

In my opinion, it is true that the unexamined life is not worth living. Without the questioning of one's own basic morals and ideals, there is a lack of growth which to me is the ideal of life itself; that is, to learn and grow and better yourself and those which you have the opportunity to impact. To live an unexamined life is to be ignorant of the change that you cause in the world, and to be uncaring of the effect it has, whether that effect be on your own life and decisions or those of others. However, it is hard to live an examined life with a complete lack of unexamined lives. One of the most effective ways of examining ones own self is by first examining others, and if it is the case that every person you meet is as self-examined as yourself, it can be difficult to see your own misgivings. This is true for the opposite as well, if no one else in the world was seeking this wisdom, it would be almost impossible to find it for yourself. Kyle Idleman put it: "There is no life without death". If there truly is no living without a lack thereof, then it is useless to cast aside this self-examination in favor of an obstinate life of willful ignorance when that same time could be spent to become wiser and increase the wisdom of the world; in short: If you're going to die anyways, might as well due something useful first.

I think the trolley problem brings an excellent intersection to utilitarianism and deontology and in many ways shows the true nature of each. To answer who in my view has the correct theory is a complicated question, as there is much overlap in which I find myself lost for a definite answer. While I would agree that it is always morally wrong to kill in any instance, I would argue with Kant that choosing to refrain from any interaction in the situation is just as morally invalid. In this choice to stand back and allow the situation to take place of its own accord, you have still chosen that which is inherently morally wrong in my eyes, too see the inevitable suffering in either case, and to relinquish any control you may have, that is, to give up any possibility of changing the outcome to cause less overall suffering. The band Rush sums this up best in their song "Freewill", they state "if you choose not to decide, you still have made a choice". In this situation although both parties make compelling arguments, I would have to agree more with Mills' Utilitarianism. While it is morally wrong to kill a person, my moral outlook is to do that which overall causes less pain, more euphoria in the world. Although with my choice the one person may still have to die, my conscious awareness that I have doomed that one would weigh far less heavily than knowing that I chose not to interact in any way, and therefore inherently led to the death of the five, as

although I did nothing, it is by this act of nothingness that 5
innocent people would meet their demise.

In my opinion the state of moral change is very subjectively based on which piece of history one chooses to look at. I would argue that the times of the American and French Revolutions marked an age of moral progress and here we see the masses coming together in search of freedom from overarching powers in favor of a more individualistic liberty. However I would also make the argument that as we move more recent in history with the start of the Industrial revolution that moral progress was reversed, leading into an age of moral regression as the idea of gender roles and classicism begin to come into play in a much more serious way than ever before. This can be seen through the more clear-cut class divides of this era, where the men of the day worked long shift in factories for low pay, while the bosses and owners lived a life of luxury totally separated from the lives of the people they employed. If again we jump forward into the post-WW2 era, up to the present, that again society has progressed morally, as the ideas of women's roles in society, the nuclear family, and racism have taken a decline in favor again of more individualistic freedom and less societal judgement of these communities. Looking at the whole of history I would say I have to agree more with Rousseau's take, that ever since the rise of "organized society", the individuality of each person has been limited by the moral aptitude and judgement of the general will; that life in society is inherently strangling for those forced to rest under its powerful and seemingly omnipresent thumb.

Is there meaning in a godless world? No, but personally I would argue the same in a godful world. I would go as far as to argue that it is the inherent search for meaning that leads each individual through their life regardless of a god. I would agree with De Beauvoir that each individual is left to their own devices either to search out or create their own meaning, however I think her idea of creating a meaning is somewhat flawed. Meaning for many can be that dream job or that house or the love of their children, but do not we see so often that when individuals reach these things they aspire to they are so often reduced to boredom and depression rather than joy and fulfilment? Thus in my opinion I would argue against both points, that there is no meaning in a life in any world, but only in the individual's search for that elusive meaning, which it appears to me that not one person has truly found.