

2.

a. Hobbes' ethical theory would fall under the consequentialist perspective. Consequentialism is all about completing an action if that action promotes the best possible outcome for the situation. This means that it might not necessarily be morally right, but it is for the greater good because it gives us the best outcome. An example of this action that comes to mind would be the trolley problem where you have the ability to switch the track from left to right, and on the left track is one person tied down to the track. In addition, the right track has five people tied down to the track. A consequentialist view would decide to change the trajectory of the trolley to the left track because even though someone is going to die it is better to save the five people than just the one. This is why I believe that Hobbes' ethics fall into this category because he describes humans as rational individuals who are stuck in the state of nature. The state of nature in Hobbes' eyes is nasty, poor, brutish, and short, but since we are rational human beings Hobbes states that we are going to figure out the best way to preserve our own life. This is where the consequentialist view comes into play because Hobbes states that we would give up our rights to a king to preserve our lives because it might not be the greatest, but it is the best possible consequence for every human being compared to being in the state of nature. So, because of this, we are going to keep giving up our rights because if we try to take them back, we will end up back in the state of nature.

b. Locke's ethical theory would fall under utilitarianism. Utilitarianism means that whatever action is responsible for obtaining the greatest good for the most amount of people is right. I believe this to be the case because Locke also believes that we are rational individuals, but where Locke differs from Hobbes by saying that we as humans would cooperate with one another. When we cooperate with one another we are helping each other out. Locke's state of nature is also different compared to Hobbes'. Locke's state of nature is a lot more peaceful and nice compared to Hobbes' nasty and bad state of nature. Locke goes on to talk about how the individuals in society will give up their rights to their personal property to not a king but a government of checks and balances that way it can be protected. They don't give all their rights to the government like in Hobbes' state of nature because they want to be able to keep the government in check. So, the government will only be dealing with political issues, and the individuals will be dealing with their private issues. Having this power granted to the government is giving the greatest good to pretty much all of the people, and that is why Locke's ethics fall under utilitarianism.

c. The movie seems to lean more towards Hobbes' view. This is because the movie talks about the Vietnam War, and how deadly human beings can be granted they are not kept in check. It describes how dark and chaotic the war was, showing how violent we as humans can become because we are rational enough to understand that in order to achieve something we have to use violence to get it. This is because there is no such thing as cooperation in the world, and this proves a point because if we were to cooperate, we would not be having a war in the first place we would all be working together to try and protect gods' property. This is why I believe the movie can not fall under Locke's ethics because his is about cooperation while the movie is portraying a more, a dog eat dog world in the scene of the Vietnam War.