



Полезная лексика по теме  
«Видеоурок: решаем  
моральную дилемму и учим  
АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК»

Imagine you're watching **a runaway trolley barreling down** the tracks, straight towards five workers who can't **escape**. You happen to be standing next to **a switch** that would **divert** the trolley onto a second track. Here is a problem: that track has a worker on it too, but just one. What do you do? Do you sacrifice one person to save five?

This is the trolley problem. A version of **an ethical dilemma** that philosopher Philippa Foot **devised** in 1967. It's popular because it **forces us to think** about how to choose when there are no good choices. Do we pick the action with **the best outcome** or **stick to** a moral code that **prohibits** causing someone's death?

In one survey about 90% of respondents said that it's OK **to flip the switch**, letting one worker die to save five and in other studies, including a virtual reality simulation of the dilemma, have found similar results. These judgments **are consistent with** the philosophical principle of **utilitarianism** which argues that the morally correct decision is the one that maximizes **well-being** for the greatest number of people. The five lives **outweigh** one, even if achieving that outcome requires **condemning someone to death**. But people don't always take the utilitarian view, which we can see by changing a trolley problem a bit.

a runaway trolley — вагонетка

to barrel down — нестись, мчаться  
(неформальное, разговорное)

to escape — уйти, сбежать

a switch — переключатель

to divert — переводить (на другой путь)

an ethical dilemma — моральная дилемма

to devise — изобрести, придумать

to force smb to do smth — заставлять кого-то  
делать что-то

the best outcome — лучший исход

to stick to — придерживаться

to prohibit — запрещать

to flip the switch — щелкнуть  
переключателем

to be consistent with — соответствовать,  
согласовываться

utilitarianism — утилитаризм

well-being — благополучие

to outweigh — перевешивать, превосходить

to condemn smb to death — приговорить к  
смерти



This time, you're standing on a bridge over the track as the runaway trolley **approaches**. Now there's no a second track, but there is a very large man on the bridge next to you. If you **push him over**, his body will stop the trolley, saving the five workers, but he'll die. To utilitarians, the decision is exactly the same: lose one life to save five. But in this case, only about 10% of people say that it's OK to throw the man onto the track. Our instincts tell us that **deliberately** causing someone's death is different than allowing them to die as **collateral damage**. It just feels wrong for reasons that are hard to explain.

This **intersection** between ethics and psychology is what so interesting about the trolley problem. The dilemma in its many variations **reveals** that what we think is right or wrong depends on factors other than a logical weighing of the **pros and cons**. For example, men are more likely than women to say it's OK to push the man over the bridge. So are people who watch a comedy clip before doing the thought experiment.

And in one virtual reality study people **were more willing** to sacrifice men than women. Researchers have studied the brain activity of people **thinking through** the classic and bridge versions. Both scenarios activate areas of the brain involved in **conscious decision-making** and **emotional responses**. But in the bridge version, the emotional response is much stronger. So is activity in an area of the brain associated with processing **internal conflict**. Why the difference?

One explanation is that pushing someone to their death feels more personal, activating an emotional **aversion to** killing another person, but we feel conflicted because we know it's still the logical choice.

Trolleyology has been criticized by some philosophers and psychologists. They argue that it

to approach — приближаться  
to push smb over — столкнуть кого-то (обычно вниз)  
deliberately — умышленно  
collateral damage — случайные/сопутствующие потери

an intersection — (здесь) точка соприкосновения  
to reveal — открывать, показывать  
pros and cons — аргументы за и против

to be willing — быть готовым, выразить желание  
to think through — тщательно обдумывать, анализировать  
conscious decision-making — осознанный процесс принятия решений  
an emotional response — эмоциональная реакция  
internal conflict — внутренний конфликт

aversion to — отвращение к..., неприятие

premise — замысел, предпосылка  
a driverless car — беспилотный автомобиль



doesn't reveal anything because its **premise** is so unrealistic that study participants don't take it seriously. But new technology is making this kind of ethical analysis more important than ever. For example, **driverless cars** may have **to handle choices** like causing a small accident **to prevent** a larger one. Meanwhile, governments are researching autonomous military drones that could **wind up** making decisions of whether they risk **civilian casualties** to attack a high-value target.

If we want these actions to be ethical, we have **to decide in advance** how to value human life and judge the **greater good**. So researchers who study autonomous systems are **collaborating** with philosophers to address the complex problem of programming ethics into machines, which goes to show that even hypothetical dilemmas can wind up on **a collision course** with the real world.

to handle choices — делать выбор  
to prevent — предотвратить  
to wind up doing smth — прийти к чему-то  
civilian casualties — жертвы среди  
гражданского населения

to decide in advance — решить  
заранее/наперед  
greater good — во благо  
to collaborate — взаимодействовать,  
сотрудничать  
a collision course — острые разногласия,  
путь конфронтации