

Ho Sum Ko (Kelly)

EWRT 2

3/10/2015

Essay 4: Annotated Bibliography Final Draft

Is it ethical to kill a zombie?

Etchells, Pete. "Zombies, Cognitive Dissonance and You." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media Limited, 31 Oct. 2013. Web. 9 Mar. 2015.

This article connects killing zombies with cognitive dissonance, a social psychology concept which refers to two conflicting beliefs come together at the same time that you will have to deal with. Etchells considers one's mental situation of facing a zombie's attack and to kill it is immediate because he or she is dealing with the conflicting beliefs of killing is wrong and killing as self-defense that happen at the same time. He stresses that one should solve such belief disagreement so there will not be a hassle during a real zombie apocalypse. This piece uses common and casual vocabularies and terms which makes it easily understandable for the public. This article is also highly accessible on the Internet and therefore the general public is the main audience of this article. Instead of looking into the concept of cognitive dissonance in a deeper manner, Etchells gives rather direct and factual information on what connects zombie killing and cognitive dissonance, so the article itself is not really analytical and debatable enough to be argued. However, this article offers a new psychological concept that would be useful for further investigation on the research paper.

Kirk, Robert. "Zombies." *Stanford University*. Stanford University, 8 Sept. 2003. Web. 9 Mar. 2015.

Kirk sees zombies in a philosophical way as a medium that connects human consciousness and the actual world, and he argues both the for and against sides on the conceivability of zombies' existence. Then, he gets to the conclusion that philosophically, the debate is not going to come to an end because there will be more new findings in the philosophical area that connects imagination and the real world, and the answer will not always be the same. This is a college-level reading because the article uses relatively complex philosophical jargons that require thorough understandings in philosophy and some research. Kirk's stance is balanced, he thinks that the existence of zombies depends on what the given circumstances are, which gives a sense of rounded argument. However, this could be a bad thing because neither the arguments given on both sides are deep enough. This source serves as a fundamental ground of zombie understanding and a reference to their possibility of existence, which help to make connections with ethical issues.

Kumar, Rahul. "Permissible Killing And The Irrelevance Of Being Human." *Journal Of Ethics* 12.1 (2008): 57-80. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 10 Mar. 2015.

This is a twenty-five paged response essay to Jeff McMahan's book *The Ethics of Killing: Problems at the Margins of Life*. Kumar's article is a college-level reading because the article is relatively lengthy and it discusses in-depth issues on permissibility of killing. Kumar sets forth situations that are permissible to kill based on McMahan's implications, and rejects his idea of discriminating specific species as targets that are permissible to be killed. Kumar's article serves as a reference to the myth to be discussed in the research paper, whether humans has a higher moral status than other species in this world.

Meyer, Michael. "What Is Ethics?" *Markkula Center for Applied Ethics*. Santa Clara University, 1 Jan. 2010. Web. 9 Mar. 2015.

This short article depicts what does the word "Ethics" mean to people in society. Meyer makes reference to a quick interview with business people conducted by sociologist Raymond Baumhart, and he concludes that most people have their feelings serve as their base of ethical standards, which Meyer considers that is not what ethics is supposed to be. Meyer suggests ethics includes two parts. The first part refers to standards of rights and obligations that benefits society, and the second part refers to the standards of moral conducts and beliefs shaped through social development. This article is relatively persuasive despite it lacks specific evidences to support its arguments because it is more of a pathos persuasion than a logos one, by attacking what common people view ethics is. This article offers a credible source and proof of people are emotional on ethical issues, this allows the research paper to develop a more logical perspective on ethics.

Munkittrick, Kyle. "The Ethics of Zombie Killing." *Pop Bioethics*. 11 Feb. 2013. Web. 9 Mar. 2015.

