

# Title: 나의 정체성, What in “ I ”? (1)

- ✓ **Instructor:** 박승배
- ✓ **Institution:** 울산과학기술대학교
- ✓ **Dictated:** 유명현, 김지은, 김현주, 신동규, 정희빈

[00:00]

Good to see you again

장동연 did you had a good weekend?

were you busy doing your homework?

you are busy killing time. Excellent.

Ok let's move on today's material

This is the title of this course, What is I

An interesting answer to this question is that I'm a mortal being, I will someday die and someday you will die and someday everybody will die.

We are all mortal beings.

And suicide is a prevalent phenomenon in this country

노무현, 최진실, 박용하 They're Korean celebrities and they committed suicide

and some students in KAIST committed suicide this year

And according to news paper article 42.6 people commit suicide a day in this country

and everybody contemplates committing suicide at least once in its life

So I thought it's appropriate to discuss suicide in this course

These are the questions that we are trying to answer today

Is suicide always immoral? If immoral, why immoral?

Thomas A believes that suicide is immoral, always immoral

On the no circumstances is suicide moral?

We will see why he thinks so.

According to some people, in some cases

Under some circumstances, suicide is moral

It is permissible for you to commit suicide on the circumstances

And we want to know what circumstances suicide is moral

OK these are the questions we will try to answer today

Ok I forgot to turn on the overhead projector

Sorry

I hope you are interest in these questions

Is suicide always immoral?

On the what circumstances is suicide moral?

I hope you are interest in these questions

If you are not interested in these questions today's class will be boring to you

If you are interested in these questions today's class will be exciting to you

And 2 students 김성원 and 장동연 will give presentation about this topic

김성원 will talk to us about Thomas Aquinas's first argument

And 장동현 will talk to us about Thomas Aquinas's second argument against suicide

Ok let's move on to student presentations

김성원 are you ready?

Hello everyone my name is 김성원

I will talk about the Thomas Aquinas question 1 what is the first argument

[05:00]

for the immorality of suicide? How should one respond to this argument?

If you see index, first let's talk about what is a suicide

as you know the word suicide has meaning of killing myself

Nowadays suicide rate is increasing

In particular South Korea's suicide rate ranked first among OECD countries

So, we have to know about a suicide (issue)

There are 3 classic arguments. It is presented by Thomas Aquinas

I will talk about the first argument of his

for the immorality of suicide?

That is... everything loves itself

the reason is because everything naturally seeks to keep itself and resist hostile forces

So suicide learns counter to one's natural inclinations

In other words suicide is going against the flow of the natural inclination

So it is immoral

And my response is this

I partially agree with Thomas Aquinas's argument

I have one opinion of the word 'naturally'

Human has a self-defense instincts

So in my opinion 'naturally loves' means not be associated directly to themselves mind and thinking.

So, it is just every creature wants to be present, although their mind is the same but their body wants to be present

So, this is my opinion

There are other responses

First one is The Feldman's Objection for the Thomas Aquinas argument

Lemmings have the natural inclination to commit suicide

Some depressed people naturally inclined to kill themselves

We should consider meaning ...

... I think that is the right objection but I want to think about the meaning of the inclination

Also there are other responses about the Thomas Aquinas's argument

In the box, 은혜 says There are some people who deny themselves

Not all people love themselves there are some people who deny themselves

Therefore the argument that everything naturally loves itself, everything naturally seeks to keep itself in being and resist hostile forces are wrong

And Professor said that 안중근 went against his natural inclination to preserve himself when he assassinated 이토히로부미

The natural inclination shows that one's mind could not be a common sense.

But also I got another question, how can we define the natural inclination?

(I want to discuss with this class)

Thomas Aquinas emphasis that everything naturally loves itself, so suicide is immoral

But it isn't always right argument

There are some other cases like 박은혜's opinion

And my professor's examples

I agreed partially with this argument, the Thomas Aquinas's argument

But it needs to confirm the meaning of the natural inclination

This is my argument and question

Thank you I appreciate for your cooperation

Please ask him question

(student asking)

... he can suicide himself because he loves much

[10:00]

For example, he didn't want to suffer and he can't cure himself

So, how do you think about that?

