

<http://www.philosophyexperiments.com/fatman/Default.aspx>

Should You Kill the Fat Man?

This activity is a treatment of some of the issues thrown up by a thought experiment called 'The Trolley Problem', which was first outlined by the philosopher, Philippa Foot, and then developed by Judith Jarvis Thomson and others. But before we start properly, we need to ask you four preliminary questions so we get a sense of the way that you think about morality. There are no right or wrong answers. Just select the option that most corresponds to your view.

Hauria de matar l'Home Gras?

Aquesta activitat és un tractament d'alguns dels assumptes creats per un experiment de pensament anomenat 'El Problema del Tròlei', que va ser dissenyat primerament per la filòsofa, Philippa Foot, i llavors desenvolupat per Judith Jarvis Thomson i altres. Però abans que comencem pròpiament, necessitem demanar-li quatre qüestions prèvies per calibrar quin és el seu sentit de moralitat . No hi ha cap resposta correcta o equivocada. Només seleccioni l'opció d'allò que més correspon al seu punt de vista

Question 1: Torture, as a matter of principle, is always morally wrong. Yes

Qüestió 1: La tortura, com a qüestió de principi, és sempre moralment equivocada.

1

Question 2: The morality of an action is determined by whether, compared to the other available options, it maximises the sum total of happiness of all the people affected by it. Yes No

Qüestió 2: La moralitat d'una acció està determinada per si, comparat amb les altres opcions disponibles, maximitza el total de suma de felicitat de totes les persones afectades per això

Question 3: It is always, and everywhere, wrong to cause another person's death - assuming they wish to stay alive - if this outcome is avoidable. Yes No

Qüestió 3: És sempre, i a tot arreu, incorrecte provocar la mort d'una altra persona - assumint desitgen quedar-se vius - si aquest resultat és evitable

Question 4: If you can save the lives of innocent people without reducing the sum total of human happiness, and without putting your own life at risk, you are morally obliged to do so. Yes No

Qüestió 4: Si pot salvar les vides de gent innocent sense reduir el total de suma de felicitat humana, i sense posar la seva pròpia vida en perill, està obligat moralment a fer això

Scenario 1

You will now be presented with three different scenarios to test your moral intuitions against the answers you gave to the four previous questions.

Li proposem ara tres escenaris diferents per tal de comprobar les seves intuïcions morals i confrontar-les a les respostes que donava a les quatre qüestions prèvies

The Runaway Train

The brakes of the train that Casey Jones is driving have just failed. There are five people on the track ahead of the train. There is no way that they can get off the track before the train hits them. The track has a siding leading off to the right, and Casey can hit a button to direct the train onto it. Unfortunately, there is one person stuck on the siding. Casey can turn the train, killing one person; or he can allow the train to continue onwards, killing five people.

Should he turn the train (1 dead); or should he allow it to keep going (5 dead)?

- Turn the Train
- Allow the Train to Keep Going

El Tren desbocat

Els frens del tren que Casey Jones està conduint acaben de fallar. Hi ha cinc persones en la via davant el tren. No hi ha cap manera que puguin aconseguir que s'apartin de la via abans que el tren els embesteixi. La via té un desviament fora, a la dreta, i Casey pot prémer un botó per dirigir el tren al desviament.

Desafortunadament, hi ha una persona enganxada sobre el desviament. Casey pot girar el tren, matant una persona; o pot deixar el tren continuar cap endavant, matant cinc persones.

Hauria de girar el tren (1 morts); o l'hauria de deixar continuar anant-se'n (5 morts)?

-Giri el Tren

-Deixar que el tren continui el seu camí

Scenario 2

Interesting. Your response that Casey Jones should divert the train is consistent with your belief that the measure of morality is the extent to which it maximises the happiness of the greatest number of people. However, your answer does seem to be out of line with your claim that it is *always* wrong to cause another person's death. More of this later. For now, let's see what you make of the scenario below.

Interessant. La seva resposta segons la qual Casey Jones hauria de desviar el tren és coherent amb la seva opinió que la mesura de moralitat ha de maximitzar la felicitat del major nombre de gent. Tanmateix, la seva resposta sembla que s'aparti de la seva declaració prèvia, segons la qual no és correcte provocar la mort d'una altra persona.

