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**Introduction**

*Summary*

Three core areas of moral philosophy will be discussed in the text: value theory, normative ethics, and metaethics. Value theory addresses questions about what makes a life go well and what is worth pursuing for its own sake. Normative ethics is concerned with what moral duties we have and how we ought to behave. Metaethics deals with questions about the status of ethics, including whether ethics is objective and whether we can have moral knowledge. Some people, sometimes called “moral skeptics,” believe that the entire enterprise of moral philosophy is fundamentally bankrupt. Such skepticism will be addressed in later chapters; here we simply note that such views are deeply controversial and must be argued for. Furthermore, even if morality turns out to not be objective, it may still be worth studying.

Ethical reflection must start somewhere, and while a precise definition of morality is difficult to come by, we can get a sense of the subject matter by distinguishing stereotypically moral questions and claims from those of other related fields, such as law and etiquette. Getting from these starting points to interesting conclusions, however, requires philosophical argument. A moral argument consists of a set of reasons (called “premises”) that are intended to support a given conclusion. Good moral arguments must avoid both false premises and bad reasoning. Arguments containing watertight reasoning, where the truth of the premises guarantees the truth of the conclusion, are called “valid arguments.” Valid arguments that contain all true premises are called “sound arguments.” The task of moral philosophy is to use rational argument to assess the merits of different moral principles, including very general moral theories that seek to cover a wide variety of particular cases.

*Essay Questions*

1. Explain the difference between normative ethics and metaethics. Give an example of a claim from each area, and explain why each claim falls into the category it does. Do you think that theories about metaethics have any bearing on claims about normative ethics, or are the two areas basically independent? Defend your answer.
2. Define moral skepticism and present what you take to be the strongest argument for the view. How do you think someone who is not a skeptic would respond to this argument? Do you think moral skepticism is true? Why or why not?
3. What are the two ways that a moral argument can go wrong? Give an example of an argument with the first failing and another example of an argument with the second. Explain what is wrong with each argument, and show how these defects could be corrected.
4. Give an example of a moral principle that you take to be plausible, and explain how the principle gives guidance about how to act in a variety of different situations. Do you think there are any exceptions to the principle you cite? Why or why not?
5. Give an example of a particular action that you take to be morally right or morally wrong. What do you take to be the morally relevant features of that action? What implications does your discussion have for the morality of other actions?
6. How would you define moral philosophy? How does moral philosophy differ from other disciplines that sometimes give advice, such as economics or psychology?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. Which of the following questions falls into the area of moral philosophy known as “value theory”?

a. Is morality objective?

b. What do we owe to each other?

c. What kind of life is most worth living?\*

d. How do we know which actions are morally right?

1. The question “do the ends justify the means?” falls within the area of

a. value theory.

b. normative ethics.\*

c. metaethics.

d. moral psychology.

1. The claim that morality is a human invention and therefore not objective is a claim about

a. applied ethics.

b. value theory.

c. normative ethics.

d. metaethics.\*

1. Skepticism about morality is

a. a position that no one has ever argued for.

b. nearly universally accepted.

c. nearly universally rejected.

d. deeply controversial.\*

1. In philosophy, an *argument* is

a. a formal debate between two parties who disagree.

b. a heated confrontation concerning a key philosophical issue.

c. a chain of reasoning consisting of a set of reasons that supports some conclusion.\*

d. an objection to a stated philosophical position.

1. It is impossible for a valid argument to have

a. true premises and a false conclusion.\*

b. true premises and a true conclusion.

c. false premises and a false conclusion.

d. None of the above

1. There is no such thing as

a. a sound argument that is also valid.

b. a sound argument that is not valid.\*

c. a valid argument that is also sound.

d. a valid argument that is not sound.

1. The conclusion of a sound argument

a. will always be true.\*

b. will always be false.

c. might be true but also might be false.

d. will always be relevant to the debate at hand.

1. A moral agent is

a. someone who acts morally all the time.

b. someone who acts in accordance with the ethics of his or her profession.

c. anyone who is capable of controlling his or her behavior through moral reasoning.\*

d. any individual whose interests we must consider in order to act morally.

1. Moral theorizing essentially involves

a. trying to decide what is right or wrong on a case-by-case basis.

b. trying to come up with general moral principles that apply to many different cases.\*

c. consulting the relevant laws and the Constitution.

d. trying to explain what causes people to make the moral judgments they do.

1. “Conventional morality” is
2. the set of laws of a particular government.
3. the set of principles genuinely believed by a moral agent.
4. the set of traditional principles that are widely shared within a culture or society.\*
5. the set of true moral principles.
6. Which is *not* a central concern of morality?
7. Protecting people’s well-being
8. Justice
9. Blame
10. Legality\*
11. The desire for “unification” in ethics is a desire for
12. everyone to agree on moral principles.
13. everyone to treat each other well.
14. a single general moral principle.\*
15. a scientific account of morality.
16. What do principles of law, etiquette, self-interest, tradition, and morality all have in common?
17. They all represent a set of standards for how we ought to behave.\*
18. They all are objective.
19. They all are descriptive.
20. All of the above
21. Some moral actions are
22. illegal.
23. impolite.
24. generous.
25. All of the above\*
26. Which of the following questions falls within the domain of metaethics?
    1. What is the status of moral claims and advice?\*
    2. What are our fundamental moral duties?
    3. Do the ends always justify the means?
    4. What is the good life?

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following claims falls within the domain of value theory?
   1. Morality is objective.
   2. Moral knowledge is impossible.
   3. The right thing to do is whatever maximizes happiness.
   4. The only thing that matters in order to live well is to get what you want.\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What area of moral philosophy deals with questions about what our moral obligations are?
   1. Value theory
   2. Normative ethics\*
   3. Metaethics
   4. Moral epistemology

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following commonly motivates people to be skeptical about morality?
   1. The existence of moral disagreement
   2. The belief that science is the only way of discovering truth
   3. The view that all moral rules have exceptions
   4. All of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is an *argument* in philosophy?
   1. A set of claims, including a conclusion and reasons given in support of the conclusion\*
   2. A formal debate between competing positions
   3. A heated exchange of the sort that is frowned upon by serious philosophers
   4. A complex philosophical theory

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to the text, how should moral philosophy begin?
   1. From a set of moral principles that cannot be doubted
   2. From a set of moral rules that is clear enough so as to not require interpretation
   3. From a set of plausible ethical claims that is subject to revision\*
   4. None of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following is impossible?
   1. A valid argument with a false conclusion
   2. A sound argument with a false premise\*
   3. A valid argument that is not sound
   4. A sound argument with a true conclusion

*Appears on the student website.*

1. If we discover that an argument is invalid, what does this tell us about its conclusion?
   1. It is true.
   2. It is false.
   3. It follows from the premises.
   4. None of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to the text, what is moral philosophy primarily concerned with?
   1. Figuring out which particular actions are right or wrong in everyday life
   2. Explaining why people make the moral judgments they do
   3. Examining the attractions of various ethical theories\*
   4. Learning about the differing moral codes of different societies

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the best description of the following argument? *If the sky is yellow, then grass is pink. The sky is yellow. Therefore, grass is pink.*
   1. Valid and sound
   2. Valid but unsound\*
   3. Invalid but sound
   4. Invalid and unsound

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 1: Hedonism: Its Powerful Appeal**

*Summary*

Theories of well-being attempt to state what it is for a life to go well, and what kinds of things make a life better. While everyone agrees that many things are *instrumentally* valuable insofar as they allow us to obtain other valuable things, theories of well-being aim to pinpoint which things are *intrinsically* valuable, or valuable for their own sake. Hedonism is the theory that pleasure is the only thing that is intrinsically good for people, and pain is the only thing that is intrinsically bad for people. Hedonists make a distinction between physical pleasure, which consists of pleasant feelings or sensations, and attitudinal pleasure, which is the positive attitude of enjoyment. If hedonism is to be plausible, we must understand it as the claim that only attitudinal pleasure is intrinsically good for us. This interpretation fits neatly with the views of the great hedonists from the past, such as Epicurus and John Stuart Mill.

Hedonism has many attractions. The theory allows that there are many different types of valuable life, and it gives us a certain degree of autonomy over what is good or bad for us. Furthermore, it just seems obvious that happiness is good for people, and misery is bad for them. Given that all of our explanations must start somewhere, hedonism seems to be a plausible starting point. Hedonism also neatly accounts for the fact that rules of thumb about what is good for people often have exceptions, since what makes one person happy needn't make someone else happy. Finally, hedonism makes sense of the fact that parents who say they want the best for their children typically want their children to be happy.

*Essay Questions*

1. Explain the difference between *intrinsic* value and *instrumental* value, and give examples of things you take to be valuable in each way. Next, define hedonism. What does the hedonist claim is intrinsically valuable and what does she claim is instrumentally valuable?
2. Hedonists distinguish between two types of pleasure. Explain this distinction and give examples of each type of pleasure. Which type of pleasure do hedonists claim is more important? Why do you think they say this? Do you agree with this claim?
3. It is often claimed that hedonism allows for many types of valuable life, and that if hedonism is true, then what benefits us is “up to us.” How would a hedonist defend these two claims? Do you think they are true? If so, are these strong considerations in favor of hedonism?
4. What does it mean to say that “explanation must stop somewhere”? How might this be used to argue for hedonism?
5. Most people would not desire their loved ones to get lobotomies, even if such a procedure would make the loved ones happier as a result. Explain how this fact might be taken to raise a challenge to hedonism. How do you think the hedonist would respond? Do you find such a response convincing?
6. Briefly describe an example of an intuitively valuable life (it can be someone you know personally or someone you just know of). Explain what makes their life valuable. Does Hedonism do a good job of capturing all the dimensions of value in the life in your example? Why or why not?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. Getting a vaccine that prevents illness is an example of something that is

a. instrumentally valuable.\*

b. intrinsically valuable.

c. Both of the above

d. None of the above

1. If something is intrinsically valuable, then it must

a. bring about other good things.

b. be valuable for its own sake.\*

c. be recognized to be valuable by everyone, not just some people.

d. be attainable by everyone.

1. According to hedonism, the key ingredient to a good life is

a. happiness.\*

b. getting what you want.

c. doing God's will.

d. being kind to others.

1. An example of attitudinal pleasure would be

a. the excitement of riding a roller coaster.

b. the delicious sensation of eating chocolate cake.

c. the enjoyment of listening to your favorite song.\*

d. the feeling of a warm bath.

1. An example of a physical pleasure would be
2. the enjoyment of your favorite book.
3. the pleasure of good company.
4. the sensation of a relaxing back massage.\*
5. the sense of accomplishment after finishing a marathon.
6. Hedonists believe that

a. pleasure is not very important to having a good life.

b. physical pleasure and attitudinal pleasure are equally valuable.

c. physical pleasure is more important than attitudinal pleasure.

d. attitudinal pleasure is more important than physical pleasure.\*

1. The first great hedonist in Western philosophy was

a. Epicurus.\*

b. Plato.

c. Aristotle.

d. John Stuart Mill.

1. According to hedonism

a. there are many different ways to live a good life.

b. what is good for us is largely a matter of personal choice.

c. most rules for living a good life have exceptions.

d. All of the above\*

1. Some people enjoy their own physical pain in certain circumstances. Hedonists would say

a. that their physical pain is good for them in those circumstances.\*

b. that their physical pain is always bad for them.

c. that their physical pain in those circumstances is both good and bad.

d. that the situation just described is impossible.

1. The fact that parents typically want their children to be happy

a. proves that hedonism is true.

b. proves that hedonism is false.

c. doesn't prove that hedonism is either true or false.\*

d. has no relation to the theory of hedonism.

1. The fact that we don't want our (cognitively normal) loved ones to get lobotomies

a. is often cited in arguments in favor of hedonism.

b. is thought to raise a problem for hedonism.\*

c. Both of the above

d. None of the above

1. John Stuart Mill’s critics claimed that hedonism was
2. “plausible but incomplete.”
3. “an opiate of the masses.”
4. “elitist.”
5. “a doctrine of swine.”\*
6. According to Epicurus, the ideal state of tranquility comes largely from
7. ccording to Epicurus, the ideal state of tranquility comes largely from ...moderation in all physical matters.
8. intellectual clarity about wha intellectual clarity about what is truly important.
9. haphhhhslkjpleasurable sensations.
10. Both a and b\*
11. According to Mill
12. all pleasure is equally valuable.
13. intellectual and artistic pleasures are better than physical pleasures.\*
14. physical pleasures are better than intellectual and artistic pleasures.
15. only pleasures resulting from had work are valuable.
16. According to hedonism, your life is good for you to the extent that
17. you experience pleasure and avoid pain.\*
18. you accomplish your goals.
19. you live morally.
20. All of the above
21. What does it mean to say that something is *instrumentally valuable*?
    1. It is good for its own sake.
    2. It is good because it helps us to achieve some other good.\*
    3. It is good both for its own sake and for what it helps us to achieve.
    4. It is useful to think it is valuable, even if it isn't really valuable.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is a theory of well-being supposed to tell us?
   1. Which policies will make people better off
   2. Why we ought to try to make other people's lives better
   3. Which things are instrumentally good for us
   4. Which things are intrinsically good for us\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following does the hedonist believe is intrinsically valuable?
   1. The pain of exercising
   2. The good health that is a result of exercise
   3. The happiness that accompanies being healthy\*
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following is an important distinction for hedonists?
   1. Present vs. future pleasure
   2. Physical vs. attitudinal pleasure\*
   3. Aesthetic vs. emotional pleasure
   4. Analytic vs. synthetic pleasure

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Who is widely regarded as the first great hedonist in Western philosophy?
   1. Plato
   2. Aristotle
   3. John Stuart Mill
   4. Epicurus\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following is an attraction of hedonism?
   1. It allows us to explain why people fear lobotomies.
   2. Accepting it frees us from moral obligations to others.
   3. It explains why there are many different types of good life.\*
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. How do hedonists typically support the claim that happiness has intrinsic value?
   1. They claim that it can be proven on the basis of other principles.
   2. They admit it cannot be proven, but must be accepted based on faith.
   3. They claim it is self-evident, and is a starting point for thinking about well-being.\*
   4. They admit that it is not true, but recommend that we believe it because it is useful.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. How do hedonists regard most rules about how to live a good life?
   1. Such rules are not very useful, but not necessarily harmful.
   2. Many such rules are correct, and have no exceptions.
   3. Such rules are merely tools of those in power, used to subordinate others.
   4. Many such rules are useful, but they have exceptions.\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What would a hedonist say about a person who sometimes enjoyed his or her own pain?
   1. Pain would sometimes be good for such a person.\*
   2. Pain would never be good for such a person.
   3. Hedonism would not apply to such a person.
   4. The existence of such a person would disprove hedonism.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the point of Philippa Foot's example about the lobotomized patients?
   1. Lobotomies make people unhappy and therefore are to be avoided.
   2. Lobotomies make people happy and therefore are to be encouraged.
   3. People with lobotomies are sometimes happy, and this is evidence for hedonism.
   4. People with lobotomies are sometimes happy, and this is a problem for hedonism.\*

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 2: Is Happiness All That Matters?**

*Summary*

This chapter explores potential objections to hedonism. The first two objections are easier for the hedonist to deal with, whereas later objections raise more serious problems. The so-called *paradox* *of* *hedonism* states that directly and single-mindedly pursuing happiness is unlikely to be successful, and is therefore irrational. This paradox, however, shows only that happiness is best pursued indirectly; it does not refute the claim that happiness is the only thing that is intrinsically good for us. The next objection points out that people can take great pleasure in committing evil deeds, and it is not good for them to do so. This observation does not threaten hedonism, however, once a distinction is made between an action's being *morally* good and being *good for* someone. Thus, hedonism emerges unscathed from these first two objections.

Other objections are more difficult to rebut. Contrary to hedonism, happiness based on false beliefs does not seem as valuable as happiness based on true beliefs because we care about being in contact with reality. Autonomy—the ability to control our own lives—seems to be valuable, even when it does not make us happier. A life that begins in misery and ends with many years of happiness seems preferable to a life with the opposite trajectory, even if the two lives contain the exact same amount of happiness. Finally, in some cases unhappiness appears to be best explained as a symptom of some underlying harm—an explanation that makes sense only if something *besides* happiness can directly make us better or worse off. All four of the preceding objections raise serious challenges for the hedonist.