Thank you for your idea

.... There are some people who deny themselves and not only to deny but also to die

because they suffer from his disease

Because he loves his body so he wants to escape from this disease. So he tries to kill himself

It is a good objection of the Thomas Aquinas's argument

I don't agree with the entire argument of the Thomas Aquinas

I only partially agree so, I think your case, I agree with you

In the meaning of natural inclination it's not clear

We have many natural inclinations

We have natural inclination to eat food when you're hungry

We have natural inclination to go to sleep at night

And we have natural inclination to preserve ourselves

And we have natural inclination to avoid pain

and different inclinations make conflict each other

that is a problem

(students talking)

it's a quite difficult problem I think

I think it is a kind of a suicide but

I think in that case it is a morally allowed suicide

I think we will get a chance to discuss the problems at this class

I can't answer perfectly, I think in that case it's a morally allowed suicide

심청 committed suicide for the sake of her father

I guess everybody knows who 심청 is

김성원 must wanted to say morally ok for 심청 to commit suicide for the sake of her father

It is a kind of a suicide yes.

... I heard about that other cases, biology instincts like disease of the cells

it say they die for whole body's effections

박은혜 are you saying that some people have suicide genes?

(student talking)

So, if somebody has suicide a gene, then he or she is likely to commit suicide?

No? Different?

Little different. It's biological problem, it's not killing myself about life, it is rather of than cell.

So some cells commit suicide? Okay.

Other questions?

Looks like there is no more question.

Okay. That's 김성원's presentation.

Thank you for the interesting presentation.

[15:00]

Hello, everyone. My name is 장동현.

And I'll give you the presentation about topic circumstances, condition for moral suicide.

I'll give you more personal opinion than public lecture.

So lots of argument says that suicide make people sad or make society losing their benefit not only profit.

And it express negative mood to community

Do you agree about that?

So we can easily extract these arguments as term 'influence'.

So the social perspective could be easily simplified as the influence argument.

But there is severe problems of influence argument.

What do you guess anything?

Is there any opinion?

First, let's compare these two person

The youth, with the bright future ahead, have great possibility to do something, the glory age waits for him or her.

And next, with the end of life no one or no family to feeling sad for him.

Then comparing two persons, is that really their influence same?

As your response, it's really hard to say yes.

So finding the morality of suicide as the influence, the problem occurs like this.

The one with no influence to the society or community, his suicide becomes moral.

When the influential person's suicide becomes immoral.

This is the problem of influential argument.

And next, do you know who is he?

So, he is the representative of labor actioner in Korean society, and he burned himself to that for the life of labor

Maybe most of us will say his suicide is moral, yes?

But look at that picture.

Also you will know him

He also killed himself in the bunker of berlin, and how would you judge his suicide?

Is his suicide is moral or immoral?

How do you think?

Of course his suicide gives positive influence to society.

He should hide himself in the bunker in berlin and his suicide is representative signature of the end of World war 2.

So how would you judge his suicide?

Would you hands up, moral? Or immoral?

It's such a controversial problem.

Students asking

The judgment of suicide by influential to the community have this kinds of problem

[20:00]

Suicide is the problem is regardless of social influence.

It means the social influence is not first coming thing to the personal suicide.

And next it measure the morality, they could measure the morality by the degree of influence

Do you understand?

This second thing is quite important to the problems influence argument.

So why these kinds of problem happen?

It is because, the influence of suicide belongs to the absent of existence, not the existence

Suicide is kind of interesting problem because this sec lection make existence absent.

Look, there is existence it could be me, or you, or someone of history.

And these existence make decision to absent.

And this influence comes up from the absent of existence, but morality is the concept about choice of existence.

