

Instructor's Manual and Test Bank
to accompany

Stories of Philosophy
An Introduction Through Original Fiction and Discussion

by Thomas D. Davis

Oxford University Press
2019

Contents

CHAPTER 1. LOGIC

Chapter Summary	3
Learning Objectives	4
Tests	4
Web Links	9

CHAPTER 2. APPEARANCE AND REALITY

Chapter Summary	10
Learning Objectives	11
Tests	11
Web Links	15

CHAPTER 3. THE NATURE OF MIND

Chapter Summary	16
Learning Objectives	17
Tests	18
Web Links	22

CHAPTER 4. FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

Chapter Summary	23
Learning Objectives	24
Tests	24
Web Links	28

CHAPTER 5. GOD AND SUFFERING

Chapter Summary	29
Learning Objectives	30
Tests	31
Web Links	35

CHAPTER 6. MORALITY

Chapter Summary	36
Learning Objectives	38
Tests	39
Web Links	43

CHAPTER 1. LOGIC

Chapter Summary

Reading 1: “Philosophy Is Murder: A Nebuchadnezzar Hulk Mystery”

Professor William Lancaster, chairman of the philosophy department at Fountain College, is shot to death in his study at his home. He had separate appointments with four other professors—Bergmann, Lord, Trilling, and Stout. One of those professors was to be fired and is presumably the murderer. The detective, Nebuchadnezzar Hulk, comes across a logical puzzle on the deceased’s desk pad that indicates who is the murderer. The reader is challenged to solve the puzzle before Hulk reveals the solution.

Reading 2: “Another Pilgrim’s Progress”

Pilgrim convinces her brother, Caution, to leave the devastated town of Status Quo to try to find the Heavenly City, even though Caution doubts such a city exists. Along the way they meet characters and situations that represent logical fallacies, such as Pop, who does his thinking by “following the crowd”; Circles, the beggar, who uses circular arguments that “beg the question”; an authority who’s anything but; Hasty, who jumps too quickly to conclusions; and Faith, who has confident beliefs that seem to be immune to any possible counterevidence.

DISCUSSION

Arguments

Stresses that philosophy focuses on arguments that offer premises in support of the truth of a conclusion. Discusses the logical form of an argument and how deductive arguments are symbolized. Defines a valid deductive argument form as one such that if the premises are true, the conclusion must be true. Defines a sound deductive argument as a valid deductive argument with true premises. Distinguishes deductive and inductive arguments.

Deductive Arguments

Discusses logical symbolism further and gives examples of valid deductive argument forms such as modus ponens, modus tollens, disjunctive syllogism and hypothetical syllogism. Discusses two invalid argument forms—the fallacy of denying the antecedent and the fallacy of affirming the consequent— and demonstrates informally why the former is a fallacy.

Inductive Arguments

Discusses inductive arguments in general and focuses on analogical induction (also called argument from analogy), inductive generalization, and hypothetical induction (also called abduction or inference to the best explanation. Discusses how the latter is used by the detective in “Philosophy Is Murder.”

Fallacies in Reasoning

Discusses the following fallacies (sketched roughly here) with reference to the story “Another Pilgrim’s Progress”:

1. Provincialism: accepting or rejecting a conclusion on the basis of one's identification with a particular group;
2. Ad hominem: attacking the person rather than the argument;
3. Straw man: misinterpreting a position or argument so as to make it seem more vulnerable to criticism;
4. Slippery slope: arguing, without good evidence, that any move in a certain direction will inevitably lead you to slide past other possibilities to some terrible extreme;
5. False dilemma: falsely reducing the possible positions at issue so as to make the position for which one is arguing seem more reasonable;
6. Appeal to force: presenting a threat in place of an argument;
7. Equivocation: using crucial word or phrase that shifts meaning within a single argument;
8. Begging the question: using some version of the conclusion as a premise.
9. Inconsistency: using statements that contradict one another;
10. Appeal to popular opinion: assuming that what's popular is true;
11. Hasty conclusion: drawing a conclusion without making a reasonable effort to determine if there is other relevant evidence;
12. Suppressed evidence: suppressing evidence not favorable to one's conclusion;
13. Appeal to authority: assuming that if a claim can't be disproved, it is probably true; and,
14. Impervious hypothesis, presenting an hypothesis or belief that seems to be immune to any possible counter-evidence.

Skepticism, Faith and Philosophy

Discusses skepticism in its various forms and ends with the type of skepticism that will be confronted in Chapter 2, namely skepticism about a world of physical objects and other minds existing outside one's own mind—the “problem of the external world.”

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the time you've finished reading this chapter you should be familiar with:

- what an argument is;
- the differences between deductive and inductive arguments;
- the differences between valid and invalid deductive arguments;
- the logical symbols introduced in “Philosophy is Murder” and repeated here;
- the specific examples of valid and invalid arguments given;
- three types of inductive arguments;
- the fifteen informal fallacies discussed; and
- what skepticism is.

TESTS

True/False Questions (5)

- *1. A valid deductive argument must have a true conclusion.

- A. True.
*B. False.

2. A valid deductive argument can't have inconsistent premises.

- A. True.
*B. False.

3. The following argument is valid: "We live on Mars; therefore, we live on Mars."

- *A. True.
B. False.

*4. The following statement is a fallacious argument: "I haven't quite made up my mind."

- A. True.
*B. False.

5. The following statement is an example of false dilemma: "Either it is raining or it's not."

- A. True
*B. False

Multiple Choice Questions (20)

*1. A "valid argument" concerns the

- A. truth of the premises.
*B. the connection between the premises and conclusion.
C. the persuasiveness of the argument.
D. the truth of the premises.

2. "Either it's going to rain tomorrow or it isn't." This argument is best symbolized as

- A. $p \vee \sim q$
B. $\sim p \vee q$.
C. $p \supset q$.
*D. $p \vee \sim p$.

3. With a valid deductive argument we know that

- A. the premises are true.
B. if the conclusion is true, the premises are probably true.
C. the conclusion is true.
*D. None of the above

*4. If this is 2094, then it is the twenty-first century

It is 2094

It is the twenty-first century

The above argument is:

- *A. valid.
- B. sound.
- C. invalid.
- D. None of the above

5. The valid argument modus tollens is symbolized as:

- A. If p, then q; p; therefore q.
- *B. If p, then q; not q; therefore not p.
- C. Either p or q; not p; therefore q.
- D. None of the above

*6. The valid argument hypothetical syllogism is symbolized as:

- A. If p, then q; p; therefore q.
- B. If p, then q; not q; therefore not p.
- C. Either p or q; not p; therefore q.
- *D. None of the above

7. Either moral questions are like scientific questions or they're like questions of taste.
It's not the case that moral questions are like scientific questions.

Moral questions are like questions of taste.

The above argument is an example of:

- A. modus ponens.
- *B. disjunctive syllogism.
- C. hypothetical syllogism.
- D. modus tollens.

*8. If we have free will, then our choices aren't caused.
If our choices aren't caused, then our choices happen by chance.

If we have free will, then our choices happen by chance.

The above argument is an example of

- A. modus ponens.
- B. disjunctive syllogism.
- *C. hypothetical syllogism.
- D. modus tollens.

9. If p, then q

Not p

Not q

The above argument is an example of the fallacy of

- A. affirming the antecedent.
- *B. denying the antecedent.

- C. affirming the consequent.
- D. denying the consequent.

*10. Reasoning that someone is guilty “beyond a reasonable doubt” would be an example of what type of reasoning?

- A. Deductive reasoning
- *B. Inductive reasoning
- C. Circular reasoning
- D. None of the above

11. “Don’t believe what Professor Ingram says in his physics class. I hear he cheats on his wife.” This would be an example of

- A. circular reasoning.
- B. argument from authority.
- *C. ad hominem argument.
- D. appeal to popular opinion.

*12. “People seem to like what John has to say. I’d believe him if I were you.” This statement involves what fallacy?

- A. Circular reasoning
- *B. Appeal to popular opinion
- C. Ad hominem argument
- D. Begging the question

13. “There can’t be global warming. Just look at how cold it was last week.” This statement involves a(n)

- A. appeal to ignorance.
- *B. hasty conclusion.
- C. inconsistency.
- D. slippery slope.

*14. “We’ll get him a fair trial and then hang him.” This statement would likely be an example of the fallacy of

- A. provincialism.
- *B. inconsistency.
- C. appeal to force.
- D. appeal to authority.

15. “Get your head on straight. You’re going to get in trouble with your neighbors believing things like that.” This statement would likely be an example of the fallacy of

- A. inconsistency.
- *B. appeal force.
- C. false dilemma.
- D. slippery slope.

*16. “Let the government into our lives, and they will take over everything.” This statement would likely be an example of the fallacy of

- A. inconsistency.
- B. appeal to force.
- C. false dilemma.
- *D. slippery slope.

17. “This scientific theory is so solid that you can’t even imagine it being false.” This statement would likely be an example of the fallacy of

- A. slippery slope.
- *B. impervious hypothesis.
- C. provincialism.
- D. appeal to ignorance.

*18. All human beings observed thus far have lived less than 20 years.

The next human being observed will live less than 20 years.

The above argument is an example of

- A. a strong inductive argument with a true premise.
- *B. a strong inductive argument with a false premise.
- C. a weak inductive argument with a true premise.
- D. a weak inductive argument with a false premise.