Ara, vegem què fa amb la nova situació que se li presenta.

Marty Bakerman is on a footbridge above the train tracks. He can see that the train approaching the bridge is out of control, and that it is going to hit five people who are stuck on the track just past the bridge. The only way to stop the train is to drop a heavy weight into its path. The only available heavy enough weight is a (very) fat man, who is also watching the train from the footbridge. Marty can push the fat man onto the track into the path of the train, which will kill him but save the five people already on the track; or he can allow the train to continue on its way, which will mean that the five will die.

Should he push the fat man onto the track (1 dead); or allow the train to continue (5 dead)?

- Push the fat man onto the track
- Allow the train to continue

Hmmmm. Your view that Casey Jones should not divert the train seems to be straightforwardly inconsistent with your claim that the morality of an action is determined by the extent to which it maximises the happiness of the greatest number of people. Not sure what you can be thinking here. Perhaps the fact that you think that it is always wrong to cause another person's death is weighing heavily. Anyway, whatever your thinking, let's see how you do with the scenario below.

Hmmmm. La seva opinió segons la qual Casey Jones no hauria de desviar el tren sembla que sigui sincerament incoherent amb la seva declaració, segons la qual la moralitat d'una acció està determinada per l'abast que maximitza la felicitat del major nombre de gent. NO és segur que vostè pensi així ara. Potser és li està pesant el fet que sempre és incorrecte r provocar la mort d'una altra persona. De tota manera, sigui com sigui, vegem què pensa ara davant la nova situació que li presentem

Should You Kill the Fat Man?

Marty Bakerman is on a footbridge above the train tracks. He can see that the train approaching the bridge is out of control, and that it is going to hit five people who are stuck on the track just past the bridge. The only way to stop the train is to drop a heavy weight into its path. The only available heavy enough weight is a (very) fat man, who is also watching the train from the footbridge. Marty can push the fat man onto the track into the path of the train, which will kill him but save the five people already on the track; or he can allow the train to continue on its way, which will mean that the five will die.

Should he push the fat man onto the track (1 dead); or allow the train to continue (5 dead)?

- Push the fat man onto the track
- Allow the train to continue

Marty Bakerman és en un vianant que camina per la passarel·la damunt les vies dels trens. Pot veure que el tren s'acosta al pont està fora de control, i que colpirà cinc persones que es troben davant la via –abaixador-i que es troba dant . L'única manera d'aturar el tren és deixar caure un pes pesat al seu camí. L'únic pes prou pesat és un home molt gras, que està mirant també el tren des de la passarel·la. Marty pot empènyer l'home gras a la via del tren, que el matarà però estalviarà les cinc persones ja en la via –abaixador-; o pot deixar el tren continuar, que significarà que les cinc persones moriran.

Hauria d'empènyer l'home gras a la via (1 morts); o permetre el tren continuar (5 morts)?

- Empenyi l'home gras a la via

- Deixi el tren continuar

That's an interesting response. Previous research has indicated that most people disagree with you that it would be right to push the fat man off the bridge. However, your response is certainly consistent with your claim that Casey Jones should divert the runaway train so that it only kills one person rather than five, and your belief that there is a moral requirement to maximise happiness. Unfortunately, as before, your answer seems to be inconsistent with your claim that it is *always* wrong to cause another person's death. Let's see whether your response to the scenario below sheds any further light on your thinking.

Això és una resposta interessant. La investigació prèvia ha indicat que la majoria de les persones estarien en desacord amb vostè que estaria bé per empènyer l'home gras del pont. Tanmateix, la seva resposta és naturalment coherent amb la seva declaració que Casey Jones hauria de desviar el fugitiu tren de manera que només mati una persona més que cinc, i la seva opinió que hi hagi un requisit moral per maximitzar felicitat. Desafortunadament, com abans, la seva resposta sembla que sigui incoherent amb la seva declaració segons la qual SEMPRE està malament provocar la mort d'una altra persona. Vegem si la seva resposta a la situació següent aclareix els seus pensaments.

Should You Kill the Fat Saboteur?