That is why influence argument has the limitation about judging the suicide.

So next, personal perspective, we will talk about concept of moral in detail.

Let's see, where the concept of moral comes up from?

The term moral comes up from relationship between the existence.

Look, this could be professor and me, or my parents and me, or me and me.

Understood?

So there are moral attitude in the relationship between me and professor, I respect professor and also professor to me, that kind of things.

And this is the case of normal, but in suicide that's quite interesting

Because that moral of suicide comes up from existence and absent.

There is absent but actually there is nothing.

That's the problem. There is nothing.

So if we want to explain the concept of absent, not by nothing, term god should be came up.

For the avoiding the confusion, the term god means not only theologically existing one but also the god of Spinoza that are existed in nature's format.



So it could be also the term nature could be represent this concept.

So if we want to define term absent by the god, the concept of gifted life came out.

So if the life is gifted, so person are gifted itself from the god, and the right to decide whether to die or live is not related to the one but to the nature or the god.

so die is kind of the theme to the god or nature.

But is it really gifted? Is life gifted?

We should think about that.

[25:00]

Think about our life. Life gains meaning by its limitation.

So if life wants to gain meaning and value, that should be existed.

And by the limitation of life, people want to achieve something and fulfilling itself by fear of that.

So if there is any promise fulfill of existence, person itself should be achieve value or meaning of itself.

It's more likely thrown to the life and thrown to the world than the gifted.

So even our life is given by the god or nature, it's more likely to the concept thrown than the gifted.

So work to define the absent by the concept of god or nature becomes fail.

So what should we judge the concept of suicide?

I want to suggest the concept 'intention'.

So there are the existence, and this existence makes the choice to the absent.

And they also reveal influence to the society or community.

And there would be intention of existence to decide.

If this decision made by the fully well condition and this influence made by absent is not so bad to the society or community, this kind of suicide could be moral.

This is my opinion. Thank you.

(student talking)

[35:00]

last week, we watched a video clip and in the video clip,  
professor shelly tagen,`` the standard the judge whether suicide is moral or immoral  
according to that standard, suicide is moral if it makes the world a better place to live in.  
if it makes people of all happier and suicide is immoral if it makes the world worse place to live  
in  
for example, 유명철 is notorious serial killer commits suicide  
if he commits suicide, then the world will become a better place to live in  
people would be happier if serial killer commits suicide  
so that kind of suicide is moral, because it maximizes happiness  
but famous scientist commits suicide, who is a famous scientist these days,,no you name it  
anyway suppose he know how to cure cancer, he developed method or technique to conquer  
cancer  
before he releases the technique to the world, he commits suicide  
and that kind of suicide is immoral according to the utilitarian standard.  
why? Because it maximizes unhappiness  
if he did not commit suicide, the world would be a better place to live in  
not, it seems he committed suicide, now the worlds do not have to chance to be a better  
place to live in in terms of cancer  
so the famous scientists committing suicide is immoral  
I don't like that kind of evaluated the life of my social or not  
I think it is look about the totalism, it is not good looking about the life  
so, I think there is two looking point about the life  
first is, totalism and one is the life about the just it is existence, it is have a meaning  
I have, I think it is one more standard  
you need another standard , different standard  
okay, what do others think?  
according to 전형주, even 유명철's life is valuable

he should not commit suicide

as presenter say, you say nazzi committed suicide is immoral because he escaped from his guilty

he committed suicide to avoid punishment , the US military

안중근, and you know, he attacked 이토 히로부미 and he killed 이토 히로부미 and he committed suicide to escape from other tortures about other bad thing

[40:00]

then is he also viewed as immoral or moral and because both of them committed suicide to escape their from kind of

so my answer is, so ,,

안중근's intention is agreeable intention to the society, his community and world the society

so intentional perspective or the judgement it could be said his intentions were agreeable and acceptable

so his action is moral and one kind of purposes the most severe differences between Hitler's decision and 안중근's decision is that

both of them , their intention was to avoid the punishment but the reason for the punishment was also important

Hitler's case, his punishment was belonged to his guilty, and he's kind of self...selfish thing

but kind of 안's reason for the guilty is not selfish

it's kind of benefit to his community and it's a kind of a broad (beneficial) value

Strictly speaking 안중근 did not committed suicide

The Japanese government executed him, the Japanese government put him to death

It is not the case that he committed a suicide before Japanese government killed him

Ok 박은혜?