19. “Since my sister has liked all the friends I’ve brought home so far, I imagine she will like my new friend, Ted, as well.” This statement is most clearly an example of

- A. hypothetical induction.
- *B. analogical induction.
- C. inductive generalization.
- D. None of the above

*20. “Look before you leap, my friend. And remember, he who hesitates is lost.” This statement exemplifies the fallacy of

- A. begging the question.
- *B. inconsistency.
- C. straw man.
- D. None of the above

Essay Questions (4)

1. Make up a page-length argument in which you commit at least five of the fallacies we’ve discussed.

2. Characterize the approaches to life of Skeptic, Caution, and Pilgrim in “Another Pilgrim’s Progress.” Explain which one is closest to your own approach and give some examples of your own thinking to illustrate.

3. “The world is nothing but your private dream.” How would you argue against (or for) this claim?

4. Think of some problem you tried to solve recently (finding something, fixing something, whatever).

- a. Describe the reasoning process you went through.
- b. Explain how your reasoning was inductive or deductive or some combination of both.

Short Answer Questions (4)

1. “Of course I can’t tell you what would disprove my hypothesis. After all, my hypothesis is true.” What’s wrong with this statement? Explain.

2. “But Caution, we don’t know this isn’t the right road. That ought to count for something.” What fallacy does this statement exemplify? Explain.

3. Either moral questions are like scientific questions or they’re like questions of taste. It’s not the case that moral questions are like scientific questions.

Moral questions are like questions of taste.

Symbolize the above argument and say whether it is valid or invalid. If it has a name, what is it?

4. “Deduction goes from the general to the particular; induction goes from the particular to the general.” Explain why this statement is wrong and give examples to support your point. Give your own characterization of the difference between deduction and induction.

WEB LINKS

Informal Logic

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-informal/>

Fallacies

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/fallacy/>

~~Instructor's Manual and Test Bank
to accompany~~

~~*Stories of Philosophy*
An Introduction Through Original Fiction and Discussion~~

~~by Thomas D. Davis~~

~~Oxford University Press
2019~~

Contents

CHAPTER 1. LOGIC

Chapter Summary	3
Learning Objectives	4
Tests	4
Web Links	9

CHAPTER 2. APPEARANCE AND REALITY

Chapter Summary	10
Learning Objectives	11
Tests	11
Web Links	15

CHAPTER 3. THE NATURE OF MIND

Chapter Summary	16
Learning Objectives	17
Tests	18
Web Links	22

CHAPTER 4. FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

Chapter Summary	23
Learning Objectives	24
Tests	24
Web Links	28

CHAPTER 5. GOD AND SUFFERING

Chapter Summary	29
Learning Objectives	30
Tests	31
Web Links	35

CHAPTER 6. MORALITY

Chapter Summary	36
Learning Objectives	38
Tests	39
Web Links	43

CHAPTER 1. LOGIC

Chapter Summary

Reading 1: “Philosophy Is Murder: A Nebuchadnezzar Hulk Mystery”

Professor William Lancaster, chairman of the philosophy department at Fountain College, is shot to death in his study at his home. He had separate appointments with four other professors—Bergmann, Lord, Trilling, and Stout. One of those professors was to be fired and is presumably the murderer. The detective, Nebuchadnezzar Hulk, comes across a logical puzzle on the deceased’s desk pad that indicates who is the murderer. The reader is challenged to solve the puzzle before Hulk reveals the solution.

Reading 2: “Another Pilgrim’s Progress”

Pilgrim convinces her brother, Caution, to leave the devastated town of Status Quo to try to find the Heavenly City, even though Caution doubts such a city exists. Along the way they meet characters and situations that represent logical fallacies, such as Pop, who does his thinking by “following the crowd”; Circles, the beggar, who uses circular arguments that “beg the question”; an authority who’s anything but; Hasty, who jumps too quickly to conclusions; and Faith, who has confident beliefs that seem to be immune to any possible counterevidence.

DISCUSSION

Arguments

Stresses that philosophy focuses on arguments that offer premises in support of the truth of a conclusion. Discusses the logical form of an argument and how deductive arguments are symbolized. Defines a valid deductive argument form as one such that if the premises are true, the conclusion must be true. Defines a sound deductive argument as a valid deductive argument with true premises. Distinguishes deductive and inductive arguments.

Deductive Arguments

Discusses logical symbolism further and gives examples of valid deductive argument forms such as modus ponens, modus tollens, disjunctive syllogism and hypothetical syllogism. Discusses two invalid argument forms—the fallacy of denying the antecedent and the fallacy of affirming the consequent—and demonstrates informally why the former is a fallacy.

Inductive Arguments

Discusses inductive arguments in general and focuses on analogical induction (also called argument from analogy), inductive generalization, and hypothetical induction (also called abduction or inference to the best explanation. Discusses how the latter is used by the detective in “Philosophy Is Murder.”

Fallacies in Reasoning

Discusses the following fallacies (sketched roughly here) with reference to the story “Another Pilgrim’s Progress”:

1. Provincialism: accepting or rejecting a conclusion on the basis of one's identification with a particular group;
2. Ad hominem: attacking the person rather than the argument;
3. Straw man: misinterpreting a position or argument so as to make it seem more vulnerable to criticism;
4. Slippery slope: arguing, without good evidence, that any move in a certain direction will inevitably lead you to slide past other possibilities to some terrible extreme;
5. False dilemma: falsely reducing the possible positions at issue so as to make the position for which one is arguing seem more reasonable;
6. Appeal to force: presenting a threat in place of an argument;
7. Equivocation: using crucial word or phrase that shifts meaning within a single argument;
8. Begging the question: using some version of the conclusion as a premise.
9. Inconsistency: using statements that contradict one another;
10. Appeal to popular opinion: assuming that what's popular is true;
11. Hasty conclusion: drawing a conclusion without making a reasonable effort to determine if there is other relevant evidence;
12. Suppressed evidence: suppressing evidence not favorable to one's conclusion;
13. Appeal to authority: assuming that if a claim can't be disproved, it is probably true; and,
14. Impervious hypothesis, presenting an hypothesis or belief that seems to be immune to any possible counter-evidence.

Skepticism, Faith and Philosophy

Discusses skepticism in its various forms and ends with the type of skepticism that will be confronted in Chapter 2, namely skepticism about a world of physical objects and other minds existing outside one's own mind—the “problem of the external world.”

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the time you've finished reading this chapter you should be familiar with:

- what an argument is;
- the differences between deductive and inductive arguments;
- the differences between valid and invalid deductive arguments;
- the logical symbols introduced in “Philosophy is Murder” and repeated here;
- the specific examples of valid and invalid arguments given;
- three types of inductive arguments;
- the fifteen informal fallacies discussed; and
- what skepticism is.

TESTS

True/False Questions (5)

- *1. A valid deductive argument must have a true conclusion.

- ~~A. True.~~
~~*B. False.~~

~~2. A valid deductive argument can't have inconsistent premises.~~

- ~~A. True.~~
~~*B. False.~~

~~3. The following argument is valid: "We live on Mars; therefore, we live on Mars."~~

- ~~*A. True.~~
~~B. False.~~

~~*4. The following statement is a fallacious argument: "I haven't quite made up my mind."~~

- ~~A. True.~~
~~*B. False.~~

~~5. The following statement is an example of false dilemma: "Either it is raining or it's not."~~

- ~~A. True~~
~~*B. False~~

~~Multiple-Choice Questions (20)~~

~~*1. A "valid argument" concerns the~~

- ~~A. truth of the premises.~~
~~*B. the connection between the premises and conclusion.~~
~~C. the persuasiveness of the argument.~~
~~D. the truth of the premises.~~

~~2. "Either it's going to rain tomorrow or it isn't." This argument is best symbolized as~~

- ~~A. $p \vee \sim q$~~
~~B. $\sim p \vee q$~~
~~C. $p \supset q$~~
~~*D. $p \vee \sim p$~~

~~3. With a valid deductive argument we know that~~

- ~~A. the premises are true.~~
~~B. if the conclusion is true, the premises are probably true.~~
~~C. the conclusion is true.~~
~~*D. None of the above~~

~~*4. If this is 2094, then it is the twenty-first century~~
~~It is 2094~~

~~It is the twenty-first century~~

~~The above argument is:~~

~~*A. valid.~~

~~B. sound.~~

~~C. invalid.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

~~5. The valid argument modus tollens is symbolized as:~~

~~A. If p, then q; p; therefore q.~~

~~*B. If p, then q; not q; therefore not p.~~

~~C. Either p or q; not p; therefore q.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

~~*6. The valid argument hypothetical syllogism is symbolized as:~~

~~A. If p, then q; p; therefore q.~~

~~B. If p, then q; not q; therefore not p.~~

~~C. Either p or q; not p; therefore q.~~

~~*D. None of the above~~

~~7. Either moral questions are like scientific questions or they're like questions of taste.
It's not the case that moral questions are like scientific questions.~~

~~Moral questions are like questions of taste.~~

~~The above argument is an example of:~~

~~A. modus ponens.~~

~~*B. disjunctive syllogism.~~

~~C. hypothetical syllogism.~~

~~D. modus tollens.~~

~~*8. If we have free will, then our choices aren't caused.~~

~~If our choices aren't caused, then our choices happen by chance.~~

~~If we have free will, then our choices happen by chance.~~

~~The above argument is an example of~~

~~A. modus ponens.~~

~~B. disjunctive syllogism.~~

~~*C. hypothetical syllogism.~~

~~D. modus tollens.~~

~~9. If p, then q~~

~~Not p~~

~~Not q~~

~~The above argument is an example of the fallacy of~~

~~A. affirming the antecedent.~~

~~*B. denying the antecedent.~~

- ~~C. affirming the consequent.~~
- ~~D. denying the consequent.~~

~~*10. Reasoning that someone is guilty “beyond a reasonable doubt” would be an example of what type of reasoning?~~