*Essay Questions*

1. Describe the paradox of hedonism, and explain why it is often taken to be a problem for the theory. What do you think is the best response that the hedonist can give to the problem? Is this response adequate?
2. Does having true beliefs sometimes make a life go better, even if it doesn't make one any happier? If so, give an example in which you think this is the case. If not, explain why not. Does the fact that we're sometimes unhappy when we find out we had false beliefs show that having false beliefs is sometimes intrinsically bad for us? Why or why not?
3. Suppose you had the opportunity to have someone else make all of your decisions for you for the rest of your life. Suppose further that this person knows you so incredibly well that her decisions are guaranteed to make you happier in the long term than you would be if you made your own decisions. Would you accept such an arrangement? Why or why not? What does this case tell us about the plausibility of hedonism?
4. Some lives begin in misery and end in success and happiness, whereas others have exactly the opposite trajectory. Write an essay about the “life's trajectory” objection to hedonism. What is the problem for hedonism supposed to be exactly? How do you think a hedonist would respond to this problem?
5. Write an essay developing what you take to be the strongest argument against hedonism. What do you think is the best reply that the hedonist can give to this argument? Do you find the argument convincing? Defend your answer.
6. Write an essay developing what you take to be the strongest version of hedonism. Be sure to explain how this version of hedonism grapples with the most serious objections raised in this chapter. Ultimately, do you think that your version of hedonism is correct? Defend your response.

*Test Bank Questions*

1. The paradox of hedonism states that

a. the happier you are, the happier you make those around you.

b. directly seeking happiness is often self-defeating.\*

c. it is impossible to be both morally good and happy at the same time.

d. many people who achieve all their goals remain unhappy.

1. If it’s true that single-mindedly pursuing happiness makes you less happy, then
2. hedonism is false.
3. hedonism is false for you.
4. hedonism says single-mindedly pursuing happiness is good for you anyway.
5. hedonism says single-mindedly pursuing happiness is not good for you.\*
6. If hedonism is true, then the enjoyment a serial killer derives from committing her crimes is
7. good for her.\*
8. bad for her.
9. Both of the above
10. None of the above
11. According to the argument from evil pleasures

a. hedonism implies that happiness that comes from evil deeds is good.

b. happiness that comes from evil deeds is not as good as happiness that comes from good deeds.

c. hedonism is false.

d. All of the above\*

1. According to hedonism, what is the relationship between well-being and moral goodness?
2. You can increase your well-being only by being morally good.
3. You can be morally good only by increasing your well-being.
4. You can be morally good only by increasing others’ well-being.
5. None of the above\*
6. If hedonism is true, then our lives go well to the extent that we are

a. happy.\*

b. uncoerced.

c. autonomous.

d. Both b and c

1. Hedonism is committed to which of the following?

a. Happiness makes us less well-off when it comes from immoral action.

b. Happiness is happiness, regardless of its source.\*

c. Happiness is more valuable when it is not based on false beliefs.

d. Happiness loses its value when it detracts from autonomy.

1. Autonomy is
2. the ability to control others’ lives.
3. the power to guide our life through our own free choices.\*
4. the ability of our subconscious to affect our behavior.
5. the power that robots have to operate according to a set of commands.
6. The *experience machine* thought experiment is supposed to show that happiness is less valuable if it is based on

a. immorality.

b. selfishness.

c. false beliefs.\*

d. trivial hobbies.

1. According to hedonism, a pleasant life of illusion is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ an equally pleasant life based on real achievement and true beliefs
2. less good for you than
3. better for you than
4. equally good as\*
5. sometimes less good, sometimes better than
6. The value of autonomy explains why paternalism is

a. always justified.

b. never justified.

c. always objectionable, even when it is justified.\*

d. always praiseworthy, even when it is not justified.

1. According to the text, the problem with the *paradox of hedonism argument* is that

a. it is invalid.

b. it is questionable whether hedonism implies that it is rational to directly pursue happiness.\*

c. it is questionable whether directly pursuing happiness is rational.

d. None of the above

1. According to hedonism, happiness is

a. always more valuable at the beginning of one's life.

b. always more valuable at the end of one's life.

c. equally valuable at all times in one's life.\*

d. more or less valuable at different times depending on the “trajectory” of one's life.

1. If happiness always makes us better off, then hedonism

a. must be true.

b. must be false.

c. might be true, but only if other things make us better off as well.

d. might still be false if other things make us better off as well.\*

1. If people can sometimes be unhappy *because* something bad has happened to them, then

a. hedonism is true.

b. hedonism is false.\*

c. hedonism might be true, but only if people are never unhappy for any other reason.

d. None of the above

1. What is the paradox of hedonism?
   1. Those who try very hard to make themselves happy almost never succeed.\*
   2. The less you care about material things like wealth and status, the happier you will be.
   3. The more you make other people happy, the happier you will be.
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. How can hedonists overcome the “Evil Pleasures” objection?
   1. By admitting that the pleasure that comes from doing evil deeds is not valuable
   2. By making a distinction between moral goodness and well-being\*
   3. By making a distinction between physical and attitudinal pleasure
   4. They can't; the “Evil Pleasures” objection refutes hedonism.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to the text, which of the following problems do hedonists have good replies to?
   1. The paradox of hedonism
   2. The worry about evil pleasures
   3. The importance of autonomy
   4. Both a and b\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. The *Argument from False Happiness* concludes that
   1. hedonism is true.
   2. false happiness is as good as true happiness.
   3. hedonism is false.\*
   4. None of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the “experience machine” thought experiment supposed to show?
   1. The dangers of technology to our well-being
   2. The value of autonomy
   3. The value of being in contact with reality\*
   4. The way in which selfishness can detract from well-being

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is lacking in the lives of people in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*?
   1. Happiness
   2. The satisfaction of their desires
   3. Autonomy\*
   4. Physical pleasure

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is paternalism?
   1. Limiting someone's liberty against her will for her own good\*
   2. Limiting someone's liberty against her will for your own good
   3. Giving parental advice to someone and letting her make up her own mind
   4. Treating someone biologically unrelated like one's own child

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which kind of life do hedonists claim is best?
   1. A life that begins in misery and ends with many happy years
   2. A life that begins with many happy years and ends in misery
   3. A life that is moderately happy from start to finish
   4. All of these lives could be equally good according to hedonism.\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following claims is part of the *argument from multiple harms* against hedonism?
   1. According to hedonism, things can harm you even if they don't make you unhappy.
   2. Things cannot harm you unless they make you unhappy.
   3. According to hedonism, you can be harmed by something only because it saddens you.\*
   4. None of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following claims is *not* true?
   1. If hedonism is true, the only thing intrinsically good for people is happiness.
   2. If hedonism is false, happiness is not intrinsically good for people.\*
   3. If happiness is not intrinsically good for people, then hedonism is false.
   4. Even if hedonism is true, many things may be instrumentally good for people.

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 3: Getting What You Want**

*Summary*

The desire satisfaction theory of human welfare states that a person's life goes well to the extent that she gets what she wants. According to the theory, something is intrinsically good for you if, only if, and because it satisfies your desires, and is instrumentally good for you if, only if, and because it is a means to satisfying your desires. The theory has many attractions. It explains why there are many types of good life, because desires vary widely from person to person. It accommodates the widely shared view that what is good for us is *up to us,* because according to the theory it is *our* desires that determine what is good for us. Whereas objective theories of welfare have always faced the difficult task of arguing that certain things benefit us even if we don't want them or anything they will bring about, the desire theory avoids this task entirely.

Additionally, the desire satisfaction theory nicely fits with many of our views about motivation, reasons for action, and knowledge of the good. Because desires are intrinsically motivating, desire theorists have an easy time explaining the connection between something being good for you and your being motivated to pursue it. Assuming that our desires give us reasons for action, the desire satisfaction theory also explains why we have reason to try to improve our lives. Finally, the desire satisfaction theory provides a plausible account of our knowledge of what is good for us, both when such knowledge is easy (when we know what we want) and when it is difficult (when we struggle to decide what we want most).

*Essay Questions*

1. What is an objective theory of human welfare, and how does such a theory differ from the desire satisfaction theory? Is hedonism an objective theory of welfare? Why or why not? Are objective theories of welfare preferable to the desire satisfaction theory? Defend your answer.
2. Many people today believe that there are many types of good life and that it is up to us which kind of life is best for us. Write an essay discussing whether or not you think these two claims are true and the extent to which the desire satisfaction theory can accommodate them. Does the desire satisfaction theory accommodate these views better than hedonism? Better than objective theories?
3. What is the relationship between something being good for you and your being motivated to pursue that thing? How does the desire satisfaction theorist's view of this relationship differ from the objective theorist's view? Which do you think is preferable, and why?
4. Do we always have a reason to do whatever would benefit ourselves? How does the desire satisfaction theorist explain the connection between reason and self-interest? Is the desire theorist's account better than the objective theorist's? Why or why not?
5. Write an essay about the way in which the desire satisfaction theory tries to account for our knowledge of what is good for us. Give an example of a case in which the theory seems to adequately explain how we know what is good for us. Are there any cases in which the desire satisfaction theory cannot adequately explain how we know (or don't know) what's good for us?
6. Describe an example of an intuitively good life (it can be someone you know personally or only know about) and explain what features of that life make it good. Do you think that the desire satisfaction theory does a good job of explaining *why* that life is good? Explain and defend your response.

*Test Bank Questions*

1. According to the desire satisfaction theory of welfare something is intrinsically good for you
   1. if it satisfies your desires.
   2. only if it satisfies your desires.
   3. because it satisfies your desires.
   4. All of the above\*
2. If the desire satisfaction theory is true, then health, wealth, and happiness
   1. are always intrinsically valuable whether or not you want them.
   2. are intrinsically valuable if they help to satisfy your desires.
   3. are instrumentally valuable if they help to satisfy your desires.\*
   4. are always instrumentally valuable whether or not you want them.
3. Desire satisfaction theorists think that no one can have a good life without
   1. believing the desire theory to be true.
   2. happiness.
   3. being devoted to some single thing.
   4. None of the above\*
4. According to the desire satisfaction theory, getting what you want
   1. makes you intrinsically better off.\*
   2. makes you intrinsically better off only if it makes you happy.
   3. makes everyone intrinsically better off.
   4. makes everyone intrinsically better off if it creates more pleasure than pain.
5. A theory of well-being is an *objective* theory if and only if it claims
   1. to be true.
   2. to find a single ingredient (e.g., desire satisfaction) that is essential to a good life.
   3. that certain things are good for us independently of our desires and opinions.\*
   4. that welfare is to be found in material possessions rather than psychological states.
6. One major difficulty for objective theories is explaining
   1. how certain things can make us better off even if we don't want them.
   2. the relationship between welfare and motivation.
   3. why we have good reasons to do what is best for ourselves.
   4. All of the above\*
7. According to the desire satisfaction theorist, if something does not contribute to the satisfaction of any of my desires
   1. it might benefit me, provided that it makes me happy.
   2. it might benefit me if it satisfies someone else's desires.
   3. it might benefit me if it increases my knowledge.
   4. it does not benefit me.\*
8. According to the desire satisfaction theory, we are usually motivated to do what is good for us because
   1. we are afraid of the consequences if we fail to do so.
   2. desires motivate us to do things.\*
   3. our beliefs about the good motivate us to do things.
   4. None of the above
9. If desiring something gives us a reason to obtain it, then according to the desire satisfaction theory
   1. we all ought to desire happiness above all else.
   2. we all ought to desire that others act on good reasons.
   3. we always have reason to do what benefits us.\*
   4. we always have very good reasons to behave as we do.
10. If the desire satisfaction theory is true, then
    1. it is always easy to know what is good for us.
    2. we can know what is good for us by figuring out what we want and how to get it.\*
    3. we can never know what is good for us.
    4. Both a and b
11. According to the *argument for self-interest*
    1. we should always be selfish.
    2. if we have reason to obtain something, then it satisfies our desires.
    3. if something makes us better off, then we have reason to obtain it.\*
    4. satisfying your desires is morally right.
12. The *first motivation argument* attempts to demonstrate what?
    1. That wealth is not intrinsically valuable
    2. That any purported objective value will not improve the lives of some people\*
    3. That the desire theory is true
    4. That some people don’t care about what’s valuable
13. According to the desire theory, in order to know what’s good for us we must know
    1. what we desire.
    2. how to get what we desire.
    3. Both of the above\*
    4. None of the above
14. Which of the following is *not* an advantage of desire theory?
    1. It allows for a variety of good lives.
    2. It explains why the satisfaction of some desires is disappointing.\*
    3. It explains why we’re motivated to pursue the good.
    4. It explains how you can know what’s good for you.
15. The *second motivational argument* poses a problem for
    1. objective theories of welfare.\*
    2. the desire theory.
    3. Both of the above
    4. None of the above
16. Which of the following is a central claim of the desire satisfaction theory?
    1. The satisfaction of a desire always directly contributes to one's welfare.
    2. The satisfaction of desires is the only thing that directly contributes to one's welfare.
    3. The only reason for which anything can directly contribute to one's welfare is because it satisfies a desire.
    4. All of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following would the desire satisfaction theorist accept?
   1. Knowledge is always intrinsically good for people.
   2. Knowledge is always instrumentally good for people.
   3. Knowledge can be intrinsically good for people, but only when it helps satisfies a desire.
   4. Knowledge can be instrumentally good for people, but only when it helps satisfies a desire.\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following types of life is guaranteed to go well, according to the desire satisfaction theory?
   1. A life filled with pleasure
   2. A life spent satisfying the desires of others
   3. A life spent pursuing knowledge
   4. None of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is an *objective* theory of welfare?
   1. A theory that claims that objects, not happiness or relationships, are the key to happiness
   2. A theory according to which there are facts about welfare, not merely opinions
   3. A theory according to which some things contribute to our welfare independently of our desires and beliefs\*
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following is a common complaint about objective theories of welfare?
   1. They can't account for the fact that knowledge is good for us.
   2. They can't explain the relationship between well-being and motivation.\*
   3. They falsely claim that happiness is not good for us.
   4. They can't explain why wealth is instrumentally good for us.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following is widely considered an attraction of the desire satisfaction theory?
   1. It makes what is good for us “up to us.”\*
   2. It explains why happiness is always good for us.
   3. It explains why some things are good for us even if they don't satisfy any or our desires.
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the desire satisfaction theorist's explanation of why we are motivated to benefit ourselves?
   1. Our beliefs about welfare motivate us.
   2. Our desires motivate us.\*
   3. We are socialized into the habit of benefiting ourselves.
   4. Benefiting ourselves makes us happy, and the prospect of happiness motivates us.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following is a premise in the desire satisfaction theorist's *argument for self-interest*?
   1. If something satisfies our desires, then we have reason to obtain it.\*
   2. People always morally ought to do whatever is in their self-interest.
   3. No one is capable of acting unselfishly.
   4. If everyone acted self-interestedly, everyone would be happier in the long run.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following would the desire satisfaction theorist *not* endorse?
   1. We can know what is good for us by figuring out what we want and how to get it.
   2. We always have reason to obtain whatever makes us better off.
   3. Happiness is always good for people.\*
   4. Sometimes it is difficult to know whether something is good for us.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following would the desire satisfaction theorist endorse?
   1. The satisfaction of any of your desires is intrinsically good for you.\*
   2. The satisfaction of many (but not all) of your desires is intrinsically good for you.
   3. The satisfaction of any of your desires is good for you, but only instrumentally.
   4. The satisfaction of many (but not all) of your desires is good for you, but only instrumentally.

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 4: Problems for the Desire Theory**

*Summary*

The desire satisfaction theory of welfare is committed to two central claims. The first claim is that desire satisfaction is necessary for becoming better off—if something is intrinsically (or instrumentally) good for us, then it fulfills (or helps fulfill) our desires. The second claim is that desire satisfaction is sufficient for becoming better off—if something fulfills (or helps fulfill) our desires, then it is intrinsically (or instrumentally) good for us. Both claims are problematic. Several counterexamples suggest that desire satisfaction is not always necessary for promoting our good. We may benefit from pleasant surprises, which satisfy no existing desire. Small children and the severely mentally disabled may benefit from a variety of things that they are unable to understand and thus do not desire. Suicidal people who want to kill themselves may benefit by being prevented from carrying out their plan. In all these cases, we can improve people's lives without satisfying any of their desires.

