a philosopher.

That well, the notion of morality and sexuality, do they have any connection. Because, if they do have connection, then a lot of regulation, a lot of moral components, come in guiding the domain of Sexuality. But, if they are not, then Sexuality is just like any other physical act, and it need not be governed, under moral norms. So, the whole notion of the uniform civil code. It looks at social relations, and a minor part of it, as sexual relations also, which should be under the ambit of civil code, and therefore under the ambit of the government, and legislation, then laws of the state.

Does marriage, as an institutional recognition of a union of two people. Now, does that seem to be an unnecessary feature, that well, as long as two people agree to be together, it does not matter, whether it is recognised by the society, or by the state, or does it deserve to be recognised by the society and the state. How do we look at marriage and relationships. Right. And, this is not just the question of Sexuality, it is also now to the question of relationships. Do the relationships, stand as between two individuals, or there is a role of social and state legal recognition, for these relationships.

As of now, this is a current state of affairs. But, these can always be varied. So, are there instance of Sexuality, that are bereft of morality. Now, let us come to another topic. Now, I am just putting these out over there, so that you can take a look and think over it, at what sense does it make. Let us say, another classic issue that comes about is, freedom of speech and privacy.

Now, we all have the right, or we think we have the right to express ourselves. But, expressing ourselves also can be hurtful to the dignity of others. Right. Privacy needs to be respected. Now, if you look at the history of a human civilisation, or even a short span of history of your lived life, you would see, how the notion of privacy has changed over the years.

Probably two decades back, asking somebody of their marital status, would not have been seen as a, invasion of privacy. But, today asking somebody, or especially a stranger asking you of your marital status, is regarded as an invasion of privacy. So, as we see the notion of the role of privacy, also changes. Freedom of speech now, that has new connotations, when it comes to the notion of social media, and the internet enabled media. Now, one can make a comment about anything, anywhere. And, there can be social media bullying, there can be trolling, there can be a lot of cyber bullying, that can be seen as at one angle, as a freedom of expression, that it is just an expression, why should it matter to the other.

On the other hand, it can also be seen as an act of bullying, that as an invasion of

privacy. So, when we look at freedom of speech, and privacy, the balance that we need to strike between these two opposing forces, will be calibrated by, what kind of moral values, we as a collective, or as an individual, hold as sacred. So, that is where, the moral debate goes on. And, if you look at parliamentary debates, you look at legal code pronouncements, they are all rich with this debate, that takes place with finally taking a position, what they need to solve. Say, another example that occurs to me, about an applied ethics issue, is the notion of suicide, whether suicide should be legal or criminal.

Now, India has gone through a history, where it was criminalised, and then it was decriminalised. So, does one have the right to take one's own life. In one conceptualisation, one would think that, yes, one owns one life, and one's own life, and therefore, one has the right to take it. On another, perhaps a more Communitarian conceptualisation, one could think of, well, the first conceptualisation, let me call it individual.

And the second one, let me call it, Communitarian. That means, your life is neither wholly built by you, nor wholly owned by you. The community has played a role in your coming into being. And, you owe the community something. So, you do not have an absolute ownership of your life.

Therefore, suicide is something, that should not be legal. So, there are Nordic countries, which hold suicide as legal. And I am not talking about euthanasia, but I am talking about suicide, not emanating from any terminal illness. So, and then there are nations, which hold suicide as illegal. So, how do we look at suicide, how do we cast a judgement on suicide, whether it is to be done. So, these are some of the big questions, that come about, or applied ethical questions, that come out and touch our lives. Maybe, I will add a few more, and two or three applied ethics questions, done in detail, in the subsequent videos, so that you can make sense of, what it means to go ahead with an applied ethical question. So, I will stop for now. Thank you very much. .