I'm little bit confused about intentional perspective

For example, people who have well conditional intention besides to suicide him or her than that is moral?

The someone who had a well-conditioned mind and a well-conditioned intention.

If that in the condition that he or she decides to commit suicide, is it moral?

A moral thing, do you think?

Well, one more confusing thing on well-conditioned is there is not a standard.

Meaning, I think a well-conditional mind has a very vague standard.

I missed one very important concept to provide you in the main lecture.

And I answered to you guys in the answer to the question.

So, intention is a personal thing,

and this personal thing should also come from a well-conditioned person and also accepted and agreed by the society.

Then this is a problem.

So, intentional perspective is the mixing of the personal perspective and social perspective both.

So, let's see, as I say, if personal intention is good, I want to, say, rescue the world,

but if in next world is hell, it is kind of not agreeable intention.

So, if it makes the community sad and society in the depression mood,

[45:00]

but if it is acceptable and agreeable, it could be a moral decision.

May I ask you a second question?

[Student speaking]

It's always hard to define the humans' mental... as you know about...

All we can do is give some examples.

My answer is following the road,

and knowing there are several uncertain standards for the mental health and mentally well-conditioned,

I want to follow that kind of standard.

That's my answer.

OK.

박예원.

Many people think someone sacrifice or others, if the result is not good, they think that could be moral too.

If someone sacrifice for others and the result is not good but many people think it's moral...

Because their intention was good, the person who committed suicide intended it to promote the welfare of others.

Since the intention was good, suicide is...

[Student speaking]

Bad? OK.

My answer is just thinking about the influential influence perspective.

If influence is negative, this suicide is immoral.

If influence is positive, this suicide becomes, say, moral.

But I show you that this kind of thinking is not good and couldn't be defined, either.

So, I just focused on the intention.

So, intention is more personal thing.

It means ahead of the influence.

If society and community could agree with the intention, even though the influence is not good, it could be said as moral.

OK. We are running out of time.

I think I have to take the stage.

Please go back to your seat.

You can ask questions to me from now on.

It's kind of hot here, so I'll turn on the air conditioner.

Thank you for the excellent presentation, 장동현.

No, not this one.

OK. According to Thomas Aquinas, suicide is always immoral.

Here comes his first argument against suicide.

Suicide runs counter to our natural inclination to preserve ourselves.

Any act that runs counter to the natural inclination is wrong.

Therefore, suicide is wrong.

Feldman raises objections against Thomas Aquinas's first argument.

Let me examine the natural inclination to commit suicide.

Some depressed people are naturally inclined to kill themselves.

OK. 안승원 talked about these objections.

Here comes my objections against Thomas Aquinas's first argument against suicide.

Suppose a psychopath, a serial killer, is at large.

He commits suicide.

Obviously, he went against his natural inclination to preserve himself.

I want to say even so, even if the psychopath went against his natural inclination to preserve himself, his suicide is moral.

Suppose Yu Yeong-cheol is at large.

Before he kills more innocent women, he commits suicide, and that kind of suicide is good.

Some might say.

Any objection?

[50:00]

Well, 제형주 might say "Wow, that's a totalitarian view!"

Well, then my response, "Well, what's wrong with a totalitarian view?"

OK. 김승훈.

[Student speaking]

OK.

[Student speaking]

OK. It's agreeable that Hitler's suicide was immoral.

But I want to say that a psychopath...

Listen. There are instances, there are examples, there are circumstances where suicide is permissible.