The satisfaction of desires also might not be sufficient for promoting one's welfare. If we desire something based on a false belief, the satisfaction of such an ill-informed desire does not seem to benefit us. The satisfaction of other-regarding desires (say, for the flourishing of distant strangers) does not seem to make our lives better, either. The desire satisfaction theorist might modify her theory to accommodate such cases, but others prove harder to evade. Sometimes we get exactly what we want but are completely disappointed as a result. Other times we may get what we want without ever knowing it. Still worse, our desires are often heavily shaped by our environments. If we are indoctrinated into believing that we should not want much for ourselves, we might get everything we want while still failing to have a good life. In these cases and others, desires are satisfied, and yet we do not seem to benefit as a result. Ultimately the desire satisfaction theory is unable to recognize that any desires are intrinsically better than others, which leads to implausible results. This suggests that objective theories of welfare might be preferable.

*Essay Questions*

1. Write an essay critically examining the following claim: “Something is good for us only if it satisfies our desires.” Are there any cases in which we can be benefited without having any of our desires satisfied? Present a couple of cases that might be thought to have this feature, and describe how you think a desire satisfaction theorist would respond.
2. Describe a case in which a desire is satisfied, but this desire is based on a false belief. Does the satisfaction of such a desire make one better off? What implications does such a case have for the desire satisfaction theory?
3. Suppose that you want something very much but that when you get it, you are completely disappointed. Why does this case raise a problem for the desire satisfaction theory? What might a desire satisfaction theorist say in response? Do you find this reply convincing?
4. Is it possible to desire to harm yourself and to succeed? Write an essay describing the “paradox of self-harm” that faces the desire satisfaction theory. Do you think the desire satisfaction theorist can solve this problem? Why or why not?
5. Are some desires intrinsically better than others? Explain and defend your answer. What does your answer imply about the desire satisfaction theory of welfare?
6. Explain the distinction between disinterested and other-regarding desires. Then, explain the objection that this distinction generates. How should the desire satisfaction theorist respond to this objection? Do you find this response satisfying? Why or why not?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. According to the desire satisfaction theory, desire satisfaction is
   1. necessary for becoming better off.
   2. sufficient for becoming better off.
   3. Both of the above\*
   4. None of the above
2. A pleasant surprise is an example of something that
   1. makes someone better off but does not satisfy any existing desire.\*
   2. satisfies a desire but does not make someone better off.
   3. satisfies a desire and makes someone better off.
   4. neither satisfies a desire nor makes someone better off.
3. One example that shows that desire satisfaction is not necessary for becoming better off is
   1. the case of desires based on false beliefs.
   2. the case of impoverished desires.
   3. the paradox of self-harm.
   4. the vaccination of small children.\*
4. According to the text, the satisfaction of a desire based on a false belief
   1. always makes us better off.
   2. does not always make us better off.\*
   3. always makes us worse off.
   4. is impossible.
5. *Informed* desires are those desires that
   1. are based on technical scientific knowledge.
   2. have been instilled in us by our society.
   3. are not based on false beliefs.\*
   4. we have been told about by someone else.
6. A desire for distant strangers to flourish is an example of
   1. an uninformed desire.
   2. a disinterested desire.\*
   3. an impoverished desire.
   4. None of the above
7. *Self-regarding* desires are those desires that
   1. are genuinely your own.
   2. are not based on any false beliefs.
   3. concern only yourself.\*
   4. make you happy when they’re satisfied.
8. A plausible case in which desire satisfaction is not sufficient for becoming better off is
   1. a passing fancy.\*
   2. an infant getting a vaccine.
   3. a pleasant surprise.
   4. a desire for autonomy.
9. According to the desire satisfaction theory
   1. no desire is intrinsically better than any other.\*
   2. desire satisfaction is good for us but only when it makes us happy.
   3. some things are objectively valuable.
   4. All of the above
10. The satisfaction of even informed, self-interested desires doesn't seem to benefit us when
    1. we don't know the desire has been satisfied.
    2. the desire was not formed autonomously.
    3. the desire is merely a passing fancy.
    4. All of the above\*
11. According to the text, why can’t the desire satisfaction theorist maintain that what’s good for us is the pleasure we feel when certain desires are satisfied?
    1. Because this is to say the pleasure rather than the desire satisfaction is what makes us better off\*
    2. Because not all pleasure is good for us
    3. Because sometimes we’re better off when our desires are satisfied and we don’t know it
    4. None of the above
12. Why do impoverished desires pose a problem for desire theory?
    1. Because setting your sights low does not seem to make you better off
    2. Because a satisfied slave does not seem to have a good life
    3. Because many of our desires are shaped by the way we’ve been raised
    4. All of the above\*
13. According to the desire satisfaction theory, sacrificing your welfare for a cause that is of the utmost importance to you
    1. contributes very much to your well-being.
    2. detracts strongly from your well-being.
    3. is sometimes good and sometimes bad for you.
    4. is impossible.\*
14. If the desire satisfaction theory is true, it is *never* good advice to tell someone to
    1. do what makes him happy.
    2. change all his desires.\*
    3. seek knowledge.
    4. try to produce beautiful things.
15. What kind of theory does the text endorse as an alternative to the traditional desire satisfaction theory?
    1. Hedonism
    2. A reformed desire satisfaction theory
    3. An objective theory\*
    4. None of the above
16. Which of the following is the desire satisfaction theory committed to?
    1. If something is good for us, then it fulfills (or helps fulfill) our desires.
    2. If something fulfills (or helps fulfill) our desires, then it is good for us.
    3. Nothing can be good for us unless it fulfills (or helps fulfill) our desires.
    4. All of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the example of giving vaccines to small children supposed to show?
   1. Some things can benefit us without satisfying our desires.\*
   2. Some things can satisfy desires without benefiting anyone.
   3. Most benefits satisfy some desire or other.
   4. Small children are incapable of being benefited or harmed.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following shows that desire satisfaction is not necessary for becoming better off?
   1. The paradox of self-sacrifice
   2. Desires that are satisfied without our knowledge
   3. Pleasant surprises\*
   4. Passing fancies

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to the text, what does the existence of desires based on false beliefs show?
   1. We can become better off without having our desires satisfied.
   2. The desire satisfaction theory needs to be modified.\*
   3. The desire satisfaction theory is irreparably mistaken.
   4. The desire satisfaction theory is plausible in many cases.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is a *disinterested* desire?
   1. A desire that one doesn't care about very much
   2. A desire that is not focused on oneself\*
   3. A desire that is primarily the result of boredom
   4. A desire that will lead to disappointment

*Appears on the student website.*

1. A desire directed toward the interests of a distant stranger is an example of which kind of desire?
   1. An uninformed desire
   2. An other-regarding desire\*
   3. An impoverished desire
   4. None of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following claims is the desire satisfaction theorist unableto endorse?
   1. Health, wealth, and happiness are often instrumentally good for us.
   2. Some desires are intrinsically better than others.\*
   3. What is good for us is up to us.
   4. Some desires are disinterested.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What does it mean to say a desire is *impoverished*?
   1. It was not formed in an autonomous way.\*
   2. It is based on false beliefs.
   3. It does not regard oneself.
   4. It is not very specific.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the paradox of self-harm?
   1. Attempts to make yourself better off often ending up harming you.
   2. According to the desire satisfaction theory, it is impossible to intentionally harm yourself.\*
   3. Attempts to harm yourself often make you better off.
   4. According to the desire satisfaction theory, all harm is self-harm.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What can never be in our self-interest, according to the desire satisfaction theory?
   1. Making ourselves happy
   2. Creating works of art
   3. Changing all our desires\*
   4. Trying to make autonomous decisions

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 5: Morality and Religion**

*Summary*

This chapter examines three popular assumptions about the relationship between morality and religion. The first assumption is that religious belief is necessary if we are to behave morally. Some people claim that without a belief in an afterlife in which virtue is rewarded and immorality is punished, many of us would lack the motivation to avoid immorality when we thought we could get away with it. This line of thought cannot show that God exists or that morality depends on God but rather argues that religious beliefs have certain practical benefits. The biggest problem for this view, however, is that genuine moral character requires doing the right thing not out of fear of punishment or desire for reward but rather *because it is the right thing to do*. Because atheists are just as capable of this as religious people, the first assumption is false.

The second assumption is that morality must have been created by someone and that the only possible creator of morality is God. Such a view leads directly to the Divine Command Theory, the view that an action is morally required just because it is commanded by God and immoral just because God forbids it. Proponents of the Divine Command Theory face the following “Euthyphro question”: Does God command actions because they are morally right, or are actions morally right because God commands them? If one adopts the second option, then God's commands seem to be arbitrary, in which case God would be imperfect. Those who believe that God is perfect must therefore hold that God commands actions because they are morally right. To accept this, however, is to give up the Divine Command Theory and admit that God is not the creator of morality after all.

The final assumption is that religion is an essential source of moral guidance. Even if the Divine Command Theory is false, this assumption might still be correct because a perfect God would be an infallible reporter of our moral obligations. This view faces many challenges, however. To defend it, one must be able to defend the claim that God exists and that God communicates with humans. In addition, one must justify selecting one sacred text out of many options and know how to determine the correct interpretation of this text.

*Essay Questions*

1. Is religion necessary in order for people to be motivated to behave morally? Why might someone believe that it is? What challenges does such a view face? Ultimately, what is your view? Explain and defend your response.
2. Could morality exist in the absence of God? Why or why not? Clearly explain what you take to be the strongest objection to your view, and respond to it.
3. State Socrates's question for Euthyphro, and explain how the *first option* is a problem for the Divine Command Theory. Is there a way for the Divine Command Theorist to solve this problem while still endorsing the first option? Explain and defend your response.
4. State Socrates’s question for Euthyphro, and explain how the *second* *option* is a problem for the Divine Command Theory. Is there a way for the Divine Command Theorist to solve this problem while still endorsing the second option? Explain and defend your response.
5. Is religion a good source of moral guidance? Describe what you take to be the strongest arguments on both side of the issue, and then defend your own view.
6. What is the relationship between religion and morality? Does morality depend on religion in any sense? Defend your answer.

*Test Bank Questions*

1. Many people believe that religion is necessary in order for
   1. us to be motivated to act morally.
   2. us to know the difference between right and wrong.
   3. morality to exist at all.
   4. All of the above\*
2. *Agnostics* are people who
   1. believe that God exists and gives commands.
   2. believe that God exists and does not give commands.
   3. believe that God does not exist.
   4. are not sure whether God exists.\*
3. *Deists* believe that
   1. God does not exist.
   2. God exists and gives us moral guidance.
   3. God exists but does not give us moral guidance.\*
   4. the very idea of God is incoherent.
4. The fear of hell is often thought to
   1. help people determine what is right or wrong.
   2. motivate people to do what they believe is right.\*
   3. scare people into behaving immorally.
   4. All of the above
5. According to the text, those who act morally out of fear of God are
   1. doing the right thing for the right reasons.
   2. doing the right thing for the wrong reasons.\*
   3. much more likely to do the right thing than atheists.
   4. much less likely to do the right thing than atheists.
6. If fear of God is the most effective way to get people to act morally, then
   1. God exists.
   2. atheists are unlikely to act morally.
   3. Divine Command Theory is true.
   4. None of the above\*
7. According to the *argument for God’s creation of morality*
   1. the moral law requires a lawmaker.\*
   2. if God is the author of the moral law, then humans cannot be.
   3. humans author some laws.
   4. All of the above
8. The Divine Command Theory states that
   1. God's commands are always based on good reasons.
   2. God did not create morality but always accurately reports it.
   3. acts are morally required just because they are commanded by God.\*
   4. All of the above
9. In Plato's *Euthyphro*, Socrates asks
   1. “What reasons do we have for believing in the gods?”
   2. “Do the gods love actions because they are pious, or are actions pious because the gods love them?”\*
   3. “How do we determine what the gods command us to do?”
   4. “Why would someone who does not believe in the gods act justly?”
10. If God's commands make actions right or wrong, then
    1. God always has reasons for his commands.
    2. God is morally perfect.
    3. God lacks reasons for his commands.\*
    4. Both a and b
11. If God has reasons for his commands, then
    1. actions are not right because God commands them.\*
    2. God is imperfect.
    3. God’s commands are arbitrary.
    4. All of the above
12. Omniscience is the property of being
    1. all-knowing.\*
    2. all-powerful.
    3. all-good.
    4. All of the above
13. If one has selected a religious text to rely on, then
    1. one must read the text literally in order to determine what is right or wrong.
    2. it is easy to determine what is right or wrong.
    3. one must interpret the text in order to determine what it implies about morality.\*
    4. it is impossible to determine what the text says about morality.
14. According to the text, extracting reliable moral knowledge from religious scriptures is
    1. difficult.\*
    2. relatively straightforward and simple.
    3. impossible.
    4. possible but not at all worthwhile.
15. According to the text, one can succeed in seeking divine guidance to lead a moral life only if
    1. God exists.
    2. belief in God can be justified.
    3. God offers moral advice.
    4. All of the above\*
16. Which of the following assumptions was *not* examined in this chapter?
    1. All religions teach basically the same moral message.\*
    2. Religious belief is required to get us to do our duty.
    3. God is the creator of morality.
    4. Religion is an essential source of moral guidance.
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1. What is the term for a person who is not sure whether God exists?
   1. Atheist
   2. Agnostic\*
   3. Deist
   4. Theist
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1. Which of the following claims would the *deist* accept?
   1. God does not exist.
   2. God exists but does not give us commands.\*
   3. God exists and gives commands but did not create morality.
   4. God exists and is the creator of morality.
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1. According to the text, what does good moral character involve?
   1. Doing the right thing because it's the right thing to do\*
   2. Doing the right thing out of fear of punishment
   3. Doing the right thing out of love of God
   4. Any of the above would constitute good moral character.
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1. What is the relationship between religion and moral motivation?
   1. Religion is required to motivate us to do the right thing.
   2. Religion often motivates people to do the right thing.
   3. Religion is not required to motivate us to do the right thing.
   4. Both b and c\*
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1. What is the Divine Command Theory?
   1. The view that God's commands do not create morality but reliably track it
   2. The view that God's commands create morality\*
   3. The view that God created the universe simply by issuing a command
   4. The view that God's commands are the only thing that motivates us to act morally
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1. Which of the following is a premise in the *argument for God's creation of morality*?
   1. Every law requires a lawmaker.\*
   2. If theism is true, then the Divine Command Theory is true.
   3. If God did not create morality, we have no reason to be moral.
   4. All of the above
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1. What problem does Socrates's question in the *Euthyphro* raise for the Divine Command Theory?
   1. If God does not exist, the Divine Command Theory must be false.
   2. Many people don't believe in God but still behave morally.
   3. If the Divine Command Theory is true, then God's commands are arbitrary.\*
   4. If the Divine Command Theory is true, then it is impossible to know what is right or wrong.
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1. Which of the following is required if we are to be justified in relying on religion for moral guidance?
   1. We must have good reason to believe in God.
   2. We must have a way of selecting which religious text is the correct one.
   3. We must have a way of accurately interpreting our chosen religious text.
   4. All of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Why is a literal reading of religious texts problematic?
   1. Such texts sometimes contradict themselves.\*
   2. A literal reading would often challenge our ordinary assumptions.
   3. It is impossible to determine what a “literal” reading would consist of.
   4. If we read the texts literally, we are not permitted to do many things we'd like to do.

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 6: Natural Law**

*Summary*

According to natural law theory, actions are right just because they are natural, and wrong just because they are unnatural. The theory has a number of attractions. By grounding morality in *human* *nature*, the theory promises to explain both how morality could be objective and why morality applies only to human beings. The theory could also help us to understand the origins of morality and how we can come to have moral knowledge. According to natural law theory, we can acquire moral knowledge by determining what our human nature is and then determining which actions fulfill it.

If natural law theory is to be plausible, its defenders must specify exactly what sense of “human nature” is supposed to be morally relevant. On one understanding, human nature consists of whatever is innately human. Others take human nature to be whatever all or most humans have in common. Still others understand human nature to consist of whatever we were “designed” by nature to do. The problem for natural law theory is that none of these understandings of human nature seems to provide a sufficient basis for morality. Whether or not an action or character trait is morally good does not seem to depend on whether it is innate or acquired. The percentage of people who have a given trait does not seem particularly morally relevant, either—even if almost everyone were cruel, this would still not make cruelty morally admirable. Furthermore, on either of the two most common ways of understanding natural purposes, whether an action enables us to fulfill a natural purpose doesn't seem to tell us whether that act is morally permissible or not.

The term *human nature* can be understood in many ways. Even if we settle on one definition of *human nature*, however, it is far from obvious that everything natural is morally good or vice versa. Given that natural laws merely tell us how things *will* behave, whereas the function of moral laws is to tell us how we *should* behave, it should come as no surprise that nature does not tell us everything we'd like to know about morality.