This article sets forth three consideration perspectives on killing zombies ethically – body dignity, infection status, and recovery potential. Munkittrick considers killing a threatening zombie as ethical when these criterions are negatively fulfilled, and under the circumstance of zombies actually exist and exist in the form of how humans normally perceive them as creatures that consume human flesh and respond to stimulants. This article is a high-school-level reading, since the author sets up assumptions and criterions within the passages, and this require readers to have a high-school level logical capability to follow the author's logical pattern. This is a well-developed article on ethics of zombie killing with logos persuasion. Instead of arguing how unethical it is to kill, this article offers an actual step-by-step solution to determine whether one should kill or not to kill based on objective criterions. This article serves as a outline model of how the research paper should be structured in order to look logical and easy for readers to follow, by setting up a constant variable of what kind of zombie the research paper will be focusing on.

Quong, Jonathan. "Killing In Self-Defense." *Ethics* 119.3 (2009): 507-537. *Religion and Philosophy Collection*. Web. 10 Mar. 2015.

This thirty-two paged article discusses the ethical aspects of killing someone in self-defense. Quong' offers his arguments on moral responsibilities that against the permissibility of killing innocent people or bystanders. He also opposes the idea of permissible to kill the aggressor in a murder incident. This is a college-level reading because the article is relatively lengthy and it discusses complex ethics, moral and responsibility issues in great depth. Quong argues that it is a "right violation" (8) to kill bystanders and the aggressor, and therefore it is not permissible to kill since they retain the right not to be killed. This serves as a rebuttal in his article which it defends ethics of killing people in self-defense. Quong's article is quite accurate as it covers a lot of perspectives that help support his arguments and make it less biased in general, but this make the article more complex for readers to follow until the end. This article provides a criterion for determining the ethics of killing zombies in the research paper.

Sinnott-Armstrong, W., and F. G. Miller. "What Makes Killing Wrong?" *Journal of Medical Ethics* (2012): 3-7. *Journal of Medical Ethics*. BMJ Publishing Group Ltd. Web. 9 Mar. 2015.

The aim of this five-paged medical journal is to defend organ donation after cardiac death (DCD), a state where a patient suffers from severe brain injury and is near death. This journal on the other hand also argues that it is not morally wrong to kill people, but it is when you cause someone to full disability. Although word choices in this journal is relatively simple, the article is not easily accessible to everyone because it is published on the *Journal of Medical Ethics*, an online journal mainly for professionals who work in the field of medical ethics. Armstrong and Miller have obvious biases and ultimate support toward organ donation after DCD in this journal, and they come into a conclusion that "it is easily obviated by abandoning the norm against killing." (5) This is a possible slippery slope because the authors presume "the norm against killing" is no big deal and people get away with such notion easily. However, this might not be the case since removing an ingrained belief is a challenging process. Their article oversimplified ethics and ignored the complexity of the issue, which their assumptions mean that as if there is never a struggle of whether the act of killing is moral or not. However, this article serves as a model of understanding in the ethics of killing for the research paper.

Thagard, Paul. "Zombie Ethics." *Psychology Today*. Sussex Publishers, 25 Nov. 2011. Web. 03 Mar. 2015.

Thagard's article, *Zombie Ethics* offers a simplified philosophical perspective on zombies ethics. He has his own set of ethical standard that tends to be more human-centered and focuses more on the sustainability of human at present and in the future. The way that Thagard judges the rightfulness of zombies ethics uses both logos and ethos persuasive modes. He thinks that zombies and human are not comparable in terms of cognition and needs. In order to sustain humans' existence in a long term, zombies should be excluded from

rights that humans have because having a different set of cognitive capacity might result in conflicting survival patterns, thus might lead to environmental destruction and bring extinction to human beings. This piece targets the general public as it uses common and casual vocabularies which makes it easily understandable, and the article is highly accessible on the Internet. The article makes sense and is reasonable, but it lacks specific analysis and evidences to back his arguments up. Thagard's article serves as a new idea to the research paper comparing the gap difference of "cognitive capacities" between humans and zombies.