I'm not saying all suicide is permissible.

Only some suicide is permissible, and suppose a psychopath commits suicide before he kills more people.

That kind of suicide is immoral, but about Hitler, I guess I can say...

Suppose somebody says, it was permissible for... it was OK.

There was nothing wrong with Hitler's suicide because he saved a lot of taxpayers' money.

It costs a lot of money to put him on trial.

If he's tried in court, that costs a lot of money.

By committing suicide, he saved a lot of taxpayers' money.

Somebody might say that.

Anyway, that is not important. OK

We talked about Ahn Jung-geun. Move on.

Here comes Aquinas's second argument against suicide.

Suicide involves damaging the community.

In other words, suicide maximizes unhappiness.

Other people are unhappy if you commit suicide.

Any act that involves damaging the community is wrong.

Therefore, suicide is wrong.

Perhaps, this is the best argument against suicide among the three.

Here comes Feldman's objections against the second argument.

An old man has contracted a painful, incurable, and fatal disease.

He is under intense pain.

There is no chance he will recover.

He has a fatal disease.

It means he will soon die.

His wife died earlier, and his children are independent of him, so he's a useless human being, and his suicide does not damage the community.

Therefore, suicide in this case is moral according to Feldman.

Do you agree with Feldman?

So, if you are old, if you don't have a family, and if you are caught with a fatal disease, you are terminally ill, and you should commit suicide.

Is that OK with you?

[Student speaking]

OK. What would you say to Feldman?

Would you say, "Feldman, you are right. The old man should commit suicide."

Would you say that to him?

장태호.

[Student speaking]

Would you say that again?

Because of the airplane, I couldn't hear you.

[Student speaking]

[55:00]

OK.

[Student speaking]

We know about his future.

He has an incurable disease.

There is no chance he will recover.

There is zero possibility that he will recover.

And fatal. He will soon die.

Painful. He is under intense pain now.

장동현.

[Student speaking]



OK. OK.

[Student speaking]

OK. OK. Fair enough.

That was unintended. 노진혁.

[Student speaking]

OK. Even the old man's life is valuable.

[Student speaking]

OK.

[Student speaking]

OK.

[Student speaking]

OK. OK. A baby's life, an old man's life, President Lee Myung-bak's life, and a beggar's life.

They're all valuable, equally valuable.

Your name is... 황윤승?

[Student speaking]

OK. 제형주.

[Student speaking]

That old man committed suicide. Okay, fair enough.

안국.

-Students Speaking

Yes. It cost a lot of money for him to stay in hospital.

Okay, these are some possible replies to Feldman.

Uh, look. The old man made good contributions to the society when he was young.

So he deserve to live when he is old. How about that?

He did good things to the society when he was young. So he should not commit suicide although he is fatally ill and his disease is incurable and so on.

Bad? Also suicide is contagious.

Of course, the old man is seriously ill, if seriously ill patients commit suicide, then moderately ill patients will feel pressure, feel the pressure to commit suicide.

A suicide is contagious and other patients will follow him, if he commits suicide.

So he should not commit suicide.

Suicide is contagious. If a seriously ill patient is allowed to commit suicide, a moderately ill patient might feel the pressure to commit suicide.

[60:00]

No? Okay, Let's move on.

This is Thomas Aquinas' third argument against suicide.

God alone has authority to decide about life and death.

Suicide is a sin against God.

Therefore, suicide is wrong.

What do you think about this argument? Is this argument good or bad?

Okay, uh. It is bad.

황의순. Why bad? Why bad?

Okay. Okay.

The argument relies on the assumption that God exists.

Now suppose God exists. You believe God exists.

Even so this argument is problematic.

Even if you grant for the sake of argument, that God exists this argument is still problematic.

You can reject this argument or other's ground, here is Hume's objection again as the 3rd argument.

So suicide is no different from other human actions, such as building houses, cultivating the ground, and sailing upon ocean.