- ~~A. Deductive reasoning~~
- ~~*B. Inductive reasoning~~
- ~~C. Circular reasoning~~
- ~~D. None of the above~~

~~11. “Don’t believe what Professor Ingram says in his physics class. I hear he cheats on his wife.” This would be an example of~~

- ~~A. circular reasoning.~~
- ~~B. argument from authority.~~
- ~~*C. ad hominem argument.~~
- ~~D. appeal to popular opinion.~~

~~*12. “People seem to like what John has to say. I’d believe him if I were you.” This statement involves what fallacy?~~

- ~~A. Circular reasoning~~
- ~~*B. Appeal to popular opinion~~
- ~~C. Ad hominem argument~~
- ~~D. Begging the question~~

~~13. “There can’t be global warming. Just look at how cold it was last week.” This statement involves a(n)~~

- ~~A. appeal to ignorance.~~
- ~~*B. hasty conclusion.~~
- ~~C. inconsistency.~~
- ~~D. slippery slope.~~

~~*14. “We’ll get him a fair trial and then hang him.” This statement would likely be an example of the fallacy of~~

- ~~A. provincialism.~~
- ~~*B. inconsistency.~~
- ~~C. appeal to force.~~
- ~~D. appeal to authority.~~

~~15. “Get your head on straight. You’re going to get in trouble with your neighbors believing things like that.” This statement would likely be an example of the fallacy of~~

- ~~A. inconsistency.~~
- ~~*B. appeal force.~~
- ~~C. false dilemma.~~
- ~~D. slippery slope.~~

~~*16. “Let the government into our lives, and they will take over everything.” This statement would likely be an example of the fallacy of~~

- ~~A. inconsistency.~~
- ~~B. appeal to force.~~
- ~~C. false dilemma.~~
- ~~*D. slippery slope.~~

~~17. “This scientific theory is so solid that you can’t even imagine it being false.” This statement would likely be an example of the fallacy of~~

- ~~A. slippery slope.~~
- ~~*B. impervious hypothesis.~~
- ~~C. provincialism.~~
- ~~D. appeal to ignorance.~~

~~*18. All human beings observed thus far have lived less than 20 years.~~

~~The next human being observed will live less than 20 years.~~

~~The above argument is an example of~~

- ~~A. a strong inductive argument with a true premise.~~
- ~~*B. a strong inductive argument with a false premise.~~
- ~~C. a weak inductive argument with a true premise.~~
- ~~D. a weak inductive argument with a false premise.~~

~~19. “Since my sister has liked all the friends I’ve brought home so far, I imagine she will like my new friend, Ted, as well.” This statement is most clearly an example of~~

- ~~A. hypothetical induction.~~
- ~~*B. analogical induction.~~
- ~~C. inductive generalization.~~
- ~~D. None of the above~~

~~*20. “Look before you leap, my friend. And remember, he who hesitates is lost.” This statement exemplifies the fallacy of~~

- ~~A. begging the question.~~
- ~~*B. inconsistency.~~
- ~~C. straw man.~~
- ~~D. None of the above~~

~~*Essay Questions (4)*~~

~~1. Make up a page-length argument in which you commit at least five of the fallacies we’ve discussed.~~

~~2. Characterize the approaches to life of Skeptic, Caution, and Pilgrim in “Another Pilgrim’s Progress.” Explain which one is closest to your own approach and give some examples of your own thinking to illustrate.~~

3. ~~“The world is nothing but your private dream.” How would you argue against (or for) this claim?~~

4. ~~Think of some problem you tried to solve recently (finding something, fixing something, whatever).~~

_____ a. ~~Describe the reasoning process you went through.~~

_____ b. ~~Explain how your reasoning was inductive or deductive or some combination of both.~~

~~*Short Answer Questions (4)*~~

1. ~~“Of course I can’t tell you what would disprove my hypothesis. After all, my hypothesis is true.” What’s wrong with this statement? Explain.~~

2. ~~“But Caution, we don’t know this isn’t the right road. That ought to count for something.” What fallacy does this statement exemplify? Explain.~~

3. ~~Either moral questions are like scientific questions or they’re like questions of taste. It’s not the case that moral questions are like scientific questions.~~

_____ Moral questions are like questions of taste.

Symbolize the above argument and say whether it is valid or invalid. If it has a name, what is it?

4. ~~“Deduction goes from the general to the particular; induction goes from the particular to the general.” Explain why this statement is wrong and give examples to support your point. Give your own characterization of the difference between deduction and induction.~~

WEB LINKS

Informal Logic

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-informal/>

Fallacies

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/fallacy/>

CHAPTER 2. APPEARANCE AND REALITY

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Reading 1: “Add Some More Boils”

Taddeo is a character with real thoughts and feelings who seems to exist with a real body in a medieval world suffering from black plague. Taddeo, who is dying from the plague, has been forced from his house by his family who fear contagion. Wandering the streets, Taddeo thinks about various theological theories of why people are suffering plague, most of which end up with human wickedness as the cause and justification. Taddeo prays for a miracle and seems to be getting one when colors of the world radically change. However, the miracle is nothing more than a temporary computer glitch. Taddeo is part of a computer simulation run by two boys who are having a little sadistic fun while both doing history homework.

Reading 2: “Why Don’t You Just Wake Up?”

Maya, college student, begins to find reality unpleasantly dream-like. She has dreams in which she seems to wake, only to find that what she thought was reality was only a dream. She’s not on drugs, as she has to keep explaining to people, and the cause can’t be the simple fact that she’s taking a philosophy class on Descartes and whether life is only a dream. She has one frightening episode in which the world seems to ripple as if it’s nothing more than a movie screen. She has another such episode in class one day. Distracted, she hears people telling her to “wake up”; she does wake finally, with terrible consequences.

DISCUSSION

Common-Sense Beliefs

Discusses the issue of illusion and reality, mentioning early discussions of the issue by Plato and Zhuangzi. Discusses different versions of the illusion/reality issue before focusing on the “problem of the external world”—whether other minds and physical objects actually exist. Discusses the threat of solipsism, the view that only one’s own mind exists.

Doubting the External World: Dreams

It is clear that we can distinguish dreams from reality if by “reality” we only mean experiences that are more vivid and more consistent from episode to episode. However, this doesn’t seem to show that reality could not still be a dream in the sense that is only a product of one’s mind.

Descartes, Doubt, and the Cogito

Discusses Descartes’s system of methodically doubting all his beliefs. To keep himself on guard, he uses the device of supposing that an evil demon is constantly working to deceive him. Descartes decided he could not be mistaken in his belief that his own mind exists; his argument is called the “cogito.”

Doubting the External World: Perception

Discusses how an analysis of perception can lead to solipsism. Charts the historical progression from criticisms of direct realism, which claims that we perceive objects directly, to representative realism (John Locke) to subjective idealism (George Berkeley) to solipsism (David Hume).

Can I Know There's an External World?

Argues that an external world is more likely than not given the richness of those experience that are imposed upon one versus the relative poverty those thoughts—obviously created by oneself—along with the implausibility of what a one mind universe would look like. Also reviews Wittgenstein's private language argument that language implies the public domain. However, knowing that there is an external world is a long way from knowing what that world is like.

Are We Living in a Computer Simulation?

Discusses the problem of knowing what the external world is like in terms of the brain-in-a-vat scenario and in terms of the question of whether or not we can be sure we're not part of some computer simulation. Discusses Bostrom's analysis that we could be certain we're living in a computer simulation if we could eliminate two other possibilities: (a) the human species is likely to become extinct before reaching a post-human stage and (b) any post-human civilization is extremely unlikely to run a significant number of simulations of their evolutionary history. It is argued that we can't eliminate those possibilities nor establish the crucial controversial assumption that the mind is substrate independent.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the time you've finished reading this chapter you should be familiar with:

- skepticism and the problem of the external world;
- Descartes's methodological doubt and his cogito;
- the views of Locke, Berkeley, and Hume on perception and on what we can know about the world;
- the skeptical problem of dreams and what arguments can be given against the possibility that we are dreaming everything;
- Wittgenstein's private language argument; and
- Bostrom's analysis of the possibility that we're living in a computer simulation; also arguments against that possibility.

TESTS

True/False Questions (5)

*1. The "problem of the external world" is the problem of whether there exists one's own mind and its images.

A. True

*B. False

~~2. Descartes hypothesized an evil demon to keep himself from doing sinful things.~~

~~A. True~~

~~*B. False~~

~~*3. The theory of direct realism is that we are in direct contact with private images coming to us from the external world.~~

~~A. True~~

~~*B. False~~

~~4. David Hume argues that we are not conscious of a Self.~~

~~*A. True~~

~~B. False~~

~~5. Nick Bostrom uses the phrase “post human” to indicate a world in which everything has regressed to an early stage of evolution.~~

~~A. True~~

~~*B. False~~

Multiple Choice Questions (20)

~~1. The problem of solipsism is the problem of whether there exists~~

~~A. one’s own mind.~~

~~B. one’s own ideas.~~

~~*C. an external world.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

~~*2. One difference between “Add Some More Boils” and “Why Don’t You Just Wake Up” is that in “Add Some More Boils”~~

~~A. there is no external world.~~

~~*B. there is an external world.~~

~~C. there are no minds.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

~~3. John Locke believed that when we are awake the images/ideas we receive from the external world~~

~~A. completely resemble qualities of objects in that world.~~

~~*B. partially resemble qualities of objects in that world.~~

~~C. have no resemblance to qualities of objects in that world.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

~~*4. George Berkeley believed in the existence of~~

~~A. God, minds, and physical objects.~~

~~B. minds and physical objects but no God.~~

~~*C. God, minds, and no physical objects.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

5. Which theory below *denies* the existence of one's own mind?

- A. Subjective idealism
- B. Representative realism
- C. Solipsism
- *D. None of the above

*6. Which theory *denies* that we always perceive physical objects by means of mental images?