*Essay Questions*

1. According to natural law theory, how can we come to have moral knowledge? Does the theory succeed in solving the problem of how to gain moral knowledge? Why or why not?
2. Suppose that “human nature” consists of the set of innate characteristics that all (or most) humans share. Understood in this way, what does human nature tell us about morality? Is it always immoral to behave contrary to human nature?
3. What is the difference between the *Efficiency* *Model* and the *Fitness Model* of natural purposes? Does either model provide a plausible basis for natural law theory? Why or why not?
4. Define *ambiguity*, and explain how it can undermine moral arguments. What key term or terms are ambiguous in natural law theory? How serious of a problem is this for the theory?
5. Explain the *natural law argument*. What are some possible interpretations of the first premise, and why is each problematic? Do you think that there is any way to modify premise one to avoid these concerns? What general lessons about natural law theory do you think that we can draw from these considerations?
6. Explain the three conceptions of human nature found in the text. Which of these conceptions of human nature do you find to be most plausible? What is an objection to that conception of human nature? Can the conception of human nature be defended against the objection? Why or why not? Does your discussion have any implications for natural law theory? Defend your response.

*Test Bank Questions*

1. According to natural law theory, an action is right if and only if
   1. it is permitted by the laws of the government.
   2. it is in accordance with human nature.\*
   3. it maximizes happiness.
   4. it is in accordance with God's commands.
2. Which of the following is *not* a problem natural law theory promises to solve?
   1. How morality could be objective
   2. Why morality is specially suited for human beings
   3. Why moral laws are eternal and unchanging\*
   4. How to gain moral knowledge
3. A *moral agent* is an individual who
   1. consistently does the morally right thing.
   2. is morally responsible for his or her actions.\*
   3. represents another person in a legal context.
   4. Both a and b
4. Which of the following problems does natural law theory promise to solve?
   1. How morality could possibly be objective.
   2. Why morality is specially suited for human beings.
   3. The origins of morality.
   4. All of the above\*
5. According to natural law theory, what is the recipe for acquiring moral knowledge?
   1. Determine what our human nature is.
   2. See whether various actions fulfill human nature.
   3. Consult holy scripture.
   4. Both a and b\*
6. Which of the following are natural law theorists committed to?
   1. The idea that morality is non-natural.
   2. The idea that human nature is unknowable.
   3. The idea that there is a human essence.\*
   4. Both a and b
7. Innate traits are traits that we
   1. acquire through education.
   2. have from birth.\*
   3. don’t manifest.
   4. acquire through socialization.
8. Rousseau believed that people are inherently \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, whereas Hobbes believed they are inherently \_\_\_\_\_\_\_.
   1. selfish; cooperative
   2. selfish; neither good nor bad
   3. neither good nor bad; selfish
   4. cooperative; selfish\*
9. The two most common secular ways of understanding the *purposes* of things are
   1. the Efficiency Model and the Fitness Model.\*
   2. the Empirical Model and the Conceptual Model.
   3. the Sufficiency Model and the Necessity Model.
   4. None of the above
10. To say that something enhances *fitness* is to say that it
    1. makes one stronger.
    2. makes one faster.
    3. increases one's success at survival and reproduction.\*
    4. Both a and b
11. The term *human nature*
    1. always refers to what all humans have in common.
    2. always refers to what is innate to humans.
    3. always refers to the natural purposes of humans.
    4. is ambiguous.\*
12. According to the text, what does it mean to say a premise *begs the question*?
    1. That it implicitly asks a question
    2. That it pleads for a question to be asked
    3. That it assumes the truth of the conclusion it’s meant to support\*
    4. That it raises an objection to the conclusion it’s mean to support
13. According to the Efficiency Model, the natural purpose of human beings is
    1. to promote survival and reproduction.
    2. to do what we’re best able to accomplish.\*
    3. to pursue our goals.
    4. All of the above
14. According to the text, nature
    1. determines what is right or wrong.
    2. sets the outer bounds of what morality can require.\*
    3. is completely irrelevant to morality.
    4. is directly opposed to morality.
15. Moral laws clearly differ from laws of nature in that
    1. they are imaginary, whereas laws of nature are real.
    2. they are real, whereas laws of nature are imaginary.
    3. they tell us what we will do as opposed to what we ought to do.
    4. they tell us what we ought to do as opposed to what we will do.\*
16. What makes someone a good person, according to the natural law theory?
    1. Obeying the laws of the land
    2. Obeying God's commands
    3. Fulfilling his or her true nature\*
    4. Doing whatever maximizes happiness
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1. Which of the following is natural law theory thought to explain?
   1. The objectivity of morality
   2. The origins of morality
   3. The possibility of moral knowledge
   4. All of the above\*
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1. What is an innate trait?
   1. A trait we learn from our parents
   2. A trait we acquire through socialization
   3. A trait we have from birth\*
   4. Both a and b
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1. How do we come to have moral knowledge, according to natural law theory?
   1. By consulting religious texts
   2. By determining human nature and which actions fulfill it\*
   3. By reflecting on the idea of morality
   4. Moral knowledge is impossible, according to natural law theory.
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1. Which of the following claims best describes Hobbes's conception of human nature?
   1. People are inherently selfish and competitive.\*
   2. People are inherently cooperative and altruistic.
   3. People are inherently moral but are quickly corrupted by society.
   4. People are inherently blank slates, neither naturally selfish nor naturally altruistic.
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1. What two models of natural purposes are discussed in the text?
   1. The Efficiency Model and the Fitness Model\*
   2. The Pleasure Model and the Desire Satisfaction Model
   3. The Natural Law Model and the Positive Law Model
   4. The Empirical Model and the Conceptual Model
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1. What is it for a term to be *ambiguous*?
   1. It is clear and precise.
   2. It has more than one meaning.\*
   3. It is meaningless.
   4. It plays a key role in an argument.
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1. How do moral laws differ from natural laws?
   1. They can be broken.
   2. They do not describe how we actually behave.
   3. They are not used to predict future behavior.
   4. All of the above\*
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1. According to the text, what is wrong with the *argument from humanity*?
   1. It is invalid.
   2. One of the premises is clearly false.
   3. One of the key terms is ambiguous.\*
   4. All of the above
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1. According to the text, what is the role of nature in moral theory?
   1. Nature determines what is right or wrong.
   2. Nature is completely irrelevant to morality.
   3. Nature sets the outer bounds of morality.\*
   4. None of the above
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**Chapter 7: Psychological Egoism**

*Summary*

*Psychological egoism* is the theory that all human actions are aimed at avoiding some personal loss or gaining some personal benefit. If the theory is true, then *altruism—*the direct desire to benefit others for their own sake—does not exist. Psychological egoism is a descriptive theory about how people *do* behave rather than an ethical theory about how they *ought* to behave. Still, the truth of psychological egoism would have important ethical implications. Because we can't be morally obligated to do the impossible, the truth of psychological egoism would mean that we cannot be obligated to behave altruistically. Accepting this would require us to substantially revise our ideas about morality.

There are a number of arguments for psychological egoism. One argument begins with the claim that every action is based on the strongest desire of the person performing it. For this to support the theory, however, the egoist must make the case that all of our strongest desires are for personal gain. This is a difficult task because the mere fact that a desire is *my* desire does not show that the desire is *for my self-interest*. A second argument claims that people always expect their actions to make them better off. But this does not seem to be true in all cases, and even if it is true, this does not show that self-benefit is the *aim* of all our actions rather than a side effect. Similarly, an egoist might point out that we would never do something that would bring us only misery. Even if this is so, however, this does not show that all of our actions *aim* at avoiding misery.

Given the failure of these arguments, egoists might try two other strategies. The first is to claim that all apparently self-sacrificing actions are performed in order to avoid a guilty conscience. The second is to claim that when we make sacrifices for others, we do so only because our well-being depends on their well-being because we would be devastated to see them suffer. The problem with these claims is that concern for the well-being of others and feelings of guilt for behaving unjustly seem to indicate concern for other people. Because there are many apparent cases of altruism and the arguments for egoism face serious difficulties, the available evidence suggests that psychological egoism is probably false.

*Essay Questions*

1. Describe the theory of psychological egoism, and explain why it is not considered a theory about ethics. Then explain why the truth of psychological egoism would nonetheless have serious implications for ethics if it were true.
2. Define altruism, and describe a case in which a person appears to behave altruistically. How would the psychological egoist explain the person's behavior in the case you describe? Do you find the egoist's explanation plausible in this case? Why or why not?
3. How might the phenomenon of a guilty conscience be used to support the theory of psychological egoism? How might the very same phenomenon be used to argue against psychological egoism? Which argument do you think is better, and why?
4. “Every action is motivated by one's strongest desire.” Explain how this claim might be used to argue for psychological egoism. How would opponents of psychological egoism respond? Which side do you think has the stronger case? Defend your answer.
5. Explain what you take to be the strongest argument in favor of psychological egoism. Then, raise what you take to be the strongest objection to this argument. How would the egoist respond to this objection? Do you find this response satisfying? Why or why not?
6. Write an essay examining the relationship between evidence and psychological egoism. What evidence is thought to support psychological egoism? What evidence is thought to undermine it? Is there any conceivable evidence that would refute psychological egoism? If so, what would it be? If not, is this an attractive or an unattractive feature of the theory?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. The story of the Ring of Gyges suggests that when people are free to do whatever they want without consequences, they tend to behave
   1. in ways that are spontaneous and creative.
   2. more kindly and less competitively.
   3. selfishly.\*
   4. Both a and b
2. Psychological egoism is the theory that
   1. the mind is composed of the id, the superego, and the ego.
   2. people morally ought to pursue their self-interest at all times.
   3. acting solely out of self-interest is psychologically unhealthy.
   4. everything people do is fundamentally motivated by self-interest.\*
3. Altruism is
   1. any action that benefits others.
   2. a direct desire to benefit others for their own sake.\*
   3. a desire to benefit others in order to further our own ends.
   4. All of the above
4. Psychological egoism is
   1. a political theory about how society ought to be organized.
   2. a descriptive theory of human motivation.\*
   3. an ethical theory about how we ought to act.
   4. a character trait that certain people have.
5. If psychological egoism is true, then
   1. this has no ethical implications because psychological egoism is not an ethical theory.
   2. we cannot be morally obligated to behave altruistically.
   3. most of what is commonly taken for granted about morality would be mistaken.
   4. Both b and c\*
6. If psychological egoism is true, then why can’t it be our duty to be altruistic?
   1. Because psychological egoism says that acting altruistically doesn’t make us better off
   2. Because then altruism would be impossible and we aren’t morally required to do the impossible\*
   3. Because according to psychological egoism, an act is right just in case it is self-interested
   4. All of the above
7. If all of our actions are motivated by our strongest desire, then
   1. psychological egoism is proven correct.
   2. psychological egoism is true only if all of our strongest desires are for self-interest.\*
   3. psychological egoism is refuted.
   4. all action is strictly conscientious action.
8. According to the text, the *argument from expected benefit*
   1. is invalid.
   2. begs the question.\*
   3. shows that psychological egoism is true.
   4. shows that psychological egoism is false.
9. If getting what we want makes us better off, then
   1. all of our actions are self-interested.
   2. when we do what we want, our actions are self-interested.
   3. when we do what we want and what we want is to make ourselves better off, our actions are self-interested.\*
   4. None of the above
10. According to the text, the first premise of *argument from expected benefit*,
    1. couldn’t possibly be true.
    2. doesn’t account for the fact that people can be mistaken about what’s good for them.
    3. seems to ignore the possibility of pessimists.\*
    4. All of the above
11. According to the text, from the fact that I expect my action to result in X, we can infer
    1. that my aim is to get X.
    2. that X will satisfy at least one of my desires.
    3. that I believe X is good.
    4. None of the above\*
12. A psychological egoist would claim that giving up something you want for the sake of a loved one
    1. is actually a self-interested action.\*
    2. is inadvisable.
    3. is impossible.
    4. is immoral.
13. According to the text, the existence of a guilty conscience
    1. is evidence against psychological egoism.\*
    2. is evidence for psychological egoism.
    3. is irrelevant to the question of whether psychological egoism is true.
    4. is impossible unless psychological egoism is true.
14. The case of the invisible hair elves is meant to show that
    1. seeing is believing.
    2. you should accept aging with grace.
    3. it is a mistake to hold a view as immune from refutation by evidence.\*
    4. there are some truths that can’t be refuted by evidence.
15. According to the text, the evidence available
    1. proves that psychological egoism is true.
    2. suggests, but does not prove, that psychological egoism is true.
    3. proves that psychological egoism is false.
    4. suggests, but does not prove, that psychological egoism is false.\*
16. What lesson have many people taken from the story of the Ring of Gyges?
    1. People are fundamentally self-interested.\*
    2. People are fundamentally altruistic.
    3. Political power is best concentrated in the hands of a few good people.
    4. Political power is dangerous when concentrated in the hands of a few people.
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1. Which of the following is impossible, according to psychological egoism?
   1. Acting to benefit oneself
   2. Acting to benefit others for the sake of oneself
   3. Giving up some present benefit for the sake of a future benefit
   4. Acting to benefit others for the sake of others\*
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1. Why isn't psychological egoism considered an ethical theory?
   1. It aims to tell us how we *do* behave, not how we *should* behave.\*
   2. It has no implications for ethics.
   3. It is regarded as immoral.
   4. Both a and b
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1. What does psychological egoism say about acts of altruism?
   1. They are very nice to perform but never morally obligatory.
   2. People sometimes perform them, but doing so is immoral.
   3. They are rare and are performed only by truly exceptional people.
   4. They are impossible.\*
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1. Which of the following best describes the relationship between psychological egoism and ethics?
   1. Psychological egoism has no implications for ethics.
   2. Psychological egoism aims to provide a comprehensive guide to our moral obligations.
   3. The truth of psychological egoism would have a few minor implications for ethics.
   4. The truth of psychological egoism would mean that most of what we take for granted about morality would be mistaken.\*
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1. What is *strictly* *conscientious* *action*?
   1. Any action that is morally permissible
   2. Any action that is morally required
   3. Any action performed because one believes it to be morally required\*
   4. Any action performed because one consciously chooses it from a set of alternatives
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1. Which of the following must be true in order for the *argument from expected benefit* to succeed?
   1. Any time we act, we expect to be better off.
   2. Any time we act, we *aim* at making ourselves better off.
   3. Any time we act, we make ourselves better off in some way.
   4. Both a and b\*
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1. If one cannot conceive of any evidence that would refute psychological egoism, what does this suggest about the theory?
   1. It is clearly true.
   2. It is clearly false.
   3. The theory is not being held rationally.\*
   4. The theory is probably, but not certainly, true.
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1. According to the text, what does the evidence suggest about psychological egoism?
   1. It is very probably true.
   2. It is very probably false.\*
   3. It is proven to be true.
   4. It is proven to be false.
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1. What would the psychological egoist say about someone who acts to avoid a guilty conscience?
   1. This would be impossible, according to psychological egoism.
   2. Such a person acts out of a direct concern for morality.
   3. Such a person acts out of a self-interested desire to avoid guilt.\*
   4. Such a person behaves altruistically, which, according to psychological egoism, is very rare.
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**Chapter 8: Ethical Egoism**

*Summary*

Ethical egoism is the theory that actions are morally right just because they best promote one's self-interest. Although psychological egoism is one source of support for ethical egoism, one can consistently accept ethical egoism—the view that we ought to behave self-interestedly—while rejecting psychological egoism—the view that we always do behave in this way. Ethical egoism faces a serious difficulty at the outset: The theory implies that it is morally right to kill, rape, and steal any time these actions would be in our self-interest. These actions seem to be paradigmatic cases of immorality. This doesn't prove that ethical egoism is false because our conventional ideas about morality could be mistaken. It does suggest, however, that we should accept ethical egoism only if there are strong arguments in its favor.

Egoists have advanced several arguments to support their position. Some claim that everyone would be better off if we were all to behave egoistically. According to egoism, however, the fact that something makes everyone better off is morally irrelevant, so this argument cannot support ethical egoism. Many egoists invoke libertarianism, according to which all of our moral duties derive from the sources of consent and reparation, to support egoism. The egoist cannot consistently accept such a view, however, because ethical egoism is committed to the idea that consent and reparation do not generate obligations—only self-interest can do so. The best argument for ethical egoism claims that if we're morally required to do something, then we have good reason to do it. Furthermore, we have good reason to do something only if it makes us better off. This latter claim is questionable, however, because there seem to be cases in which we have good reason to do something (say, help a stranger) even if doing so does not benefit us.