So if suicide is immoral so are these human activities. If these human activities are moral, so is suicide.

They are on the same boat.

Suicide and these human activities are on the same boat.

Okay, uh. Here comes another objection to Thomas Aquinas' argument.

God gave us free will. God endowed us with free will, with free will, we are entitled to decide about life and death.

So you can choose to die because you have free will and God gave you free will.

Is this response good or bad?

God gave us free will. We can exercise free will and choose to die.

-Students Speaking

Um, not good? Okay. There are some bad choices, okay.

Other comments? 황.

Limitations, Okay. Even if you have a freedom of choice, you are not allowed to choose something that is off-limit.

Fair enough, um. Okay, here comes a popular argument for suicide.

I own my body. My body is my possession, it's my thing, it is not your property, it is my property.

So I can do whatever I want to do to my own body, therefore suicide is moral.

It is my business, whether I commit suicide or not. Get out of my business.

Stay away from my business. I have a final authority on what to do with my own body, that's the idea.

[65:00]

오영서, 오영경.

Okay. So if I commit suicide, others may follow me, that's your idea.

Okay, fair enough. Other reaction?

장. Um, okay. Whatever I do has an impact on others, okay. Other reaction?

박, okay. Ah, okay. Morality like is the relation that I have to others, okay.

Um, professor Keagan talked about that too in last week's video clip.

Okay, uh other reaction? No?

Here comes my reaction to this argument.

I deny the first premise.

I guess the first premise is false.

My body is not completely mine.

My body is partially owned by me, and partially owned by my parents, and partially owned by the community.

Why do I think so? Well, you owe yourself to your parents and to the society.

Without your parents you would not be around. Think about the lunch you had today.

You did not make lunch for yourself. Others prepared lunch for you. Think about the clothes you are wearing you did not make them others made a cloth for you.

So in a sense you do owe yourself to the society, to your society. So a consent from your parents and society is required to destroy your body.

How do you think about this reaction, to this argument?

Before you commit suicide, you should ask your parents "Father, Mother I want to commit suicide, is it okay with you?"

You should ask that kind of question to your parents.

And perhaps to the society too.

오영경. Okay.

In certain cases, yes. I'm sleeping in my house at night and a robber is breaking into my house and he has a knife and he is trying to kill me then I am entitled to kill him in self defence.

So under certain circumstances killing other human being is commisable.

전영규.

Okay, that's a good question. Does anybody want to respond to 전영규's interesting question?

Okay. Uh? What if they died? Yeah, that's the question. What should we do if our parents died?

We can't ask them "Is it okay for me to commit suicide?" we can't ask that kind of question to our parents. You want to ask that question?

Okay, reply. Ask yourself, imagine what your parents would say to you, if you ask this question.

[70:00]

To your parents, is it okay for me to commit suicide? Just imagine what your parents would say to that question.

And if you think your parents will say "Okay, it is okay for you to commit suicide, Go ahead and kill yourself."

If you think so and perhaps it is okay for you to commit suicide.

Just imagine what your parents would say, yeah.

Oh my god, 유영철 is alive and 유영철's parents are alive. What if 유영철 says to his parents "Is it okay for me to commit suicide?" That's an interesting question, I have never thought of that kind of question.

you want to reply to? Okay, different question?

My opinion is that I don't think that I owe to my parents.

Ah, you deny the premise okay.

Because parents also don't want any compensation for me, so that's the reason why I owe to them, it is my will to choose society or live this way.

Problem is, you receive a lot of benefits from the society. You cannot be alive now without this society. No?

Maybe I thought that it was 당연하다, natural to give any benefit to me.

It is natural for individuals to receive benefits from the community? Yes.

That's an interesting view, okay, okay.

Fair enough, uh, I will think about your interesting point.

Okay, I don't have time to go with rest of these slides.

Anyway thank you for the participation, I hope you have a great week.

Okay, that's it. That's all about today's class. Have a great week.