- A. Indirect realism
- B. Representative realism
- *C. Direct realism
- D. None of the above

7. Which of the following theories accords with the views of George Berkeley?

- A. Direct realism
- B. Representative realism
- *C. Subjective idealism
- D. solipsism

8. "My bewilderment is such that it is almost able to convince me that I am sleeping." This quotation is from

- A. Plato.
- *B. Descartes.
- C. David Hume.
- D. Nick Bostrom.

*9. "One can easily imagine millions of individuals running thousands of variations on hundreds of themes, each containing billions of simulated individuals." This quotation is from

- A. Plato.
- B. Descartes.
- C. David Hume.
- *D. Nick Bostrom.

*10. "Such qualities which in truth are nothing in the objects themselves but powers to produce various sensations in us by their primary qualities." This quotation is from

- A. Wittgenstein
- *B. John Locke.
- C. David Hume.
- D. Nick Bostrom.

11. "I may venture to affirm the rest of mankind that they are nothing but a bundle or collection of different perceptions." This quotation is from

- A. Descartes.
- B. John Locke.

~~C. George Berkeley.~~

~~*D. David Hume.~~

~~*12. Wittgenstein's private language argument has been used as an argument *against*~~

~~A. direct realism.~~

~~B. representative realism.~~

~~*C. solipsism.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

~~13. To say that the mind is "substrate independent" is to say that it~~

~~A. is independent of other minds.~~

~~B. can be simulated very easily.~~

~~*C. needn't be made from biological tissue.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

~~*14. "How can I be dreaming? Just now, I asked my friend if I was dreaming and she said 'No.'" The problem with this argument is that~~

~~A. my friend might be tricking me.~~

~~*B. my friend may be part of my dream.~~

~~C. my friend may not understand philosophy.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

~~15. Descartes's cogito is an attempt to prove that~~

~~A. God exists.~~

~~*B. the mind exists.~~

~~C. an evil demon exists.~~

~~D. the external world exists.~~

~~*16. The idea of the brain in the vat is to challenge~~

~~A. our belief that there is external world.~~

~~*B. our belief that we know what the external world is like.~~

~~C. our belief that we have a mind.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

~~17. Perceptual illusions have convinced many that~~

~~A. our minds don't really exist.~~

~~B. people are trying to fool us all the time.~~

~~*C. we can't be perceiving physical objects directly.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

~~*18. George Berkeley claimed that our everyday images of objects came from~~

~~A. the objects themselves.~~

~~*B. God.~~

~~C. our own minds.~~

~~D. None of the above~~

19. Which theory *denies* the existence of other minds?

- A. Subjective idealism
- B. Representative realism
- C. Direct realism
- *D. None of the above

*20. Who presented the Allegory of the Cave?

- A. Zhuangzi
- *B. Plato
- C. Descartes
- D. John Locke

Essay Questions (3)

1. Find a favorite science fiction film or story that deals with the themes discussed in this chapter. Explain how those themes play out in the fiction.
2. Do you think you can know that you are not a brain in a vat or a character in a computer simulation? Explain your answer in detail.
3. Present your own views on the morality of someone running computer simulations evolving conscious characters who face a great deal of suffering.

Short Answer Questions (3)

1. Summarize Wittgenstein's private language argument.
2. Summarize the view called "direct realism" and explain why so many thinkers have rejected it.
3. How does the assumption of substrate independence figure into Bostrom's analysis of whether or not we're living in a computer simulation?

WEB LINKS

Solipsism

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/solipsis/>

Descartes's Epistemology

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/descartes-epistemology/>

CHAPTER 3. THE NATURE OF MIND

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Reading 1: "Strange Behavior"

After landing on the planet Gamma, humans initially confuse the sophisticated Gammese Robots for real Gammas. Once they understand the difference, the humans remain confused by the way the Gammas treat their robots—as if the robots were their equals, as if the robots had minds. After they quiz the Gammas about this, the humans—already convinced that machines can't have minds—conclude that the Gammas don't have minds either. The Gammas have a sophisticated culture that includes art, music, literature, and religion. The question becomes, What attitude should you take toward a creature which acts like it has a mind but does not?

Reading 2: "Life After Life."

Charlie swallows a fishbone, blacks out, wakes up, and tries to reassure his family he is all right. However, they can't hear him, and he sees a body just like his lying still on the floor. Charlie realizes that he has survived death as a disembodied soul. No God appears, and Charlie seems to be left to his own devices. He can observe the world in the normal way but can't interact with it. Getting bored just observing things and being hugely disappointed by his family's reaction to his death, Charlie tries to contact other souls. He succeeds but the other souls whom he can hear but not see or touch end up being disappointing companions. He wonders what the hell he's supposed to do with himself.

DISCUSSION

Substance Dualism

Discusses dualism, the view that there are physical bodies and nonphysical minds; substance dualism, the view that physical bodies and nonphysical minds are separate substances; and interactionism, a version of substance dualism that says that the mind and body are causally related. Discusses the problems many thinkers have had with the idea that the physical and nonphysical can be causally related and the theories of parallelism that have been offered place of interactionism.

Three Materialist Theories of Mind

Covers three materialist theories of mind and possible problems with them. Behaviorism claims that the mind is nothing but physical behavior and dispositions to behave. Behaviorism is based on claims about what we mean when we talk about minds but not all our talk about minds accords with a behaviorist analysis. The identity theory argues that those aspects of the mind not susceptible to a behaviorist analysis (e.g., thoughts and sensations) are, in fact, brain states. However, it doesn't seem as if brain states and mental states can be numerically identical in that they don't all have the same properties. The third theory, functionalism, defines mental states in terms of their functional roles, allowing for the possibility that machines might have minds. Discussed is the "Turing test," which claims in effect that if a machine could answer questions in a way that fooled an interrogator into thinking the machine was human, then the machine could be said to

have a mind in the same sense we do. That argument was countered by Searle's "Chinese room" thought experiment, which tried to demonstrate that understanding is different from manipulating symbols and that the Turing test would not show the machine understood the meaning of the symbols.

Zombies and the "Hard" Problem of Consciousness

Discusses David Chalmers's distinction between the "easy problem consciousness" and the "hard problem consciousness," the latter concerning how phenomenal consciousness could arise from the physical. Chalmers invents the idea of a "philosophical zombie," a creature just like us but without phenomenal consciousness, to isolate the problem. Chalmers argues that functionalism can solve the easy problem but not the hard problem.

Three More Dualist Theories

Sketches three more dualist theories, which are alternatives to substance dualism: Property dualism, which says that mental events are emergent nonphysical, nonreductive properties of the physical brain; epiphenomenalism, which says that nonphysical mental events emerge from brain events but have no effects on brain events; and, panpsychism which says that nonphysical mind is a fundamental feature of the universe and exists (at the very least) wherever matter exists.

Life After Death

Discusses the fact that the substance dualist can believe in the existence of the soul that survives the death of the body but also points out the difficulties in conceiving how an afterlife could be for a soul given the problems with interactionism. All theories would be compatible physical resurrection; however, the idea of physical resurrection runs into trouble if the resurrected body doesn't have the same matter.

Personal Identity

Says that continuity of soul with psychological continuity or continuity of body/brain with psychological continuity would be sufficient for personal identity. Considers some of the difficulties with the idea of psychological continuity in terms of multiple personalities and the Transporter cases of Derek Parfit. Some thinkers, like the Buddha, have concluded that there is no real personal identity, no real personhood.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the time you've finished reading this chapter you should be familiar with:

- what interactionism is and why it is both attractive and problematic;
- what the following three theories are and what can be said for and against them: logical behaviorism, the identity theory, and functionalism;
- Searle's "Chinese Room" thought experiment;
- Chalmers's "hard problem of consciousness" and what philosophical zombies are and how they relate to the "hard problem";
- what the following four theories are and what can be said for and against them: substance dualism, property dualism, epiphenomenalism, and panpsychism;

- the difficulties in deciding what capacities a soul would have; and
- the problem of personal identity.

TESTS

True/False Questions (5)

*1. Behaviorism is supposed to be an analysis of how we use mental terms.

*A. True.

B. False.

2. The identity claimed by the identity theory is identity of meaning rather than factual identity.

A. True.

*B. False.

*3. Critics of the identity theory claim that the mind and the brain have different characteristics.

*A. True.

B. False.

4. Property dualists say that mental events do not cause physical events.

A. True.

*B. False.

5. Behaviorism claims that the mind does not exist.

A. True

*B. False

Multiple-Choice Questions (5)

*1. Dualism is the view that there are

A. physical bodies and physical minds.

B. nonphysical bodies and physical minds.

*C. physical bodies and nonphysical minds.

D. None of the above

2. G. W. F. Leibniz argued for a view of mind and body we call

A. epiphenomenalism.

B. occasionalism.

C. property dualism.

*D. preestablished harmony.