Okay so this scenario is identical to the preceding scenario but with one crucial difference. This time Marty Bakerman knows with absolute certainty that the fat man on the bridge is responsible for the failure the train's brakes: upset by train fare increases, he sabotaged the brakes with the intention of causing an accident. As before, the only way to stop the train and save the lives of the five people already on the track is to push the fat saboteur off the bridge into the path of the train.

Should Marty push the fat saboteur onto the track (1 dead); or allow the train to continue (5 dead)?

- Push the fat saboteur onto the track
- Allow the train to continue

Hauria de matar l'Home gras sabotejador?

Molt bé. La situació que ve a continuació és idèntica a la situació anterior, però amb una diferència crucial. Aquesta vegada Marty Bakerman sap amb certesa absoluta que l'home gras del pont és el responsable del la fallada dels frens del tren: Molest per l'augment de la tarifa dels trens, ha sabotejat els frens amb la intenció de provocar un accident. Com en la situació anterior l'única manera d'aturar el tren i estalviar les vides de les cinc persones ja en la via és empènyer el sabotejador gras del pont a la via del tren.

-Marty hauria d'empènyer el sabotejador gras a la via (1 morts); o permetre el tren continuar (5 morts)?

- Empenyi el sabotejador gras a la via**
- Permetre i el tren continuar**

Scenario 3

That's an interesting response. Previous research has indicated that most people disagree with you that it would be right to push the fat man off the bridge. However, your response is certainly consistent with your claim that Casey Jones should divert the runaway train so that it only kills one person rather than five, and your belief that there is a moral requirement to maximise happiness. Unfortunately, as before, your answer seems to be inconsistent with your claim that it is *always* wrong to cause another person's death. Let's see whether your response to the scenario below sheds any further light on your thinking.

És una resposta interessant. La recerca prèvia ha indicat que la majoria de les persones estarien en desacord amb vostè que estaria bé per empènyer l'home gras des del pont. Tanmateix, la seva resposta és naturalment coherent amb la seva declaració que Casey Jones hauria de desviar el tren desbocat de manera que només mati una persona en comptes de cinc, i la seva opinió que hi hagi un requisit moral per maximitzar felicitat. Desafortunadament, igual que abans, la seva resposta sembla que sigui incoherent amb la seva declaració que sempre està malament provocar la mort d'una altra persona

Should You Kill the Fat Saboteur?

Okay so this scenario is identical to the preceding scenario but with one crucial difference. This time Marty Bakerman knows with absolute certainty that the fat man on the bridge is responsible for the failure the train's brakes: upset by train fare increases, he sabotaged the brakes with the intention of causing an accident. As before, the only way to stop the train and save the lives of the five people already on the track is to push the fat saboteur off the bridge into the path of the train.

Should Marty push the fat saboteur onto the track (1 dead); or allow the train to continue (5 dead)?

- Push the fat saboteur onto the track
- Allow the train to continue

6

Scenario 4

Your response is almost completely inexplicable. You previously claimed that it that it would be right to push an 'innocent' (fat) man off the bridge in order to save the lives of five people, but now you're saying that this would not be acceptable in the case of the saboteur. That doesn't make any sense. It's just about possible that you have some sophisticated justification for the difference in your responses. More likely, though, you're merely confused! Let's see if you remain confused after completing the scenario below.

Should You Torture the Fat Man?

The fat man, having avoided being thrown in front of the runaway train, has been arrested, and is now in police custody. He states that he has hidden a nuclear device in a major urban centre, which has been primed to explode in 24 hours time. The following things are true:

1. The bomb will explode in 24 hours time.
2. It will kill a million people if it explodes.
3. If bomb disposal experts get to the bomb before it explodes, there's a chance it could be defused.

4. The fat man cannot be tricked into revealing the location of the bomb, nor is it possible to appeal to his better nature, nor is it possible to persuade him that he was wrong to plant the bomb in the first place.
5. If the fat man is tortured, then there is a 75% chance that he will give up the bomb's location.
6. If the fat man does not reveal the location, the bomb will explode, and a million people will die: there is no other way of finding out where the bomb is located.

Should the fat man be tortured in the hope that he will reveal the location of the nuclear device?