Egoism also faces three serious problems. As mentioned before, it violates many widely shared moral beliefs. In addition, it cannot allow for the existence of moral rights that protect us from interference from others. After all, if violating my supposed rights would benefit you, egoism says that you morally ought to do so. Finally, egoism seems to arbitrarily elevate the interests of a single person over everyone else, and it is not clear how to defend such a bias. Given that the main arguments for egoism fail and that the theory suffers serious problems, we seem to be justified in rejecting it.

*Essay Questions*

1. Write an essay on the relationship between psychological egoism and ethical egoism. Define each theory, and explain how they are similar and how they differ. Does accepting one theory commit you to accepting the other? Does rejecting one commit you to rejecting the other? Why or why not?
2. *“Why* *be* *moral?”* How does the ethical egoist answer this question? How might someone who denies egoism answer it? Is one of these answers more satisfactory than the other? Defend your answer.
3. In what ways does ethical egoism require actions that seem to be paradigmatic cases of immorality? How serious of a problem is this for the theory? What should the egoist say in response?
4. How does the theory of ethical egoism relate to the libertarian idea that all of our obligations derive from the sources of consent and reparation? Does either idea support the other? Why or why not?
5. Describe the objection that ethical egoism requires us to arbitrarily elevate the interests of some individuals (namely, ourselves) over others. How do you think the egoist would respond to this objection? Do you find the egoist's response compelling?
6. Explain the *Best Argument for Ethical Egoism*. Raise what you take to be the most serious objection to it. How would an egoist respond to your objection? Do you find this response satisfying? Why or why not?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. According to ethical egoism, conflicts between self-interest and morality
   1. are widespread.
   2. are rare but should always be resolved in favor of self-interest.
   3. are impossible.\*
   4. are rare but should always be resolved in favor of morality.
2. The fact that ethical egoism requires actions that seem to be paradigm cases of immorality
   1. proves that the theory is false.
   2. proves that our conventional ideas about morality are mistaken.
   3. shows that we should accept conventional morality only if there are very strong arguments in its favor.
   4. shows that we should accept ethical egoism only if there are very strong arguments in its favor.\*
3. In order to claim that murder, rape, and torture are always morally impermissible, the ethical egoist must maintain that
   1. such actions fail to maximize preference satisfaction.
   2. those who murder, rape, or torture never benefit from their crime.\*
   3. such actions cannot be applied as universal law.
   4. those who murder, rape, or torture are vicious.
4. According to the text, what’s wrong with the *argument from paradigm cases*?
   1. It’s invalid.
   2. Premise 2 is definitely false—ethical egoism never requires killing, rape, or theft.
   3. It begs the question against the ethical egoist.\*
   4. None of the above—the argument is sound.
5. Psychological egoism
   1. must be true if ethical egoism is true.
   2. is one, but not the only, possible source of support for ethical egoism.\*
   3. is completely unrelated to ethical egoism.
   4. implies that ethical egoism is false.
6. If ethical egoism is true, then
   1. it is never morally permissible for someone to murder you.
   2. it is never morally permissible for someone to steal from you.
   3. Both of the above
   4. None of the above\*
7. Suppose the widespread acceptance of egoism would make everyone better off. This would
   1. be a strong moral consideration in favor of ethical egoism.
   2. not support ethical egoism.\*
   3. be a strong consideration against ethical egoism.
   4. decisively refute ethical egoism.
8. According to libertarianism, all of our duties derive from
   1. self-interest.
   2. the categorical imperative.
   3. consent and reparation.\*
   4. God’s commands.
9. If libertarianism is true, then
   1. ethical egoism is correct.
   2. ethical egoism is false.\*
   3. ethical egoism is probably true.
   4. this provides some weak evidence against ethical egoism.
10. *The best argument for ethical egoism* states that
    1. if there is good reason to do something, then doing it must make you better off.\*
    2. if doing something makes you better off, then there is good reason to do it.
    3. no one is capable of behaving altruistically.
    4. egoism makes everyone better off.
11. According to the text, what’s wrong with the *best argument for ethical egoism*?
    1. It’s invalid.
    2. Sometimes we have reason to do things that will gain us nothing.\*
    3. It begs the question against the opponent of ethical egoism.
    4. None of the above—the argument is sound.
12. If ethical egoism is true, then everyone
    1. is allowed to pursue self-interest.\*
    2. has the right to be free from the interference of others when pursuing self-interest.
    3. is entitled to one's own property.
    4. All of the above
13. Ethical egoism
    1. violates many widely shared moral beliefs.
    2. cannot allow for the existence of genuine moral rights.
    3. arbitrarily elevates the interests of some people over those of others.
    4. All of the above\*
14. If ethical egoism is true, then I should regard the interests of others as having
    1. just as much moral importance as my own interests.
    2. some moral importance but not as much as my own interests.
    3. no moral importance.\*
    4. more moral importance than my own interests.
15. If ethical egoism is true, others are morally obliged
    1. to promote our interests.
    2. to refrain from frustrating our interests.
    3. to frustrate our interests.
    4. None of the above\*
16. What is ethical egoism?
    1. The theory that every human action aims at some personal benefit
    2. The theory that altruism is impossible
    3. The theory that actions are morally right just because they promote one's self-interest\*
    4. The theory that it is permissible, but not obligatory, to value oneself over others
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1. Which of the following accurately describes the relationship between ethical egoism and psychological egoism?
   1. If psychological egoism is true, this supports ethical egoism.\*
   2. If ethical egoism is true, psychological egoism must be true.
   3. They are competing theories about what we ought to do.
   4. They are competing theories about the way humans actually behave.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What would an ethical egoist say about a situation in which self-interest and morality conflict?
   1. One should do what morality demands.
   2. One should do what self-interest demands.
   3. One should sometimes do what morality requires and sometimes pursue self-interest.
   4. Such a situation is impossible, according to ethical egoism.\*
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1. Which of the following rights do we have, according to ethical egoism?
   1. A right to not be physically assaulted
   2. A right not to have our property taken from us
   3. A right to pursue our own self-interest\*
   4. All of the above
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1. According to the text, what is wrong with the *self-reliance argument*?
   1. It is not true that all would be better off if everyone tended to his or her own needs.
   2. The egoist cannot endorse the claim that we ought to do what benefits everyone.
   3. Both of the above\*
   4. Nothing; the argument is sound.
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1. What is the relationship between libertarianism and ethical egoism?
   1. If libertarianism is true, ethical egoism must be true.
   2. Libertarianism supports ethical egoism but does not require it.
   3. Ethical egoism supports libertarianism but does not require it.
   4. Libertarianism and ethical egoism are inconsistent.\*
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1. According to the text, what is the best argument for ethical egoism?
   1. Our moral obligations give us reasons, and all reasons come from self-interest.\*
   2. Everyone would be better off if everyone were an ethical egoist.
   3. Libertarianism is true, and libertarianism requires ethical egoism.
   4. None of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following is a problem for ethical egoism?
   1. It falsely claims that altruism is impossible.
   2. It violates core moral beliefs.\*
   3. It cannot explain why we have reason to be moral.
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to ethical egoism, how should we regard the basic needs of others?
   1. They are just as important as our needs.
   2. They are important but less important than our needs.
   3. We should completely discount them.\*
   4. We should seek to thwart them whenever possible.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following claims about ethical egoism is *not* true?
   1. It cannot allow for the existence of moral rights.
   2. It claims that everyone always behaves selfishly.\*
   3. It arbitrarily makes one's own interests all-important.
   4. It may require us to do things that seem like paradigmatic cases of immorality.

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 9: Consequentialism: Its Nature and Attractions**

*Summary*

Consequentialism is a family of ethical theories according to which acts are morally right just because they maximize the amount of goodness in the world. There are many consequentialist theories, but the most influential is *act utilitarianism*: the view that an action is morally required if and only if it brings about the greatest overall balance of happiness over misery. According to most utilitarians, the right action is the one with the best *actual—*rather than *expected—*results. This can make moral knowledge difficult to come by because many of our actions can have consequences far into the future that are difficult to predict. Furthermore, if through no fault of our own and with the best intentions we happen to fail to maximize happiness, the utilitarian must say that we have acted wrongly. In such cases, utilitarians typically distinguish between the assessment of actions and the assessment of intentions. Actions are right or wrong depending on their consequences, whereas intentions are good or bad based on whether they are *reasonably* *expected* to yield good results.

Utilitarianism has a number of attractions. The theory is *impartial* in that it treats all people's interests as equally important, no matter who they are. It justifies conventional moral wisdom in that it nicely explains why paradigm cases of immorality (e.g., slavery, rape, murder) are wrong and clear cases of moral behavior (e.g., helping the poor, telling the truth) are good. It gives us a clear method for resolving difficult moral issues; in each case, we must simply do our best to determine what would bring about the most good. The theory also allows for moral flexibility and explains why most moral rules, such as the prohibition against lying, may sometimes permissibly be broken in unusual circumstances.

Utilitarianism also gives us a clear criterion for membership in the *moral* *community*—the group of individuals whose needs and interests are morally important for their own sake. According to utilitarianism, any being that is capable of suffering deserves our moral consideration; species membership is morally irrelevant. This has led many utilitarians to argue that our treatment of non-human animals is immoral. If utilitarianism is correct, it is wrong to treat an animal in any way that it would be immoral to treat a human with the same mental abilities.

*Essay Questions*

1. Define consequentialism, and explain why act utilitarianism is a form of consequentialism. How does consequentialism differ from rival approaches to ethics? Do you find consequentialism to be a plausible way of thinking about right and wrong? Explain your answer.
2. It is sometimes said that act utilitarianism requires us to do whatever will benefit the greatest number of people, or that utilitarianism requires us to do whatever generates the greatest amount of happiness. Explain why both of these are misconceptions, giving examples to illustrate your points.
3. According to utilitarianism, there is no essential connection between the morality of an action and the morality of the intentions behind it. Describe the utilitarian approach to evaluating actions and intentions, and explain why utilitarians are committed to seeing the two as disconnected. Do you find this feature of utilitarianism to be plausible?
4. In what ways is utilitarianism impartial? Is this a strength or a weakness of the theory? Defend your answer.
5. What implications does utilitarianism have for our treatment of non-human animals? How do utilitarians argue for their conclusions about non-human animals? Do you find the utilitarian’s conclusions about animals plausible? If so, why? If not, how would you respond to their arguments?
6. Explain what you take to be the strongest version of consequentialism. What does it count as good and bad and how does it understand the balance of good over bad? Explain some advantages of your theory over other versions of consequentialism.

*Test Bank Questions*

1. Consequentialism is
   1. a family of ethical theories that includes utilitarianism.\*
   2. one version of act utilitarianism.
   3. inconsistent with utilitarianism.
   4. None of the above
2. Consequentialism states that an action is right if and only if
   1. it maximizes the amount of goodness in the world.\*
   2. it gives people what they deserve.
   3. it does not harm anyone.
   4. it is good for more people than any alternative action.
3. The principle of utility can be summarized as
   1. do unto others as you would have them do unto you.
   2. do whatever is most useful in the circumstances.
   3. maximize overall well-being.\*
   4. always pursue your own self-interest.
4. John Stuart Mill thought that the only intrinsically valuable thing is
   1. desire satisfaction.
   2. happiness.\*
   3. virtue.
   4. knowledge.
5. According to utilitarianism, gaining moral knowledge
   1. requires consulting religious texts.
   2. requires memorizing moral rules.
   3. requires accurately predicting the outcomes of one's actions.\*
   4. is impossible.
6. Most utilitarians believe that the morality of an action depends on
   1. its expected results.
   2. its actual results.\*
   3. the goodness of one's intentions.
   4. All of the above
7. According to utilitarianism
   1. whether one's intentions are good depends on whether one's action is right.
   2. whether one's action is right depends on whether one's intentions are good.
   3. the morality of actions and the goodness of intentions are mutually dependent.
   4. there is no essential connection between the morality of an action and the morality of the intentions behind it.\*
8. Utilitarianism allows that we may count one person's interests as more important than the interests of others if
   1. they are related to us.
   2. we care deeply about them.
   3. they live closer to us.
   4. None of the above\*
9. Utilitarians believe in
   1. a handful of absolute moral rules.
   2. only one absolute moral rule: the principle of utility.\*
   3. breaking conventional moral rules whenever it's in one's self-interest.
   4. no moral rules whatsoever.
10. What does it mean to say a policy is optimific?
    1. It treats everyone fairly.
    2. It makes everyone better off.
    3. It yields the greatest balance of benefits over drawbacks.\*
    4. It is immoral.
11. According to the text, a *slippery slope argument* is
    1. an argument which assumes the truth of its conclusion in one of its premises.
    2. an argument which criticizes something on the grounds that that thing will lead to terrible results.\*
    3. an argument which demonstrates that some view is logically committed to an implausible claim.
    4. None of the above
12. Which of the following might utilitarianism sometimes require?
    1. Harming one person to benefit another
    2. Performing actions that benefit fewer people than we possibly could
    3. Performing actions that generate less happiness than we possibly could
    4. All of the above\*
13. According to utilitarianism, harming a human being is
    1. incomparably worse than harming a non-human animal.
    2. in and of itself slightly worse than harming a non-human animal.
    3. in and of itself not any better or worse than harming a non-human animal.\*
    4. not as bad as harming a non-human animal.
14. Which is *not* an attraction of utilitarianism?
    1. Impartiality
    2. Makes it easy to acquire moral knowledge\*
    3. Justifies conventional moral wisdom
    4. Allows for conflict resolution
15. According to utilitarian Jeremy Bentham, what is the relevant question for determining membership in the moral community?
    1. Can they suffer?\*
    2. Can they reason?
    3. Can they talk?
    4. Can they care?
16. Which of the following best describes the relationship between utilitarianism and consequentialism?
    1. Utilitarianism is a form of consequentialism.\*
    2. Consequentialism is a form of utilitarianism.
    3. Utilitarianism and consequentialism are completely independent theories.
    4. Utilitarianism and consequentialism are inconsistent.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is necessary in order to gain moral knowledge, according to most utilitarians?
   1. Having a virtuous disposition
   2. Accurately predicting the consequences of an action\*
   3. Making a careful study of moral philosophy
   4. Most utilitarians deny the existence of moral knowledge.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following do most utilitarians believe determines the morality of actions?
   1. The expected consequences of the action
   2. The actual consequences of the action\*
   3. The goodness of the intentions of the person performing the action
   4. Whether or not the action violates God's commands

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What determines the morality of the intentions behind one's actions, according to utilitarianism?
   1. The expected consequences of the action\*
   2. The actual consequences of the action
   3. The emotions felt by the person performing the action
   4. The sincerity of the person performing the action

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to the text, what do most utilitarians believe about conventional moral wisdom?
   1. Most of conventional morality is mistaken.
   2. Conventional morality is mistaken in some ways but is mostly correct.\*
   3. Conventional morality is entirely correct.
   4. Conventional morality should be ignored whenever doing so is in one's self-interest.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What attitudes do most utilitarians take toward moral rules?
   1. Many moral rules are absolute and must never be broken.
   2. Moral rules can be helpful but can be broken if doing so is optimific.\*
   3. Following moral rules is harmful and ought to be shunned.
   4. Utilitarians believe that the idea of a “moral rule” is incoherent.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What attitude do most utilitarians take toward non-human animals?
   1. Their suffering does not matter morally.
   2. Their suffering matters morally but not nearly as much as that of humans.
   3. If an animal suffers to the same extent as a human, the animal’s suffering is equally important.\*
   4. Animal suffering is morally more important than human suffering because animals are not moral agents.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. In determining the moral permissibility of the death penalty, which is *not* a concern of a consequentialist?
   1. Whether or not the death penalty reduces crime
   2. Whether or not the death penalty increases security
   3. Whether or not the death penalty is applied fairly\*
   4. Whether or not the death penalty expands respect for human life

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What does it mean for you to be a member of the moral community?
   1. That you are part of a society that has certain moral beliefs
   2. That you are part of a group that acts morally
   3. That you are morally virtuous
   4. That you are morally important in your own right\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Consequentialists all agree that
   1. morality requires whatever act is optimific.\*
   2. well-being is the only thing that is intrinsically valuable.
   3. all living things are members of the moral community.
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 10: Consequentialism: Its Difficulties**

*Summary*

Those who accept consequentialism face a number of difficulties. If consequentialism is true, then determining which action is right requires accurately predicting how much well-being each of one's options would bring about. Although in some cases it is obvious what will maximize happiness, we seem to lack any precise way of measuring well-being, rendering utilitarianism incapable of providing concrete guidance in difficult cases. Another common objection is that utilitarianism demands too much of us in our deliberations, in our motivations, and in our actions. If utilitarianism is true, for instance, it is impermissible to ever spend money on a vacation if one could bring about more good by giving that money to charity. Similarly, the impartiality that is built into utilitarianism requires that we never choose to benefit our loved ones if we could create more happiness by choosing to benefit strangers instead. Many people feel that a special regard for one's own family and friends is a good thing and find this aspect of utilitarianism implausible.