*3. "How will that which is corporeal seize upon that which is incorporeal, so to hold it conjoined with itself." This quote from Gassendi is part of a critique of

A. substance dualism.

B. occasionalism.

*C. interactionism.

D. parallelism.

*4. The identity theory claims that the mind is identical to

A. the behavior of the body.

*B. the brain.

C. the way we function in society.

D. None of the above

5. Critics of the identity theory say that the mind and the brain

A. are numerically identical.

*B. do not have all the same characteristics.

C. do not causally interact.

D. None of the above

6. To say that mental states are multiply realizable is to say that they

*A. could take different forms in different creatures.

B. can be viewed from multiple perspectives.

C. are very real.

D. None of the above

7. Functionalism says that another creature could not have mind if it

A. wasn't made of flesh and blood like we are.

B. didn't have phenomenal consciousness.

C. didn't have a functional liver.

*D. None of the above

*8. The "Turing test" is a test of

*A. machine intelligence.

B. whether certain sounds are a secret German code.

C. whether an "interrogator" could come up with questions that no one can answer.

D. None of the above

9. The "Chinese room" thought experiment is designed to show that

A. Chinese is a very difficult language.

*B. manipulating Chinese symbols isn't the same as understanding Chinese.

C. a Chinese speaker in a closed room would have a difficult time determining what's said outside the room.

D. None of the above

*10. The "hard problem of consciousness" is the problem of how a physical system like the brain could

A. discriminate stimuli or report information.

*B. give rise to phenomenal experience.

C. control so much bodily behavior.

D. None of the above

*11. A “philosophical zombie” is an imaginary creature who

A. ate the flesh of philosophers in the horror novel “A Taste of Truth.”

B. is just like us with an animated dead body.

*C. is just like us but without phenomenal consciousness.

D. rejects philosophical behaviorism.

12. Which of the following theories does *not* believe in the existence of physical bodies?

A. The identity theory.

B. Functionalism.

C. Parallelism.

*D. None of the above

*13. Which of the following theories does *not* believe in the existence of a nonphysical substance mind?

A. Occasionalism

B. Preestablished harmony

*C. Property dualism

D. Interactionism

14. Which of the following theorists would be most likely to see the mind as analogous to shadow of a traveler walking by?

A. Parallellist

B. Property dualist

*C. Epiphenomenalism

D. Interactionist

*15. Property dualism claims that nonphysical mental properties are

*A. emergent properties.

B. reductive properties.

C. properties the soul.

D. None of the above

16. Which of the following theorists could consistently believe in the existence of a soul?

A. Behaviorist

*B. Parallelist

C. Epiphenomenalist

D. Property dualist

17. Which theorists could *not* consistently believe in the resurrection of the dead?

A. Behaviorist.

B. Identity theorist.

C. Interactionist.

*D. None of the above

*18. If you believed there was a soul that could move physical objects, you'd likely be a(n)

- A. epiphenomenalist.
- B. parallelist.
- C. property dualist.
- *D. None of the above

19. The concept of "anatman" indicates

- A. there is an underlying soul.
- *B. there is no underlying soul.
- C. there is no continuing physical body.
- D. None of the above

*20. Continuity of soul with psychological continuity would be sufficient but not necessary for sameness of person because

- A. continuity of soul requires a belief in an afterlife.
- *B. continuity of body/brain with psychological continuity would also be sufficient.
- C. psychological continuity is difficult to determine.
- D. None of the above

Essay Questions (3)

1. Do believe in life after death. If not, why not? If you do, what form do you think it would take? Has our discussion challenged or changed your views on this at all?

2. What are your views on whether or not a machine could ever be said to have a mind in the same sense that humans have minds? Answer with some references to our discussion of mind.

3. Answer the questions that concluded the chapter:

Ask yourself this: On your death bed, what would you have to believe is going to happen for you to feel that you will continue after death as you? Let's grant that if your soul with the same personality continues after death, that would be you. But assume for a moment that there is no soul and consider the following possibilities:

1. In the afterlife, God creates a body/mind out of your original matter, resulting in someone who looks, acts and thinks like you.
2. In the afterlife, God creates a body/mind out of different, heavenly matter, resulting in someone who looks, acts and thinks like you.
3. After your death, scientists recreate a previously made copy of your personality in a clone of your body/brain.
4. After your death, scientists recreate a previously made copy of your personality in a human-like robot.

Short Answer Questions (2)

1. In “Life After Life” Charlie says, “I wasn’t able to move objects in any way, which is kind of puzzling when you think of it. Of course, my soul didn’t have a body anymore. But if a soul can’t move objects, how does it ever move a body?” Explain in a bit of detail what philosophical problem Charlie’s remarks are bringing up.
2. What is John Searle’s “Chinese Room” thought experiment, and how is it an attack on functionalism?

WEB LINKS

Hard Problem of Consciousness

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/hard-con/>

Immortality

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/immortal/>

The Turing Test

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/turing-test/>

CHAPTER 4. FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Reading 1: “Please Don’t Tell Me How the Story Ends”

In a future society, a prisoner, Q, is given months of physical and psychological tests and then is isolated in a comfortable hotel-like prison cell. The walls of the cell are full of books, many of them black volumes that look like a huge encyclopedia. Q discovers that he is part of an experiment trying to prove that human behavior is predictable and that people don’t have free will. In this version of the experiment, Q is aware that his behavior is being predicted. He is able to read each prediction in the black volumes after it has come true. Q wants to believe he has free will and tries to foil the experiment. When he is unable to do so, he must decide whether to die or go on with his life.

Reading 2: “A Little Omniscience Goes a Long Way”

In a comic dialogue between God and Satan, Satan tells God that he and the other angels are tired of God controlling everything they think and do. Satan says “We do everything we do because you make us do it. That makes us feel like puppets. It’s not dignified. We’re not responsible for anything we do.” God replies that they do have control because they can do whatever they want to do. Satan says that’s not good enough because what they want God makes them want; they don’t want everything to be inevitable. God says that the opposite of inevitability is chance. They try an experiment with Adam and Eve, attempting to put chance in their bodies and minds in a way that Satan finds attractive.

DISCUSSION

The Determinism—Free-Will Issue

Discusses the ideas of determinism, indeterminism and libertarianism, and interrelations between them. Explains in detail the idea of contra-causal freedom.

Freedom of Action and Fatalism

Discusses the frequently confused concepts of freedom of action versus contra-causal freedom and fatalism versus determinism. Explains why the idea of fate is generally applied just a few events.

Do We Have Contra-Causal Freedom?

Discusses the complexities of trying to establish contra-causal freedom through consideration of quantum physics (seems to apply to just subatomic events) or of our feeling of freedom (too many of our mental processes are subconscious). Explains that contra-causal freedom is appealing in religious terms because it seems to make humans, not God, responsible for the evil in the world; however, it is tricky to reconcile such contra-causal freedom of God’s knowledge of the future.

Libertarianism and Its Critics

Presents a fuller account of libertarianism that structures the next few sections of the discussion. Says that libertarianism is a belief in the following:

1. Contra-causal freedom is conceptually coherent and would be a desirable thing to have.
2. Contra-causal freedom implies moral responsibility, and vice versa.
3. We have contra-causal freedom.
4. (Therefore) We are morally responsible for our choices (from 2 and 3).

Explains that the hard determinist differs from the libertarian in rejecting statement 3 and therefore concluding that we are never responsible for our choices.

Is There a Coherent Concept of Contra-Causal Freedom?

Some philosophers reject premise 1 of libertarianism, claiming that contra-causal freedom is an impossible notion because it is incoherent or contradictory (it's impossible to combine chance and control). Believing that contra-causal freedom is required for responsibility, they conclude that we are never responsible for our choices. This belief is called hard impossibilism.

Freedom as Compatible With Determinism or Indeterminism

Other philosophers reject premise 3 of libertarianism. They claim that contra-causal freedom is not required for moral responsibility. The early "compatibilists" argued that all that was required for moral responsibility is something like freedom of action. More sophisticated compatibilist views have been developed that require for moral responsibility a "deep self" that can review and modify our more basic desires.

Holding People Responsible

It is pointed out that even if hard determinism or hard impossibilism were true, we would still need and could justify a system of social control that might look much like our current one. We reviewed the views of Peter Strawson who argued that even if we believed in determinism, we wouldn't put everybody in the category of those who are exempt from moral judgments on the grounds that they are not responsible. Such would undermine our normal interpersonal relationships, and we would find that cost too high. Discusses the alternate view of Saul Smilansky, who calls his view "illusionism." Smilansky argues that a belief in determinism would undermine all our moral judgments and that we should promote the illusion that we have free will.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the time you've finished reading this chapter you should be familiar with:

- determinism, indeterminism, and libertarianism;
- the differences between determinism and fatalism and between freedom of action and
- (contra-causal) free will;
- the relevance to the free will debate of quantum physics, introspection, and religious;
- doctrines of God's foreknowledge;
- hard determinism and arguments for it;
- hard impossibilism and the arguments for it;
- what compatibilism is and the reasons some philosophers have endorsed it;

- the advantages of deep-self compatibilism over the simpler varieties; and
- Peter Strawson's views on holding people responsible in the face of determinism.

TESTS

True/False Questions (5)

1. Indeterminism implies libertarianism.

A. True

*B. False

*2. Freedom of action requires a causal break in the choice process.

A. True

*B. False

3. Libertarianism implies that people are always responsible for what they do.

A. True

*B. False

*4. According to "illusionism," we should tell everybody that their belief in free will is an illusion.