- Yes, the fat man should be tortured
- No, the fat man should not be tortured

La seva resposta és gairebé completament inexplicable. Prèviament afirmava que estaria bé empènyer un home 'innocent' (gras) des del pont per salvar les vides de cinc persones, però ara està dient que això no seria acceptable en termes del sabotejador. Això no té sentit. És possible que vostè ho vulgui justificar d'una forma sofisticada per intentar diferenciar les seves respostes. Probablement vostè està confós. Vegem si roman confós després de completar la situació.

L'home gras, que ha evitat ser llançat contra el tren desbocat, ha estat arrestat i està custodiat per la policia. Manifesta que ha amagat un mecanisme nuclear en un centre urbà essencial, que ha estat preparat per explotar en 24 hores temps. Les coses següents són veritables:

- 1. La bomba explotarà en 24 hores.**
- 2. Matarà un milió de persones si explota.**
- 3. Si els artificiers arriben a la bomba abans que exploti, hi ha una possibilitat podria ser apaivagat.**
- 4. L'home gras no es pot ser enganyar perquè reveli la localització de la bomba, ni és possible atreure la seva millor natura, ni és possible persuadir-lo que estava equivocat per plantar la bomba en el primer lloc.**
- 5. Si l'home gras és torturat, llavors hi ha una possibilitat d'un 75% per localitzar la bomba.**
- 6. Si l'home gras no revela la localització, la bomba explotarà, i moriran un milió de persones: no hi ha cap altra manera de trobar on està situada la bomba.**

L'home gras s'hauria de torturar en l'esperança que revelarà la localització del mecanisme nuclear?

-Sí, l'home gras s'hauria de torturar

-No, l'home gras no s'hauria de torturar

Some Final Questions

Your response that the fat man should be tortured is in direct contradiction with your earlier claim that torture is always wrong. However, it does make sense in terms of

other responses you have given. For example, you think that the morality of an action is determined by the extent to which it maximises the happiness of the greatest number of people. It is certainly possible to argue that torturing the fat man is justified in these terms if it prevents, or there is good reason to think that it might prevent, the detonation of a nuclear device. Also, on at least one occasion you have responded that it would be right to end the life of one person to save the lives of some other greater number of people. It would be strange then if you did not think it might sometimes be right to torture a person if by doing so it might be possible to save all those people whose lives would otherwise be lost in a nuclear explosion. Perhaps then you should revisit your blanket opposition to torture.

About You

We now just need to find out a little bit about you. Once you complete the questions below, and hit the Submit button, you'll be taken to the analysis page.

Some Final Questions

Your response that the fat man should not be tortured is consistent with your earlier claim that torture is always wrong. However, this blanket opposition to torture doesn't sit easily with the other responses you have given. For example, you think that the morality of an action is determined by the extent to which it maximises the happiness of the greatest number of people. It is certainly possible to argue that torturing the fat man is justified in these terms if it prevents, or there is good reason to think that it might prevent, the detonation of a nuclear device. You have also claimed that if it is possible to save the lives of innocent people without reducing the sum total of human happiness, and without putting your own life at risk, then there is a moral obligation to do so. Again it is at least arguable that torturing the fat man is justified in these terms. Finally, on at least one occasion you have responded that it would be right to end the life of one person to save the lives of some other greater number of people. It is strange then that you do not think that torture is ever justified, not even in a situation where by employing it one might be able to save all those people whose lives would otherwise be lost in a nuclear explosion. Perhaps you should revisit your blanket opposition to torture.

La seva resposta, segons la qual l'home gras s'hauria de torturar està la contradicció directa amb la seva declaració anterior que la tortura està sempre malament. Tanmateix, té sentit en termes d'unes altres respostes que ha donat. Per exemple, pensa que la moralitat d'una acció estigui determinada per la maximització de la felicitat pel major nombre de persones. Certament és possible sostenir que torturant l'home gras se li justifica en aquests termes si evita, o hi ha bona raó de pensar que podria evitar, la detonació d'un mecanisme nuclear. També, en com a mínim una ocasió ha respost que estaria bé per acabar la vida d'una persona per salvar les vides d'un número més gran de gent. Seria estrany llavors si no pensés que podria a vegades estar bé torturar una persona si fent això pogués ser possible salvar les vides de les persones que altrament es podrien perdre a causa de l'explosió nuclear.. Potser llavors hauria de revisar la seva oposició ingènua a torturar.