According to utilitarianism, whether an action is right or wrong depends solely on the consequences of the action. It follows that if utilitarianism is true, there are no actions that are intrinsically wrong—i.e., wrong by their very nature. But it seems to many that killing or torturing innocent people is wrong, even if doing so would bring about the best consequences. Utilitarianism cannot accommodate this and demands that we commit serious injustices (including killing innocents) whenever doing so is optimific.

Consequentialists have responded to this last problem in four ways. One reply is to allow that justice, in addition to well-being, is intrinsically valuable. To make this a workable theory, however, the consequentialist would need to give us a principle for negotiating trade-offs in which we could either bring about more justice or more happiness, but not both. A second reply is to deny that unjust acts can ever maximize happiness, but this seems overly optimistic. A third reply is simply to insist that justice must sometimes be sacrificed for the general good. Finally, one could attempt to avoid the problem of injustice by embracing rule consequentialism, the view that an act is morally right just because it is required by an optimific social rule. Such a move presents a problem, however, because rule consequentialism sometimes requires actions that will definitely produce worse results than other available actions.

*Essay Questions*

1. Write an essay developing what you take to be the most powerful objection to utilitarianism. Explain the objection in detail, and then describe how you think a utilitarian would reply. Is the utilitarian reply satisfactory? Defend your answer.
2. What role does *measuring well-being* play in utilitarianism? What problems does such measurement present? How serious do you think these problems are for the theory? Explain and defend your response.
3. In what ways is utilitarianism thought to be too demanding? Give examples to explain your answer. What do you think the utilitarian would say in response to this objection?
4. Describe a case in which utilitarianism seems to require that someone behave unjustly. Do you think utilitarianism nonetheless gives the correct moral verdict in this case? Why or why not? How might a utilitarian reply to the objection that the theory wrongly licenses injustice?
5. Write an essay comparing and contrasting act utilitarianism with rule consequentialism. Define each theory, and then explain why rule consequentialism is often thought to provide a solution to the problem of injustice that faces act utilitarianism. What objection can be levelled against rule consequentialism? Which theory do you think is preferable?
6. Develop a utilitarian decision procedure—given utilitarianism, how should we decide what to do? Does your account help utilitarianism avoid any of the objections from this chapter? Why or why not?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. Measuring well-being is difficult for utilitarians because
   1. there is no precise unit of happiness.
   2. there might be multiple things that directly contribute to well-being.
   3. there doesn't seem to be any method to compare the quantities of different benefits.
   4. All of the above\*
2. Some claim that utilitarianism demands more calculation than we are capable of. John Stuart Mill responded to this by claiming that
   1. with training, people can learn to make such complicated calculations well.
   2. calculations are often unnecessary because we can usually rely on common wisdom.\*
   3. this is equally a problem for every moral theory.
   4. this explains why no one has moral knowledge.
3. Most utilitarians regard utilitarianism as a
   1. standard of rightness.\*
   2. decision procedure.
   3. Both of the above
   4. None of the above
4. Utilitarians claim that
   1. all moral action is supererogatory.
   2. all self-interested action is supererogatory.
   3. very few things are supererogatory.
   4. no acts are supererogatory.\*
5. If utilitarianism is true
   1. it is always acceptable to give preference to the interests of our family members.
   2. it is never acceptable to give preference to the interests of our family members.
   3. it is sometimes permissible to give preference to our family members, but only when doing so is most beneficial.\*
   4. it is always obligatory to give preference to the interests of our family members.
6. According to utilitarianism, the preferences and well-being of people with deep-seated prejudices
   1. matter much less than the preferences and well-being of oppressed people.
   2. matter slightly less than the preferences and well-being of oppressed people.
   3. matter equally to the preferences and well-being of oppressed people.\*
   4. matter more than the preferences and well-being of oppressed people.
7. Utilitarianism states that it is always intrinsically wrong to
   1. violate people's rights.
   2. kill innocent people.
   3. lie to people.
   4. None of the above\*
8. According to the *argument from injustice*
   1. injustice can sometimes be justified in certain circumstances.
   2. utilitarianism sometimes requires us to commit serious injustices.\*
   3. justice is not intrinsically valuable.
   4. All of the above
9. Rule consequentialism is the view that
   1. an action is morally right just because it is required by an optimific social rule.\*
   2. acts are morally right if and only if they create the greatest amount of well-being.
   3. we ought to usually follow consequentialism but may occasionally do otherwise for the sake of self-interest.
   4. the best way to maximize happiness is to follow existing social rules.
10. According to the text, which of the following is an objection to rule consequentialism?
    1. The theory often requires actions that are considered injustices.
    2. The theory requires that we obey rules that are not optimific.
    3. The theory demands that we obey rules even when we know that breaking them would yield better results.\*
    4. None of the above
11. Which of the following best represents John Stuart Mill's view of pleasure?
    1. All pleasure is equally valuable.
    2. Pleasure is one of many things that are intrinsically valuable.
    3. Some pleasures are “higher” than others and thus more valuable.\*
    4. Both a and b
12. Why is the lack of a method for measuring well-being a problem for utilitarians?
    1. It shows that utilitarianism requires immorality.
    2. It renders utilitarianism incapable of giving concrete advice.\*
    3. It proves that the theory is excessively committed to impartiality.
    4. All of the above
13. What is a *decision procedure* in ethics?
    1. A theory that tells us which actions are right and which are wrong
    2. A calculation of the total benefits of an action
    3. A method for making moral decisions\*
    4. A theory that tells us when intentions are morally good or bad
14. What is *supererogation*?
    1. Behaving in a self-interested manner
    2. Doing what is morally required of you
    3. Violating another person's rights
    4. Doing something that is admirable and praiseworthy but not morally required\*
15. According to the text, how should we regard utilitarianism's commitment to impartiality?
    1. It is entirely a strength of the theory.
    2. It is entirely a weakness of the theory.
    3. It is irrelevant to the merits of the theory.
    4. It is in some ways a strength and in others a weakness.\*
16. Utilitarians can completely avoid the problem of adding up well-being by claiming that well-being consists in
    1. how happy you are.
    2. how much your desires are satisfied.
    3. Both of the above
    4. None of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Utilitarianism requires that agents always
   1. consider each option and its effects before deciding how to act.
   2. always be motivated by maximizing the good.
   3. always act to achieve optimific results.\*
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. How would most utilitarians characterize the principle of utility?
   1. It is a standard of rightness.\*
   2. It is a decision procedure.
   3. It describes the single appropriate motivation when making choices.
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following would the utilitarian regard as wrong in all possible circumstances?
   1. Violating someone's rights
   2. Performing an action that is not optimific\*
   3. Killing an innocent person
   4. None of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following responses to the problem of injustice is *not* consistent with utilitarianism?
   1. Justice must sometimes be sacrificed for the sake of well-being.
   2. Justice is intrinsically valuable.\*
   3. Injustice is never optimific.
   4. In almost every case, the just action will also be the one that maximizes well-being.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the primary motivation for rule consequentialism?
   1. It is thought to solve the problem of injustice.\*
   2. It avoids the irrational rule worship of act utilitarianism.
   3. It allows for more moral flexibility than act utilitarianism.
   4. It vindicates all actually existing social norms.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What do rule consequentialists demand when breaking a moral rule would yield better results?
   1. Break the moral rule.
   2. Obey the moral rule.\*
   3. Re-write the moral rules.
   4. Obey the moral rule unless it results in an injustice.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to utilitarianism, it is intrinsically morally right to
   1. donate to charity.
   2. make someone happy.
   3. act in your self-interest.
   4. None of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Exemplary punishment is
   1. punishment that makes an example of someone.\*
   2. punishment that is a model for other punishments.
   3. punishment that rehabilitates the criminal.
   4. punishment that is targets innocent people.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. An optimific social rule is a rule which
   1. is optimific whenever it’s followed.
   2. is optimific when nearly everyone follows it.\*
   3. is optimific most of the time.
   4. is optimific for a certain society.

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 11: The Kantian Perspective: Fairness and Justice**

*Summary*

While utilitarians claim that the ultimate point of morality is to improve well-being, Immanuel Kant's moral theory emphasizes the importance of fairness and justice. When discussing moral issues, people often raise the issue of fairness by asking questions such as “*What if everyone did that*?” and “*How would you like it if I did that to you*?” These questions fail to provide foolproof tests of the morality of actions, however. Some actions, such as remaining celibate, can be morally permissible even if the consequences of *everyone* doing the same would be disastrous. Furthermore, as the existence of principled fanatics makes clear, one's actions might be immoral even if one would have no problem with everyone else behaving the same way. Kant provides a test for the morality of actions that aims to avoid these problems. According to Kant, an act is morally acceptable if and only if its maxim is universalizable. A maxim is the principle one gives to oneself when acting; it states what one is going to do and why one is going to do it. A maxim is universalizable if and only if one's goal could be achieved in a world in which everyone acted on that maxim. For example, a maxim that states that one will lie whenever doing so is convenient would not be universalizable because in a world in which everyone followed such a maxim, no one would trust the promises of others, and lying would be futile.

Kant thought that all immoral action is irrational because he believed the principle of universalizability to be the fundamental principle of morality and that to violate the principle is to act inconsistently. The principle of universalizability fails as a general test for the morality of our actions, however. The existence of principled fanatics shows this to be the case: the maxim that one will do whatever it takes (including killing) to protect the beauty of one's lawn seems to pass the test, but killing to protect one's lawn is clearly immoral. Kant also believed that the moral rules prohibiting certain actions, such as lying, are *absolute—*i.e., never permissibly broken. This is not required by the principle of universalizability, however, and seems implausible in certain cases (such as lying to prevent a murder).

*Essay Questions*

1. Write an essay contrasting Kant's approach to ethics with consequentialism. Which do you think is better, and why?
2. What does Kant claim is the supreme principle of morality? Clearly state the principle and explain how Kant thought we could apply it to determine the morality of actions. What do you think is the most powerful objection to this principle? Can this objection be overcome?
3. Explain the distinction between hypothetical and categorical imperatives. Which category did Kant think that moral requirements fall into, and why did he think this is important?
4. What does it mean for a moral duty to be *absolute*? Give an example of a moral rule (besides the principle of universalizability) that Kant believed to be absolute. Does the principle of universalizability require us to regard the moral rule you mention as absolute? Why or why not?
5. What did Kant think is the relationship between morality and rationality? How would he respond to the challenge of the amoralist, who believes that moral rules exist but does not care about them? Do you find Kant's views on this topic to be plausible?
6. Explain the principled fanatics objection to Kant’s ethical theory. How do you think Kant would respond to this objection? Do you find his response satisfying? Why or why not?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. The question “What if everyone did that?” does not provide an acceptable ethical standard because
   1. it seems to license the actions of principled fanatics.
   2. it makes the morality of one's actions depend on the way they are described.
   3. it prohibits things that do not seem to be immoral, including celibacy.
   4. All of the above\*
2. The golden rule fails to give any guidance concerning
   1. how to treat loved ones.
   2. lying.
   3. self-regarding actions.\*
   4. how to treat strangers.
3. In Kant's theory, a *maxim* is
   1. a piece of wisdom handed down over many generations.
   2. an objectively correct moral rule.
   3. a principle of action that one gives to oneself.\*
   4. a false moral principle.
4. According to Kant, an action is morally acceptable if and only if
   1. it maximizes happiness.
   2. its maxim is universalizable.\*
   3. its maxim is accepted in one's society.
   4. it is in accordance with the golden rule.
5. Kant claims that the morality of an action depends on
   1. one's intentions.\*
   2. the results of one's action.
   3. Both of the above
   4. None of the above
6. Kant claimed that
   1. morality and rationality have nothing to do with each other.
   2. acting morally is always irrational.
   3. acting immorally is always irrational.\*
   4. acting rationally is usually immoral.
7. An *amoralist* is
   1. someone who does not believe in the existence of morality at all.
   2. someone who believes that morality is subjective.
   3. someone who believes in morality but does not care about it at all.\*
   4. someone who tries to act immorally.
8. According to Kant, the demands of morality are
   1. categorical imperatives.\*
   2. hypothetical imperatives.
   3. created by God.
   4. the products of social convention.
9. The principle of universalizability does not account for the immorality of
   1. lying.
   2. slavery.
   3. cheating on one's taxes.
   4. principled fanatics.\*
10. Kant believed that it is permissible to lie
    1. in order to avoid a serious inconvenience.
    2. in order to save someone else's life.
    3. whenever one feels like it.
    4. None of the above\*
11. According to Kant, what is the main problem with the golden rule?
    1. It makes morality depend on a person's desires.\*
    2. It makes morality depend solely on the consequences of one's actions.
    3. It fails to give us any guidance whatsoever.
    4. It allows lying, which is never permissible.
12. Which of the following best characterizes Kant's moral theory?
    1. It is a version of utilitarianism.
    2. It is a version of consequentialism, but it is not utilitarian.
    3. It is neutral on the issue of whether consequentialism is true.
    4. It is inconsistent with consequentialism.\*
13. What is a categorical imperative, according to Kant?
    1. A command of reason that depends on our desires
    2. A command of reason that does not depend on our desires\*
    3. A principle of action that one gives to oneself
    4. A principle of action that one gives to others
14. What is a hypothetical imperative, according to Kant?
    1. A command of reason that depends on our desires\*
    2. A command of reason that does not depend on our desires
    3. A principle of action that one gives to oneself
    4. A principle of action that one gives to others
15. What does Kant mean by a *maxim*?
    1. A bit of folksy wisdom
    2. An objective moral law
    3. A misleading moral command
    4. A principle of action that one gives to oneself\*
16. What is the fundamental principle of morality, according to Kant?
    1. Never lie.
    2. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.
    3. Act only on maxims that are universalizable.\*
    4. Always maximize happiness.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What did Kant believe is the relationship between rationality and morality?
   1. Morality and rationality are fundamentally opposed.
   2. Rationality requires us to be moral.\*
   3. Morality and rationality are completely independent.
   4. Rationality might sometimes require immorality, but not often.
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1. Which of the following did Kant believe to be the central moral virtue?
   1. Integrity\*
   2. Benevolence
   3. Compassion
   4. None of the above
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1. The principle of universalizability states that you should
   1. act only in such a way that you would be comfortable with everyone acting.
   2. act towards others as you would want them to act towards you.
   3. act only according to maxims that are universalizable.\*
   4. act only if your maxim results in good consequences.
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1. According to the text, what is wrong with the principle of universalizability?
   1. It fails to explain what's wrong with lying.
   2. It permits the actions of principled fanatics.\*
   3. It falsely claims that the central moral virtue is benevolence.
   4. It makes the morality of actions solely a matter of their consequences.
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1. To have integrity is to
   1. act in harmony with the principles you believe in.\*
   2. act in a way that benefits others.
   3. act morally.
   4. act consistently.
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1. According to Kant, which actions have maxims?
   1. Moral actions
   2. Immoral actions
   3. Rational actions
   4. All of the above\*
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1. The *Amoralist’s Challenge* is a direct challenge to what?
   1. Kant’s principle of universalizability
   2. Kant’s claim that immoral conduct is irrational\*
   3. Kant’s claim that every action has a maxim
   4. Kant’s verdict in the lying promise case

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to Kant, moral requirements apply to
   1. all living things.
   2. all who possess reason.\*
   3. all who can suffer.
   4. None of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to Kant, if two actions have the same result
   1. they have the same maxim.
   2. they have the same moral status.
   3. they are the same act.
   4. None of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 12 The Kantian Perspective: Autonomy, Free Will, and Respect**

*Summary*

Kant gave a number of formulations of what he considered to be the supreme principle of morality. In addition to the principle of universalizability, Kant put forward the principle of humanity, which states: Always treat a human being (yourself included) as an end and never as a mere means. Whereas to treat a person as a mere means is to regard her simply as a tool to your own ends, treating a person as an end requires treating her with the respect she deserves. When Kant speaks of “human beings,” he means to include not just *Homo* *sapiens* but any being that is rational and autonomous. For Kant, rationality and autonomy are what give each person intrinsic worth and dignity and provide the basis for both our moral rights and the moral responsibility we bear for our actions. Autonomy is the Kantian basis of our dignity, so Kant’s theory requires that we have free will, or the ability to make free choices.