A. True

*B. False

5. If our lives are not fated, then we must have free will.

A. True

*B. False

Multiple Choice Questions (20)

1. "We have free will when we can do what we want to do." This statement reflects the view of

*A. classical compatibilism.

B. deep-self compatibilism.

C. libertarianism.

D. impossibilism.

*2. Determinism is the view that

A. quantum physics correctly describes the behavior of subatomic particles.

*B. all events are governed by causal laws.

C. not all events are governed by causal laws.

D. we must struggle against our fate.

3. Determinism implies that all future events could be predicted if

A. there weren't so much chance of the world.

B. we were mystics.

- ~~*C. we knew enough.~~
- ~~D. we had faith in God.~~

~~*4. “You will die on August 10, 2041, no matter what you do.” This statement would be an example of~~

- ~~A. hard impossibilism.~~
- ~~*B. fatalism.~~
- ~~C. determinism.~~
- ~~D. deep self compatibilism.~~

~~*5. The problem with looking at our choices to see if they are free/uncaused is that~~

- ~~A. our choices might be determined.~~
- ~~B. it won’t tell us how our actions happened.~~
- ~~*C. there may be unconscious causes for those choices.~~
- ~~D. our choices might be fated.~~

~~6. The hard determinist differs from the libertarian in believing~~

- ~~A. contra-causal freedom is conceptually coherent.~~
- ~~B. contra-causal freedom would be a desirable thing to have.~~
- ~~C. contra-causal freedom implies moral responsibility and vice versa.~~
- ~~*D. we do not have contra-causal freedom.~~

~~*8. If God gave us free will, it’s hard to see how God could~~

- ~~A. love humanity.~~
- ~~B. make a rock so big he can’t lift it.~~
- ~~*C. predict the future.~~
- ~~D. know the past.~~

~~*9. Hard determinism says that~~

- ~~A. we are always responsible for what we do.~~
- ~~B. we are sometimes responsible for what we do.~~
- ~~*C. we are never responsible for what we do.~~
- ~~D. it’s hard to live with determinism.~~

~~10. Hard impossibilism says that~~

- ~~A. events happened by chance.~~
- ~~B. free will puts a difficult burden on us.~~
- ~~*C. free will is an incoherent notion.~~
- ~~D. free will is a perfectly sensible idea.~~

~~*11. Contra-causal freedom seems to imply a causal break somewhere in the choice-process because~~

- ~~*A. otherwise our choices would be governed by causal laws.~~
- ~~B. otherwise we would not have freedom of action.~~
- ~~C. otherwise our choices would be fated.~~
- ~~D. None of the above~~

12. Susan Wolf says that to have free will we must have a deep self that (a) can evaluate ourselves sensibly and accurately and (b)

A. is contra-causally free.

B. is fated to be free.

*C. is sane.

D. None of the above

*13. Quantum physics implies that

*A. determinism is false.

B. indeterminism is false.

C. all events are fated.

D. no events are fated.

*14. The impossibilist argument says that contra-causal freedom is impossible because

A. determinism is true.

*B. contra-causal freedom makes no sense.

C. all our choices are fated.

D. None of the above

15. Impossibilism becomes hard impossibilism with the addition of the following premise:

A. It is hard being an impossibilist.

B. Freedom is compatible with determinism.

*C. Responsibility requires contra-causal freedom.

D. Our choices might be determined.

16. One difficulty in believing that all events are fated is that if they were fated

A. life should be much more orderly.

*B. life should be much more chaotic.

C. we should get more of what we want.

D. None of the above

*17. "Contra-causal freedom would be a desirable thing to have." Which of the following would be most likely to reject this statement?

A. Hard determinist

B. Libertarian

*C. Hard impossibilist

D. Fatalist

18. The problem with imagining that contra-causal freedom involves a causal break between the personality and the mental act of choice is that it implies

A. the personality just appears from nowhere and then causes choices.

*B. that actions result from a mental event (choice) that is in no way caused by the thoughts, wants, or moral views which we are calling the personality.

C. choices don't result in actions.

D. None of the above

*19. Soft determinism involves

*A. determinism plus compatibilism.

B. determinism plus incompatibilism.

C. a combination of determinism and indeterminism.

D. None of the above

20. Which of the following views would answer yes to *all* the following questions: Is contra-causal freedom necessary for moral responsibility? Is contra-causal freedom coherent and desirable? Are we ever morally responsible?

A. Compatibilism

B. Hard impossibilism

C. Hard determinism

*D. Libertarianism

Essay Questions (3)

1. Discuss in detail how you would have acted and reacted if you'd been in Q's place in "Please Don't Tell Me How the Story Ends."

2. Discuss in detail how you would have acted and reacted if you'd been in Satan's place in "A Little Omniscience Goes a Long Way." Would you have decided that having chance in Adam's and Eve's minds was an improvement over inevitability? Is there some way you could have refined the experiment that God and Satan conduct?

3. Discuss your own news of freedom and responsibility in the light of what you have read in this chapter.

Short Answer Questions (3)

1. "A free agent is he that can do as he will, and forbear as he will, and that liberty is the absence of external impediments." This quote is an example of what particular view? Explain.

2. Peter Strawson says there are cases where an agent is not the sort of person toward whom resentment is *ever* appropriate. Why doesn't he think we would view everybody this way if we believed in determinism.

3. Would a libertarian hold everybody responsible for every one of their actions? Explain your answer.

WEB LINKS

Free Will

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/freewill/>

Moral Responsibility

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/moral-responsibility/>

CHAPTER 5. GOD AND SUFFERING

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Reading 1: “The Vision”

A woman, Kayla, having recurring visions of an other-worldly being must decide if the visions are hallucinations or reflect a higher reality. Her psychiatrist says she’s suffering from hallucinations and gives her medications to stop them. But the Vision, a shimmering light with a sweet face and a sweet voice, makes Kayla feel so good that she hesitates to take the pills. The Vision says that she is trying to transform Kayla so that Kayla will be worthy to travel on into a higher realm. But when the exercises become scary and painful, Kayla takes the pills and the Vision goes away. Did she make the right choice and for the right reasons?

Reading 2: “Surprise! It’s Judgment Day”

A philosopher, Martin, surprised to find himself in an afterlife, complains to God about the irrationality of religion and about the existence of so much suffering in the world. Martin criticizes the traditional ontological, cosmological, and teleological/design arguments for God’s existence. Martin says that the design argument actually shows that God should not exist because the suffering in the world is such a great flaw. God and Martin argue about the traditional free will defense and virtue defense in support of the view that perfect God would allow, even create, suffering. The ending of the story raises further questions about what heaven could be like giving the traditional defenses of suffering.

DISCUSSION

Religious Experience

Discusses the question, Are particular religious experiences veridical—that is, true experiences of some objective reality (as with everyday perceptions of cars and trees and people)—or are they nonveridical—that is, merely subjective (as with dreams and fantasies)? If we apply our normal criteria of veridicality to vivid, particular religious experiences, the experiences seem too rare and too varied to qualify as evidence for particular religious truths. Also there’s the problem of what to do with the horrible experiences such as schizophrenics have.

Traditional Arguments for God’s Existence

Discusses arguments for different versions of three traditional arguments for God’s existence, as well as the criticisms brought to bear on these arguments. The Ontological/Definitional Argument attempts to show that the existence of a perfect God can be proved from the very definition of God. However, it doesn’t seem as if any concept could necessarily imply the existence of the thing it is a concept of. The Cosmological/First Cause Argument argues that given the existence of anything there must be something, God, that caused it to be. Critics argue that nothing had to cause the world, and even if there was a cause, it wouldn’t have to be God. There is a further discussion of how the Big Bang theory impacts the cosmological argument. The

Teleological/Design Argument attempts to show that given the complex orderliness of the universe it must have been designed by great intelligence, namely God. The theory of evolution has undercut the old design/chance dichotomy which earlier versions of the argument were based. However, there is a newer version of the teleological argument called the “fine-tuning argument,” which says the universe must have been fine-tuned at the beginning so that intelligent life would appear sometime, somewhere. However, atheists and others argue that the suffering in the world indicates that it could not have been designed by a moral God.

Atheism and the Problem of Suffering

Discusses the “problem of suffering”: Does the existence of suffering show that there could not be a God who is omnipotent (all-powerful), omniscient (all-knowing), and perfectly good? Yes, it does, says the critic: Such a God would create the best of all possible worlds. In the best of all possible worlds, there would exist human beings with free will who were happy and virtuous. Obviously, this world is not such a world. Therefore, there is no such God. But many theists make the following reply: The world you have just described is not a possible world. The idea of creating such a world is contradictory. Even an omnipotent God cannot do contradictory things; therefore, God can in no way be blamed for not having created such a world. Discussed are the free will and virtue defenses of suffering, along with possible problems with the them. It is noted that even if they work in general, there remains the difficult question of why there had to be this much suffering.

Faith and Reason

Discusses William Clifford’s view that we should believe nothing on insufficient evidence and the reply of William James who says we may believe without sufficient evidence in cases (like those involving belief in God) where the choice of belief in question seems “live,” “momentous,” and “forced.” Discusses the wager argument of Blaise Pascal that we should choose to believe in God because such a belief offers us greater potential benefits than not believing. Discusses Kierkegaard’s view that Christianity is absurd but that believing in that absurdity is the ultimate heroic test of faith.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

At the end of this discussion you should be familiar with:

- arguments for and against the claim that religious experiences are (at least sometimes) true experiences of some objective reality;
- the following arguments for the existence of God and objections to those arguments:
 - the ontological/definitional arguments
 - the cosmological/First Cause arguments
 - the teleological/design arguments;
- the “problem of suffering”;
- the problems with the following defenses of suffering:
 - Human beings couldn’t be happy all the time;

- Without a contrast, you couldn't know what happiness was;
- the "free will defense"; and
- the "virtue defense"
- William Clifford's view of when a belief is rationally (and morally) justified and William James's disagreement with Clifford;
- Pascal's "wager argument" and objections to it; and
- Kierkegaard's view of Christianity and of faith in God.

TESTS

True/False Questions (5)

- *1. The ontological argument is an a posteriori argument.
 A. True
 *B. False
2. The first cause argument, if successful, would prove the existence of a perfect God.
 A. True
 *B. False
- *3. The big bang theory gives some support to the fundamentalist Christian view that God created the world about 4000 B.C.
 A. True
 *B. False
4. The free will defense argues that free will necessarily implies suffering.
 A. True
 *B. False
5. If God limits our freedom of action is necessarily limiting our contra-causal freedom.
 A. True
 *B. False

Multiple Choice Questions (20)

1. The narrator of "The Vision" decides to take pills to make her stop seeing the Vision because
 A. she thinks it over carefully and decides the Vision can't be real.
 *B. what the Vision makes her do is uncomfortable and scary.
 C. she believes the world is about to end.
 D. None of the above
- *2. What a normal observer is observing and other normal observers could/would observe under similar conditions constitutes our criteria for the
 A. religiosity of the perception.
 *B. veridicality of the perception.

- C. teleology of the perception.
- D. None of the above

*3. If we refuse to consider horrible visions as possible religious experiences, we are

- A. using an argument from ignorance.
- B. we are committing the ad hominem fallacy.
- *C. begging the question against what counts as religious experiences.
- D. None of the above

4. If a particular argument for the existence of God doesn't work, that

- A. shows that God does not exist.
- B. counts as some evidence that God does not exist.
- *C. means nothing one way or the other.
- D. None of the above

*5. In "Surprise It's Judgment Day," what argument is Martin referring to when he says "Anselm and Descartes claimed that the definition of a perfect God necessarily implies that he exists"?

- *A. The ontological argument
- B. Cosmological argument
- C. The teleological argument
- D. None of the above

6. "Now, if I take the subject (God) with all its predicates (omnipotence being one), and say, *God is*, or *There is a God*, I add no new predicate to the conception of God." This quote is from

- A. Anselm.
- B. Descartes.
- *C. Kant.
- D. Aquinas.

*7. "A being with logically necessary existence." This phrase indicates a being who is such that it

- A. can't be made not to exist if it exists.
- *B. must exist.
- C. must think logically if it exists.
- D. None of the above

8. The theory of evolution undercuts some versions of

- A. the ontological argument.
- B. cosmological argument.
- *C. the teleological argument.
- D. None of the above

9. The "fine-tuning argument" is designed to show that God created the universe so that

- A. there would be a special creation of human beings on earth.

~~*B. life would appear sometime, somewhere in the universe.~~
~~C. there would be minimal suffering.~~
~~D. None of the above~~

~~*10. A person who isn't sure whether or not God exists is called a(n)~~
~~A. atheist.~~
~~*B. agnostic.~~
~~C. theist.~~
~~D. None of the above~~

~~*11. The "problem of suffering" is the problem of how God could allow suffering if God is~~
~~A. omnipotent.~~
~~B. omniscience.~~
~~C. omnipotent and omniscient.~~
~~*D. None of the above~~

~~12. There is nothing illogical about saying that an omnipotent God could not do contradictory things because~~
~~A. contradictory things are so difficult one can't expect even God to be able to do them.~~
~~*B. contradictions described nothing to do.~~
~~C. contradictions are forbidden by God.~~
~~D. None of the above~~

~~*13. Proving that it is impossible to have happiness without unhappiness wouldn't justify God creating the world like this one because it doesn't~~
~~A. mention free will.~~
~~*B. say how much unhappiness.~~
~~C. mention generosity.~~
~~D. None of the above~~

~~14. The free will defense uses the concept of~~
~~A. compatibilist freedom.~~
~~*B. contra-causal freedom.~~
~~C. deep self freedom.~~
~~D. None of the above~~

~~15. The virtue defense argues that God was right to create a world in which there~~
~~A. might be suffering.~~
~~*B. would definitely be suffering.~~
~~C. were necessarily virtuous people.~~
~~D. None of the above~~

~~*16. "It is wrong always and everywhere and for anyone to believe anything on insufficient evidence." This quote is from~~
~~*A. William K Clifford.~~

- B. William James.
- C. Blaise Pascal.
- D. Soren Kierkegaard.

17. Pascal's "wager argument" is designed to show that

- A. it is more likely that God exists than not so it is more rational to believe in God.
- *B. considering the gains and losses of believing versus not believing in God make it in your self-interest to believe.
- C. wagering God exists would be offensive to God.
- D. None of the above

*18. William James says that we may believe in God without evidence if

- A. we're convinced by Pascal's wager argument.
- *B. the choice to believe seems while live, momentous and forced.
- C. we have thought through the choice carefully.
- D. None of the above

19. The idea that God tests our faith by making religions seem irrational is called

- A. pragmatism.
- B. rationalism.
- *C. fideism.
- D. None of the above

*20. According to Kierkegaard, if God made the truth of his existence obvious, it would have

- *A. made believing too easy.
- B. been a welcome change.
- C. made it easier to make a "leap of faith."
- D. None of the above

Essay Questions (3)

1. Discuss the basis for your own religious belief or lack of belief in light of the views of Clifford, James, Pascal, and Kierkegaard.

2. Answer the following question from the text:

Try to imagine the following sort of world: A world with more abundance than anyone could use up, including space for living; people with free will but with a tendency toward good (as we are now supposed to have a tendency toward selfishness or evil); people with bodies that can suffer some painful injuries and diseases but can't be in agony or be maimed or be killed. In this world, people can have adventures and take risks and display moral qualities, although not to the degree that we can (because of the limits on suffering).

- a. Is there anything contradictory about this world? Explain.
- b. Would such a world be better or worse than our own? Explain.

3. Whether you are a believer or not, explain how you think a believer might try to justify the amount of suffering in the world? You think this justification is ultimately successful?

Short Answer Questions (2)

1. Suppose you began to have some “visions.” How would you decide whether they represented some objective reality or were merely fantasies or hallucinations?

2. What do you think of the fideist idea that the intellectually difficult aspects of religion are a test of faith? Would that be a fair test?

WEB LINKS

The Problem of Evil

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/evil-evi/>

The Fine-Tuning Argument

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/fine-tuning/>

Pascal's Wager

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/pasc-wag/>

CHAPTER 6. MORALITY

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Reading 1: “The Land of Certus”

A medieval traveler stumbles upon a land, the land of Certus, where mysterious red and green lights emanate like auras around various people and their deeds. The traveler is told that the lights are the lights of good and bad and, although he is initially skeptical, further observation convinces him this is so. But then complications arise. A man named Georges ignores the lights and encourages others to do the same. The inhabitants of a neighboring town claim that their sacred book shows what is truly good and bad and that the lights are simply there to deceive. The traveler is shocked when he comes upon Georges being tortured. However, he accepts the rightness of the deed when he sees that the torturers are glowing green. Would you have accepted it as well?

Reading 2: “Those Who Help Themselves”

Visitors from Earth find on the planet Omega the “only truly moral civilization” that they have encountered on their travels. The Omegans truly care for one another. Their society, although involving some competition for goods, makes sure that the less fortunate are well taken care of. The Omegans have virtually eliminated discrimination in terms of sex and color. Their society is democratic, but their debates about policies and ideals, as well as their competition for office, have a high moral tone. The visitors from Earth try to find out the Omegans’ secret and finally do: The Omegans believe in the perpetual reincarnation of souls, which is not only natural but random. There was no telling what one might be in the next life in terms of sex, color, ability, or inclination. Therefore, in promoting a society that helps, they would ultimately be helping themselves.

DISCUSSION

Metaethics Versus Normative Ethics

Distinguishes metaethical questions—questions concerning whether or not moral/ethical judgments are true and false and, if so, whether or not we can know which ones are true and false—from normative ethical questions—questions about what things are good or bad, right or wrong, about what things should or should not be done. Also distinguishes factual judgments from value judgments.

Moral Objectivism and Moral Subjectivism

Distinguishes moral objectivism—the view that says that where we have a moral judgment and its negation, one of these judgments must be true and the other false—from moral subjectivism, which is the denial of this.

An Argument for Moral Subjectivism

Presents an argument for moral subjectivism. If moral questions were indeed analogous to scientific questions, which are objective, then we ought to be able to specify what evidence would decide moral questions. According to the moral subjectivist, we cannot

do this. There is no evidence that would demonstrate that abortion is right or wrong, that an equal distribution of goods is or is not better than competition for goods. Thus, says the subjectivist, moral questions cannot be analogous to scientific questions. Instead, they are analogous to questions of taste. The moral subjectivism argues further that even the clear commands of a God would not result in a rational resolution of moral disputes.

Moral Subjectivism Reconsidered

The cruder forms of moral subjectivism, which say that moral judgments are nothing more than simple statements of attitude, have been criticized for not making possible the idea of moral debate or the distinction between morality and self-interest. One revision of moral subjectivism claims that moral judgments express special preferences from the moral point of view as to what moral rules we should all follow.

What About Cultural Relativism?