The principle of humanity faces a number of difficulties. The notion of treating someone as an end is vague and difficult to apply, and Kant's own account of how to determine what people deserve—*lex* *talionis*, the eye-for-an-eye principle—is problematic. Kant assumes that the morality of actions depends only on factors within our control, but this is called into question by cases of *moral* *luck*. Finally, because of Kant's emphasis on the importance of rationality and autonomy, it is difficult for him to account for the moral standing of beings that lack those traits, including non-human animals and the mentally disabled.

Kant believed that there is only one thing that is valuable in all circumstances: the good will. The good will is the ability to reliably know what your duty is and a steady commitment to doing your duty for its own sake. Kant argued that the only actions that are truly praiseworthy are those performed from the good will. Even kind and generous actions, if not performed from a sense of duty, have no moral worth on this view. According to Kant, acting from the good will is entirely an exercise of reason and does not require any particular desires or emotions. Kant believed this in part because he thought that the morality of actions depends entirely on things within our control, whereas our emotions are often outside our control.

*Essay Questions*

1. Write an essay explaining Kant's principle of humanity. State the principle clearly and define any key terms. Give examples to make clear how we are supposed to apply the principle. Does this principle provide a better test of the morality of actions than the principle of universalizability? Why or why not?
2. Kant claims that humans have a special kind of value not possessed by anything else on earth. How does he justify this claim? What are the implications of this view regarding the moral status of non-human animals? Do you find this view plausible?
3. What gives actions *moral worth*, according to Kant? Compare Kant's view on this subject with the view of the utilitarian. Which view do you think is preferable, and why?
4. What is *moral luck*, and why would the existence of moral luck be a problem for Kant's theory? Do you think moral luck exists? Defend your answer.
5. Write an essay presenting in detail what you take to be the strongest objection to Kant's principle of humanity. Explain the objection and try to formulate the strongest reply you can on Kant's behalf. Do you think the objection succeeds? Why or why not?
6. Compare and contrast Kant’s principle of humanity with his principle of universalizability (from the previous chapter). Are there any cases where the two principles render conflicting verdicts about the moral status of an action? If so, do you think one of the principles could be revised so as to make them consistent? If not, why do you think that the principles will always agree?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. According to utilitarianism, slavery
   1. is intrinsically wrong.
   2. can never be justified.
   3. can be justified under certain circumstances.\*
   4. Both a and b
2. The principle of humanity states
   1. it is never permissible to kill an innocent human being.
   2. always treat a human being as an end, and never as a mere means.\*
   3. act only on maxims that can be applied to all of humanity.
   4. all human beings, even those who lack rationality and autonomy, are equally valuable.
3. Kant believed that humans have dignity by virtue of
   1. their membership in the species *Homo sapiens*.
   2. their being created in the image of God.
   3. their capacity for kindness.
   4. their rationality and autonomy.\*
4. According to Kant, the only thing that is valuable in all circumstances is
   1. happiness.
   2. wisdom.
   3. wealth.
   4. the good will.\*
5. Kant believed that it is possible to be motivated
   1. only if we have some desire to prompt us to action.
   2. only if we have some emotion to prompt us to action.
   3. from an understanding of our moral duty, without any desire or emotion.\*
   4. without any beliefs or desires whatsoever.
6. In Kant's view, your action has moral worth if and only if
   1. you do what duty requires.
   2. you do it because you understand that it is the right thing to do.\*
   3. it maximizes happiness.
   4. it is performed out of a desire to benefit others.
7. In order to determine what people deserve, Kant recommended that we consult
   1. the principle of *lex* *talionis*.\*
   2. the principle of utility.
   3. the golden rule.
   4. the principle of *mens* *rea*.
8. The principle of an eye for an eye
   1. does not take intentions into account in determining punishment.
   2. cannot tell us how to punish crimes that have not harmed anyone.
   3. sometimes prescribes punishments that seem deeply immoral.
   4. All of the above\*
9. Something is a case of *moral* *luck* if
   1. the morality of one's action depends on factors outside of one's control.\*
   2. someone does the right thing but with the wrong intentions.
   3. the morality of one's action depends on one's intentions.
   4. the morality of one's action depends on factors within one's control.
10. Treating someone *as an end* is to
    1. treat her as a goal.
    2. treat her as if you’ll never see her again.
    3. treat her with the respect she deserves.\*
    4. treat in a way that makes her better off.
11. Treating someone *as a means* is to
    1. treat her as a way to help you achieve your goals.\*
    2. treat her as a way to help you achieve her goals.
    3. treat her as a way to maximize happiness.
    4. treat her in a way that respects her autonomy.
12. Unlike the principle of universalizability, the principle of humanity can account for the immorality of what?
    1. Harming animals
    2. A lying promise
    3. Slavery
    4. The fanatic\*
13. Paternalism is
    1. limiting the liberty of others for their own good.\*
    2. limiting the liberty of others for your own good.
    3. limiting everyone’s liberty for the good of society.
    4. limiting the liberty of children.
14. According to Kant, under what conditions is punishment always unjust?
    1. When the punishment has bad overall effects
    2. When the criminal is not autonomous\*
    3. When the punishment is severe
    4. All of the above
15. According to Kant's theory, non-human animals
    1. are the moral equals of humans.
    2. have some moral rights, but not to the same degree as humans.
    3. have no moral rights.\*
    4. are moral agents.
16. Which of the following is Kant's *principle of humanity*?
    1. Always treat a human being as an end, never as a mere means.\*
    2. Always act so as to maximize the well-being of humanity.
    3. Always act on maxims that all of humanity accepts.
    4. None of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. When Kant talks about *humanity*, to whom is he referring?
   1. All and only those who are members of the species *Homo* *sapiens*
   2. All sentient animals
   3. All and only those beings that possess autonomy and rationality\*
   4. All primates, including *Homo* *sapiens*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is *autonomy*?
   1. The capacity to communicate using language
   2. Control over our choices and our actions\*
   3. The tendency to do the right thing because you understand it is the right thing to do
   4. The tendency to do the right thing because of your desires

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the only thing that has value in all circumstances, according to Kant?
   1. Happiness
   2. The satisfaction of desires
   3. Wisdom
   4. The good will\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. When did Kant think that actions are truly praiseworthy?
   1. When they are motivated by benevolence
   2. When they are done in accordance with duty
   3. When they are performed from the good will\*
   4. When the consequences are optimific

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is motivating a person who acts from the good will?
   1. An understanding of what is morally required\*
   2. A desire to benefit others
   3. The emotion of empathy
   4. A desire for reward

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What principle did Kant think tells us what criminals deserve?
   1. The golden rule
   2. *Lex talionis\**
   3. The principle of utility
   4. The principle of non-contradiction

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following characterizes cases of *moral* *luck*?
   1. One does the right thing for the wrong reasons.
   2. One does the right thing for the right reasons.
   3. The morality of an action depends on factors within one's control.
   4. The morality of an action depends on factors outside of one's control.\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following claims, if true, would refute Kant's theory?
   1. People are not autonomous.\*
   2. People often behave immorally.
   3. Some people lack the good will.
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following claims about non-human animals did Kant *not* endorse?
   1. They have no moral rights.
   2. They lack rationality and autonomy.
   3. Abusing them can have bad consequences.
   4. It is permissible to treat them in any way we like.\*

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 13: The Social Contract Tradition: The Theory and Its Attractions**

*Summary*

Many philosophers believe that it is appropriate to begin ethical theorizing by assuming the truth of those moral judgments in which we have the most confidence, such as those prohibiting rape, slavery, and torture. An alternative approach known as *proceduralism* denies this; according to proceduralism, we should begin not by making any substantive moral assumptions, but instead by devising a procedure that will tell us the steps we must take to distinguish right from wrong. One prominent proceduralist view is *contractarianism*, the theory that actions are morally right just because they are permitted by rules that free, equal, and rational people would agree to live by, on the condition that others obey these rules as well. Part of the motivation for such a theory comes from reflecting on *prisoner's dilemma* situations, situations in which everyone would be better off if all could agree to scale back their pursuit of self-interest. According to the founder of modern contractarianism, Thomas Hobbes, life in a world without a government to enforce order would be a prisoner's dilemma situation writ large. According to Hobbes, the only way to escape from such a situation is to agree to a social contract—a set of social rules to promote cooperation—and set up an authority to punish violations of the contract.

As a moral theory, contractarianism has a number of advantages. It not only explains why morality is essentially a social phenomenon that does not apply to individuals in isolation but also explains and justifies the content of moral rules. According to contractarianism, moral rules are justified because they are rules that free, equal, and rational people would agree to live by. Because the question of which rules such ideal contractors would agree to is not simply a matter of personal opinion, contractarianism provides an account of how ethics can be objective. Contractarianism also explains why it is sometimes permissible to break moral rules; because the point of morality is to facilitate social cooperation, moral rules are worth following only when others are willing to do so as well. Because contractarians view the state as a tool for enforcing fair and mutually beneficial social rules, the theory explains both why we usually have a duty to obey the law and why the state is justified in punishing those who break the law.

*Essay Questions*

1. Describe the *proceduralist* approach to ethics and explain how it differs from an approach that begins with certain deeply held moral judgments. Which approach to ethics do you think is preferable, and why?
2. Describe in detail a prisoner's dilemma situation and explain what makes the situation a prisoner's dilemma. Does contractarianism provide a satisfying solution to prisoner's dilemma situations?
3. What did Hobbes mean by the *state of nature*? What did he imagine life would be like in such a state? How did he suggest that people could get out of such a state? Do you agree with his assessment of the state of nature? Why or why not?
4. Define contractarianism and explain how contractarians seek to justify moral rules. Do you find contractarianism to be an attractive moral theory? Why or why not?
5. What attitude do contractarians take toward the state? How can state power be justified, according to contractarianism? Is it ever permissible to break the law, according to the theory?
6. Explain the veil of ignorance. What work does the veil do for contractarianism? What do you think contractors would agree to from behind the veil? Do you think that this is a good approach to contractarianism? Why or why not?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. According to *proceduralism*, we should begin moral inquiry
   1. by assuming that morality does not exist unless we can prove that it does.
   2. by assuming the truth of our most deeply held moral judgments.
   3. by identifying a method for determining right from wrong.\*
   4. only once we have settled contentious political issues.
2. An example of proceduralism would be
   1. rule consequentialism.
   2. the principle of universalizability.
   3. contractarianism.
   4. All of the above\*
3. Contractarianism originated as
   1. a sociological theory.
   2. a psychological theory.
   3. a political theory.\*
   4. a philosophical theory.
4. Contractarianism states that actions are morally right if and only if
   1. everyone agrees that they are right.
   2. they do not violate any agreements.
   3. they do not violate anyone's rights.
   4. they are permitted by rules that free, equal, and rational people would agree to live by.\*
5. Contractarians have traditionally taken the view that people are for the most part
   1. vicious and mean-spirited.
   2. rational and self-interested.\*
   3. kind and altruistic.
   4. irrational and fickle.
6. According to contractarianism, we do best for ourselves by agreeing to
   1. pursue our own self-interest.
   2. limit the direct pursuit of self-interest.\*
   3. act only for the sake of others.
   4. seek to maximize well-being.
7. A *prisoner's* *dilemma* is a situation in which
   1. all people benefit if all people refrain from pursuing their short-term interests.\*
   2. all people benefit if all people pursue their short-term interests.
   3. every possible course of action ends up harming everyone.
   4. there is no possible action that does not break the law.
8. *Prisoner’s dilemmas* are
   1. purely hypothetical examples used in philosophy.
   2. a kind of situation which occurs often in the real world.\*
   3. a historical example about a problem faced by people in jail.
   4. None of the above
9. The founder of modern contractarianism was
   1. Immanuel Kant.
   2. Thomas Hobbes.\*
   3. John Stuart Mill.
   4. Aristotle.
10. Hobbes claimed that life in the state of nature would be
    1. free and easy.
    2. difficult but safe.
    3. a war of all against all.\*
    4. characterized by moral virtue.
11. The purpose of Rawls's “veil of ignorance” is
    1. to ensure that the choices of the contractors are fair.\*
    2. to remind us of how much we don't know.
    3. to prevent people from invading one another's privacy.
    4. to prevent the immoral behavior that often results from higher education.
12. According to the moral theory of contractarianism, the final authority on ethics is
    1. personal opinion.
    2. the law.
    3. conventional wisdom.
    4. None of the above\*
13. According to contractarianism, breaking the law is justified
    1. whenever it is in one's self-interest to do so.
    2. whenever a law is grossly unjust.\*
    3. whenever the law is unpopular.
    4. never.
14. According to contractarianism, the state’s ultimate purpose is
    1. to aid our escape from the state of nature.\*
    2. to make sure everyone is as well off as possible.
    3. to punish people who cause harm.
    4. None of the above
15. Which of the following is *not* an advantage of contractarianism?
    1. It explains the objectivity of morality.
    2. It justifies the content of basic moral rules.
    3. It ensures everyone is as well off as possible.\*
    4. It implies a basic moral duty to obey the law.
16. What does the approach known as *proceduralism* claim?
    1. All criminal trials must follow a rigorous procedure in order to be fair.
    2. Ethical theorizing should begin with our deeply held moral judgments.
    3. Ethical theorizing should begin by identifying a method for distinguishing right from wrong.\*
    4. Ethical theory is an empty formality.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. When is an action morally right, according to contractarianism?
   1. When it does not break any of one's agreements
   2. When it respects the rights and autonomy of others
   3. When it is permitted by the rules that free, equal, and rational people would agree to\*
   4. When it maximizes the well-being of all involved

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the term for a situation in which everyone is made worse off when all pursue self-interest?
   1. Paradox of hedonism
   2. Prisoner's dilemma\*
   3. Egoistic pitfall
   4. Mutually assured destruction

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What was Thomas Hobbes's term for a condition in which there is no government to maintain order?
   1. The lawless condition
   2. The state of nature\*
   3. The before time
   4. The state of Eden

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What did Hobbes think is the only way to escape from the condition in which there is no government to maintain order?
   1. For each person, individually, to strive to morally improve himself
   2. For people to accept a religious faith
   3. To mutually agree on a set of rules for social cooperation\*
   4. Hobbes did not think such a state could be truly escaped

*Appears on the student website.*

1. How do contractarians seek to justify basic moral rules?
   1. By showing that free, equal, and rational people would agree to such rules\*
   2. By showing that they maximize utility
   3. By showing that such rules are universalizable
   4. Contractarians claim that basic moral rules cannot be justified.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. How does contractarianism regard the status of moral rules?
   1. They are a matter of personal opinion.
   2. They are a matter of societal convention.
   3. They are objective.\*
   4. There are no moral rules, according to contractarianism.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. When is it permissible to break moral rules, according to contractarianism?
   1. Whenever doing so is in one's self-interest
   2. Whenever most others consistently fail to abide by them\*
   3. Whenever doing so will maximize utility
   4. Never

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is Rawls's *veil of ignorance*?
   1. A metaphorical term for the way in which humans often fail to empathize with one another
   2. A description of the tools used by governments to keep their people ignorant
   3. An imaginary device for ensuring that contractors make fair choices\*
   4. An objection to contractarianism

*Appears on the student website.*

1. When does contractarianism claim that civil disobedience is justified?
   1. Whenever a law is grossly unjust\*
   2. Whenever it is in one's long-term self-interest
   3. Always
   4. Never

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 14: The Social Contract Tradition: Problems and Prospects**

*Summary*

This chapter explores four potential problems for contractarianism. The first problem is brought out by Hobbes's character “the Fool,” who believes that acting immorally is sometimes in our self-interest and therefore rational. This raises the *free*-*rider* *problem*: Many public goods can be provided only if many people contribute to them, but any individual can in principle enjoy the good without contributing. Because many contractarians think the point of morality is to promote one's self-interest through mutually beneficial agreements, it is difficult for them to explain why we should refrain from free-riding whenever we can get away with it. Perhaps the best contractarian reply is to argue that it is rational to become a just person—i.e., the kind of person who cares about justice and tries to behave morally. Even if this is true, however, it does not establish that unjust people have good reason to behave morally in all situations.