Discusses relativism with an eye to its relation to subjectivism. Distinguishes two forms of metaethical relativism—cultural relativism and individual relativism. Dismisses cultural relativism on the grounds that to be different from individual relativism it must include the implausible premise that we all decide moral questions by consulting the predominant beliefs of our culture. Argues that individual relativism is basically the same subjectivism and needs the same refinements.

A More Technical Take On Metaethics

Gives the following expanded definition of moral objectivism:

1. Moral judgments state beliefs about moral properties in the world.
2. There are such moral properties in the world.
3. At least some of these properties apply to all human beings.

Relates each of these premises to sophisticated debates in metaethics that are not taken up in this text.

From the Moral Point of View

Discusses precedents for the moral point of view in religion and philosophy. These include the Golden Rule as well as the “ideal observer theory,” which claims that in formulating a moral judgment we are implying that such a judgment would be endorsed by an ideal observer who was sympathetic to all human beings, and Kant’s ethical theory with its general categorical imperative: “Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law.”

Utilitarianism Versus John Rawls

Discusses act-utilitarianism and rule-utilitarianism and John Rawls’s critique of utilitarianism from an analogue of the moral point of view. Rawls asks us to imagine an idealized social contract situation. From an “original position of equality,” behind a “veil of ignorance” (not knowing what kind of people we will be) must decide what general principles will govern society. Rawls is arguing that people in the original position would opt for basic rights and duties before any principle regarding the distribution of goods. He further argues that people would select as their principle of distribution an extremely egalitarian “difference principle.”

Morality, Virtue, and Living Well

Discusses arguments for claim that “flourishing” (the development of worthwhile) certain human capacities) can be considered an intrinsic good like happiness. Discusses virtues (worthwhile character traits) and the pros and cons of virtue ethics as opposed to the predominant ethics of rules (such as utilitarianism and Kantian ethics). Virtue ethics would focus on good character rather than right action and include a whole spectrum of virtues, including those that an ethics of rules might see as nonmoral.

Feminism and the Ethics of Care

Discusses the development of feminist ethics put in terms of rights, freedom and equality, and a more recent feminist ethic called the “ethics of care,” which sees ethics as modeled on the caring relationships within families. There is a comparison between the ethics of care and other “sympathy ethics” like utilitarianism and John Rawls’s idealized social contract. Discusses the threat to both from “basic social contract theory,” which posits a minimalist social ethic demanding very little of the people.

Race From the Moral Point of View

The moral point of view is set up in such a way as to be “color-blind.” Rawls’s ideal agents choosing what kind of society they would endorse would have no idea what color their skin would be. Either approach would presumably lead to a society that did not discriminate against people of color. However, some critics have argued that it is not sufficient to discuss the problems of racism in terms of ideal justice with color blind principles: Even if such ideal justice recommends nondiscriminatory principles, it fails dismally to recognize past racial injustices and the impact they have on people’s life prospects now. Charles W. Mills argues that we should conceptualize societies like ours as being based not on a social contract brought about by equal human beings but on a “domination contract”: a cooperative agreement by one segment of society, which includes the intention to dominate other segments of society. Mills suggests we revise Rawls’s thought experiment, giving the agents more and different information that will produce a nonideal theory that takes account of historical injustices.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

At the end of this discussion you should be familiar with:

- the distinction between metaethics and normative ethics;
- the theories of moral objectivism and moral subjectivism and the argument given for moral subjectivism;
- the problems with the simpler forms of moral subjectivism and how the theory has been modified to take care of those problems;
- the theory of cultural relativism;
- the idea of the moral point of view and how it relates to the theories of Adam Smith and Immanuel Kant;
- the debate between the utilitarian and John Rawls from the moral point of view;
- virtue ethics and the ethics of care and the strengths and weaknesses of both theories; and

- the difficulties dealing with racial issues using Rawls's ideal social contract model.

TESTS

True/False Questions (5)

1. To call a judgment "factual" is to say that it is true.

A. True

*B. False

*2. Divine Command Theory seems to imply that if God commanded gratuitous acts of torture those acts would be right.

*A. True

False

3. Virginia Held argues that if there is a social contract, it is actually a "domination contract."

A. True

*B. False

*4. Carol Gilligan argued that there is a special sort of female thinking about ethical problems.

*A. True

B. False

5. Utilitarianism is an example of a consequentialist ethic.

*A. True

B. False

Multiple-Choice Questions (20)

1. "Is abortion wrong?" would be a

A. metaethical question.

*B. normative ethical question.

C. factual question.

D. None of the above

*2. Moral objectivism says that where we have a moral judgment and its negation

A. both must be true.

B. both must be false.

*C. one must be true and the other false.

D. None of the above

3. To believe that moral judgments are like statements of taste would make one a

A. moral objectivist.

- ~~*B. moral subjectivist.~~
- ~~C. utilitarian.~~
- ~~D. None of the above~~

~~*4. The “‘X is right’ means ‘I approve of X’” version of moral subjectivism is unsatisfactory because it doesn’t~~

- ~~A. specify what “X” is.~~
- ~~*B. allow for moral debate.~~
- ~~C. say who “I” is.~~
- ~~D. None of the above~~

~~5. “Moral preferences” (as defined by the text) are preferences for~~

- ~~A. good over evil.~~
- ~~*B. how people should treat one another.~~
- ~~C. how I will treat you, but not how you will treat me.~~
- ~~D. None of the above~~

~~*6. To say that all moral beliefs are equally true would be to voice a form of~~

- ~~A. metaethical cultural relativism.~~
- ~~*B. metaethical individual relativism.~~
- ~~C. normative relativism.~~
- ~~D. None of the above~~

~~7. To say that we ought not to judge other cultures would be to voice a form of~~

- ~~A. metaethical cultural relativism.~~
- ~~B. metaethical individual relativism.~~
- ~~*C. normative relativism.~~
- ~~D. None of the above~~

~~*8. Moral objectivism is~~

- ~~*A. cognitivist.~~
- ~~B. moral anti-realist.~~
- ~~C. relativist.~~
- ~~D. None of the above~~

~~9. “If you want to do X, then you ought to do Y” would be a~~

- ~~A. categorical imperative.~~
- ~~*B. hypothetical imperative.~~
- ~~C. hypothetical syllogism.~~
- ~~D. None of the above~~

~~*10. “Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law.” This quote is from~~

- ~~A. Adam Smith.~~
- ~~B. Jeremy Bentham.~~
- ~~*C. Immanuel Kant.~~

D. John Rawls.

11. "By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question." This quote is from

A. Adam Smith.

*B. Jeremy Bentham.

C. Immanuel Kant.

D. John Rawls.

12. John Rawls criticizes utilitarianism on grounds that it

A. doesn't acknowledge the importance of religion.

B. focuses too much on rules.

*C. doesn't give enough protection to individuals.

D. None of the above

*13. "To evaluate a person's life we need a kind of 'binocular vision' to assess 'two strands of the good life.'" This quote is from

A. Aristotle.

B. Lawrence Kohlberg.

*C. Jonathan Glover.

D. John Rawls.

*14. According to Glover, if one strand of the good life is happiness, the other would be

A. self-satisfaction.

*B. flourishing.

C. virtue.

D. None of the above

15. "What's ultimately wrong with cheating someone is not that you're a cheater but that they got cheated; what's ultimately wrong with being mean to someone is not that you're a mean person but that they got hurt." This quote (from the text) is a criticism of

A. utilitarianism.

*B. virtue ethics.

C. an ethic of rules.

D. None of the above

*16. "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This quote is from

A. Carol Gilligan.

B. Nel Noddings.

C. Virginia Held.

*D. Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

*17. According to Kolberg, the highest level of moral thinking is

- A. thinking of right in terms of social roles and relationships.
- *B. recognizing and following abstract principles that apply to all humanity.
- C. obeying authority and avoiding punishment.
- D. None of the above

18. “The moral imperative that emerges repeatedly in the women’s interviews is an injunction to care, a responsibility to discern and alleviate the ‘real and recognizable trouble’ of this world. For the men Kohlberg studied, the moral imperative appeared rather as an injunction to respect the rights of others and thus to protect from interference the right to life and self fulfillment.” This quote is from

- *A. Carol Gilligan.
- B. Nel Noddings.
- C. Virginia Held.
- D. Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

19. “A globalization of caring relations would help enable people of different states and cultures to live in peace, to respect each other’s rights, to care together for their environments, and to improve the lives of their children.” This quote is from

- A. Carol Gilligan.
- B. Nel Noddings.
- *C. Virginia Held.
- D. Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

*20. Charles W Mills criticizes Rawls for

- *A. not taking account of historical injustices.
- B. not making rules that were “color-blind.”
- C. not stressing freedom and equality.
- D. None of the above

Essay Questions (3)

1. Explain Rawls concept of the “veil of ignorance.” Why does Rawls think his principles would be chosen behind the veil? Why do others think the utilitarian principle would be chosen instead?
2. “Moral judgments are simply statements of preference.” In what ways, and for what reasons, has this version of moral subjectivism been modified?
3. What does Mills mean by the “domination contract” How does this relate to his critique of Rawls?

Short Answer Questions (2)

1. What is utilitarianism? What is the difference between act utilitarianism and rule-utilitarianism?

~~2. Give an account of Aristotle's ethics.~~

WEB LINKS

Virtue Ethics

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/virtue/>

John Rawls

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/rawls/>

Social Contract Theory

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/soc-cont/>

Metaethics

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/metaethi/>

Care Ethics

<https://www.iep.utm.edu/care-eth/>