A second problem focuses on the role that *agreement* plays in contractarianism. One might wonder whether we have all really consented to any social contract that gives the government power over us. Some contractarians claim that we have *tacitly consented* to obey the law simply by choosing to live in a country, but this does not seem to be true of everyone, especially those who actively protest the government. Modern contractarians reply to this problem by claiming that an action is morally right if it is permitted by rules that free, equal, and rational people *would* agree to, and insist that the absence of any *actual* agreement does not release one from one's moral duties.

According to contractarianism, the correct moral standards are those that would be agreed to in certain ideal conditions. But here a third problem arises: What if the contractors selecting the rules disagree among themselves? Rawls's version of contractarianism seeks to prevent this by placing the contractors behind the “veil of ignorance” that strips them of knowledge of their particular characteristics. This would solve the problem of disagreement and ensure that the standards agreed upon are fair, but it also raises the question of why *we* should obey standards chosen by people quite unlike us. A final problem for contractarians is that because the contractors choose rules based on rational self-interest, there seems to be no reason that they would protect those who can't enter into such agreements, including non-human animals, infants, and those with severe intellectual disabilities.

*Essay Questions*

1. Write an essay on the relation between self-interest and morality in contractarianism. What role does self-interest play in determining which moral standards are correct, according to the theory? Do contractarians think that it is always in our self-interest to behave morally? Why or why not?
2. Have we all consented to abide by a social contract? If so, how? If not, is this a problem for contractarianism? Defend your answer.
3. The decisions of hypothetical contractors play an important role in contractarianism. Suppose that such contractors failed to agree about some moral question. How serious of a problem would this be for contractarianism? Describe Rawls's idea of the *veil of ignorance*,and explain how it might be able to solve this problem. Do you think it succeeds? Why or why not?
4. Can contractarianism account for the moral status of human infants and non-human animals? Explain why some people think this is a problem for contractarianism. Do you think this is a serious problem? How might a contractarian defend the theory?
5. Describe Hobbes's character of “the Fool.” How does the Fool raise a problem for contractarianism? What is Hobbes's solution to this problem? Do you find it convincing?
6. Develop what you take to be the most serious objection to contractarianism (it can be one discussed in the book or one you thought of on your own). How should a contractarian reply to your objection? Do you find the contractarian’s reply satisfying? Why or why not?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. According to Hobbes, what is the fundamental reason for acting?
   1. Self-interest\*
   2. Altruism
   3. Virtue
   4. None of the above
2. In Hobbes's philosophy, “the Fool” is someone who
   1. believes that it is sometimes rational to behave unjustly.\*
   2. believes that it is always rational to behave morally.
   3. acts altruistically and neglects his own self-interest.
   4. doesn't believe that anything is just or unjust.
3. Situations in which one person can benefit from a common good without contributing anything are sometimes referred to as
   1. the prisoner's dilemma.
   2. the free-rider problem.\*
   3. the paradox of hedonism.
   4. the contractarian problematic.
4. For Hobbes, a well-ordered society is one in which
   1. there is no government.
   2. no one ever breaks one's agreements.
   3. all of the laws are easy to understand.
   4. there are reliable threats against breaking mutually beneficial rules.\*
5. Hobbes argued that
   1. the risks of doing wrong always outweigh its potential benefits.\*
   2. it is sometimes rational to behave immorally.
   3. the Fool was actually correct.
   4. we have not actually entered into a social contract to obey the government.
6. Some contractarians believe that we all have a duty to obey the law because
   1. doing so maximizes overall utility.
   2. we have tacitly consented to do so.\*
   3. we have explicitly consented to do so.
   4. doing so is commanded by God.
7. According to *the consent argument*,
   1. we have a duty to obey the law only if we have consented to do so.
   2. many people do not have a duty to obey the law.
   3. many people have not given their consent to obey the law.
   4. All of the above\*
8. According to contractarians, our fundamental moral duties are determined by
   1. what we have actually consented to.
   2. what we have tacitly consented to.
   3. what we *would* agree to if we were free, rational, and seeking mutual cooperation.\*
   4. the principle of universalizability.
9. According to contractarianism, we are morally required to
   1. do whatever a majority of our society thinks is right.
   2. do whatever existing laws and customs dictate.
   3. do whatever the leadership of our society thinks is right.
   4. None of the above\*
10. According to Rawls's theory,
    1. the contractors disagree about many important issues, undermining morality's objectivity.
    2. the contractors disagree about a few small points, but this does not undermine morality.
    3. the contractors never disagree.\*
    4. the decisions of the contractors are irrelevant to morality.
11. According to contractarians, the contractors who fix the content of morality are
    1. benevolent and generous.
    2. jealous and vindictive.
    3. perfectly altruistic.
    4. rational and self-interested.\*
12. All contractarians agree that the contractors who fix the content of morality are
    1. clones of one another.
    2. us, situated as we are.
    3. the leaders of a society.
    4. None of the above\*
13. To be self-interested is to
    1. be selfish.
    2. have a strong concern for how well you are faring in life.\*
    3. be unconcerned with the well-being of others.
    4. All of the above
14. If contractarianism is true, then the moral community includes
    1. ecosystems.
    2. non-human animals.
    3. Both of the above
    4. None of the above\*
15. Which of the following is *not* an advantage of contractarianism?
    1. It explains why it is usually rational to behave morally.
    2. It explains why we have moral obligations to all fellow persons.\*
    3. It explains why we are often bound to obey the law.
    4. It explains why we may sometimes break the law.
16. Which of the following best characterizes the attitude of Hobbes's character “the Fool”?
    1. He does not believe that breaking promises is unjust.
    2. He believes that breaking promises is unjust but doesn't care.\*
    3. He always keeps promises, whether it is in his interest or not.
    4. He believes it is always irrational to break promises.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following best describes the *free*-*rider* *problem*?
   1. Everyone would be better off if everyone refrained from pursuing self-interest.
   2. People can sometimes enjoy common goods without contributing to them.\*
   3. A person who receives welfare from the government thereby loses the incentive to work.
   4. Industrious people always attract others who try to capitalize on their success.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the ultimate point of morality, according to contractarians?
   1. To maximize the well-being of all sentient beings
   2. To ensure that we behave in ways that are consistent and universalizable
   3. To promote self-interest through mutually beneficial agreements\*
   4. To obey God's commands

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the term for the idea that we have agreed to obey the law simply by living where we do?
   1. Explicit consent
   2. Tacit consent\*
   3. *Lex talionis*
   4. Birthright citizenship

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the conclusion of the *consent argument*?
   1. It is always irrational to break the law.
   2. It is sometimes rational to break the law.
   3. Everyone has a duty to obey the law.
   4. Many people do not have a duty to obey the law.\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to contractarianism, what fixes our basic moral duties?
   1. Our actual agreements
   2. Our tacit agreements
   3. The agreements we would make if we were free, rational, and seeking cooperation\*
   4. The principle of utility

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is Rawls's veil of ignorance thought to ensure?
   1. The contractors will always agree among themselves
   2. The agreements of the contractors will be fair
   3. Both of the above\*
   4. None of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following is a problem for the idea of veil of ignorance?
   1. It is unclear why we should follow agreements made by people unlike us.\*
   2. It renders the agreements of the contractors unfair.
   3. It assures that the contractors will disagree among themselves.
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to contractarianism, what motivates the contractors to select the rules they do?
   1. A desire for revenge
   2. Rational self-interest\*
   3. Impartial benevolence
   4. Selfless altruism

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following are members of the moral community, according to contractarianism?
   1. All contractors\*
   2. Non-human animals
   3. The severely mentally retarded
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 15: Ethical Pluralism and Absolute Moral Rules**

*Summary*

All of the ethical theories that have been discussed thus far are *monistic*: Each postulates the existence of a single moral principle that is absolute (i.e., can never be broken) and fundamental (in that there is no more basic rule that justifies it). *Ethical* *pluralism* is a family of views according to which there is more than one fundamental moral rule. This chapter looks at versions of ethical pluralism that regard the fundamental moral rules as absolute. Any such view immediately faces a challenging question: Is it permissible to violate the moral rules if doing so is necessary to prevent a catastrophe, such as the death of thousands of innocent people? Many of us feel that virtually any moral prohibition may be broken if doing so were necessary to avoid a catastrophe. Morality might even require us to sacrifice some innocent lives in order to save even more innocent people.

Absolutists often resist such consequentialist ideas, however, and one common way of doing so is to invoke the Doctrine of Double Effect. This principle states that if one's goal is worthwhile, one is sometimes permitted to act in ways that *foreseeably* cause certain harms, though one must never *intend* to cause those harms. This principle, if it can be defended, would justify a non-consequentialist approach to ethics according to which certain things must never be done, even in order to prevent disasters. One difficulty with the principle, however, is that it is difficult to distinguish foreseen effects from intended effects in any principled way.

Absolutism also faces several other challenges. If there is more than one absolute ethical rule, it seems that there might be cases in which the rules conflict and thereby give contradictory advice. Some consequentialists have argued that it is irrational to believe that moral rules, such as the prohibition on killing innocents, must never be violated. If innocent life is truly valuable, they claim, one should be willing to sacrifice a few innocent people if this is necessary to save a much larger number of innocents. In response, absolutists often insist that it is always worse to do harm than to allow the same harm to occur. Although this often seems plausible in a number of cases, the distinction between doing and allowing can be difficult to draw, and there seem to be some counterexamples to this principle.

*Essay Questions*

1. Write an essay explaining the difference between *monistic* and *pluralistic* approaches to ethics. Give an example of a monistic theory, and explain why it qualifies as monistic. What are the two main types of pluralistic theories? Is ethical pluralism preferable to ethical monism? Defend your answer.
2. Describe the *argument from disaster prevention*, and explain why it is an objection to ethical absolutism. How might an absolutist reply to this argument? Do you find the argument convincing?
3. What is the Doctrine of Double Effect? Describe a case in which the doctrine could be used as a source of moral guidance. Do you think the Doctrine of Double Effect gives good advice in this case? What about in general?
4. Present in detail the consequentialist argument for the conclusion that moral absolutism is irrational. Do you find this argument compelling? Why or why not?
5. What view do absolutists commonly hold about the moral significance of the distinction between *doing* and *allowing*? Describe a case in which their view seems to give the right ethical verdict and another case in which it seems to get things wrong. Do you think the absolutist view of this distinction can be supported? Defend your answer.
6. Explain why the distinction between intention and foresight poses problems for the Doctrine of Double Effect. Develop what you take to be the most plausible account of the distinction. Does your account help the Doctrine of Double Effect avoid the problems? Explain and defend your response.

*Test Bank Questions*

1. Ethical monism is the theory that
   1. there is only one fundamental moral rule, and it is absolute.\*
   2. there is only one fundamental moral rule, and it is not absolute.
   3. morality is objective and not a matter of personal opinion.
   4. morality is subjective and simply a matter of personal opinion.
2. A moral rule is absolute if and only if
   1. it is not explained by some deeper, more basic rule.
   2. it can never permissibly be broken.\*
   3. it is the supreme principle of morality.
   4. All of the above
3. A moral rule is fundamental if and only if
   1. it is not explained by some deeper, more basic rule.\*
   2. it can never permissibly be broken.
   3. it is the supreme principle of morality.
   4. All of the above
4. Ethical pluralism is
   1. the view that there are many different ethical theories, all of which are equally good.
   2. there is no such thing as moral truth.
   3. there is more than one fundamental moral rule.\*
   4. it is not appropriate for one to force one's values on another person.
5. According to the *argument from disaster prevention*
   1. all moral rules are absolute.
   2. every moral rule may be permissibly broken.\*
   3. absolute moral rules may be permissibly broken.
   4. All of the above
6. If every moral rule may permissibly be broken in order to prevent a catastrophe, then
   1. ethical pluralism is true.
   2. ethical pluralism is false.
   3. moral absolutism is true.
   4. moral absolutism is false.\*
7. The Doctrine of Double Effect states that
   1. doing harm is always worse than allowing harm.
   2. it is always wrong to intentionally harm others.
   3. you are sometimes permitted to foreseeably cause certain harms, but you must never intend to cause those harms.\*
   4. All of the above
8. If the Doctrine of Double Effect is true, then
   1. consequentialism is true.
   2. consequentialism is false.\*
   3. ethical pluralism is false.
   4. ethical absolutism is false.
9. Utilitarians and other act consequentialists maintain that two acts with identical results
   1. might have different moral statuses.
   2. must be morally equivalent.\*
   3. are done with the same intention.
   4. are impossible.
10. What is the most serious difficulty with the Doctrine of Double Effect?
    1. It seems to recommend deeply offensive actions in some circumstances.
    2. It ignores the consequences of our actions.
    3. We lack a clear basis for distinguishing between intention and foresight.\*
    4. All of the above
11. If two supposedly absolute moral rules conflict with each other, then
    1. this generates a contradiction, which refutes the claim that both rules are absolute.\*
    2. this generates a contradiction, and one may permissibly break either rule on that occasion.
    3. this shows that ethical pluralism is false.
    4. this shows that ethical absolutism is false.
12. According to the text, what is the moral absolutists’ best response to the *argument from contradiction*?
    1. Deny that theories which generate a contradiction are false.
    2. Maintain that absolute moral rules can be honored entirely through inaction.\*
    3. Deny that conflicting absolute moral rules generate a contradiction.
    4. Maintain that absolute moral rules sometimes have exceptions.
13. According to the *argument from irrationality*, why are absolute moral rules irrational?
    1. Because perfect obedience to any absolute moral rule can sometimes frustrate its underlying purpose\*
    2. Because following absolute moral rules doesn’t require us to appreciate why we’re following them
    3. Because all of the arguments for moral absolutism beg the question
    4. All of the above
14. The Doctrine of Doing and Allowingclaims that
    1. if one is morally permitted to allow a harm, then one is permitted to cause that harm directly.
    2. if one is not morally permitted to do a harm, one is not permitted to allow that harm.
    3. it is always morally worse to allow harm than to do the same harm.
    4. it is always morally worse to do harm than to allow the same harm to occur.\*
15. One problem for the Doctrine of Doing and Allowing is that
    1. it sometimes seems worse to do harm than to allow harm.
    2. it seems as though it is not always permissible to allow certain harms.
    3. it is sometimes very difficult to determine whether something counts as doing or allowing.\*
    4. All of the above
16. Ethical egoism, utilitarianism, and contractarianism all fall into what family of theories?
    1. Consequentialism
    2. Hedonism
    3. Ethical pluralism
    4. Ethical monism\*
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1. What is the term for an ethical rule that may never permissibly be broken?
   1. A fundamental rule
   2. A monistic rule
   3. An absolute rule\*
   4. A pluralistic rule

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What does it mean to say that an ethical rule is *fundamental*?
   1. It may never permissibly be broken.
   2. Every other moral rule is derived from it.
   3. It is not explained by some deeper, more basic rule.\*
   4. All of the above
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1. Which of the following would an ethical pluralist *not* accept?
   1. In questions of morality, there are no truths.\*
   2. There is no single supreme principle of morality.
   3. There is more than one fundamental moral rule.
   4. Utilitarianism and ethical egoism are both false.
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1. What is the *argument from disaster prevention* supposed to show?
   1. There are no absolute moral rules.\*
   2. There are no fundamental moral rules.
   3. Ethical pluralism is true.
   4. Ethical pluralism is false.
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1. What is the term for the view that we are sometimes permitted to act in ways that *foreseeably* cause certain harms, even though we are never permitted to *intend* those harms?
   1. The Doctrine of Doing and Allowing
   2. Ethical pluralism
   3. The Doctrine of Double Effect\*
   4. The Intentionality Doctrine
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1. Suppose someone could show that any two moral rules are bound to conflict at some point. What would this show?
   1. Ethical pluralism is false.
   2. Ethical absolutism is false.
   3. There can be, at most, only one absolute moral rule.\*
   4. Consequentialism is true.
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1. In what sense is ethical absolutism sometimes thought to be irrational?
   1. Adherence to absolute rules can frustrate the underlying purpose of the rules.\*
   2. There is no evidence for the existence of objective moral rules.
   3. Ethical absolutism requires assuming that one's views are right and that everyone else is wrong.
   4. All of the above
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1. Which of the following claims states the Doctrine of Doing and Allowing?
   1. It is never permissible to do harm but sometimes permissible to allow harm.
   2. It is always morally worse to do harm than to allow the same harm to occur.\*
   3. It is never permissible to allow harm but sometimes permissible to do harm.
   4. It is always morally worse to allow harm than to do the same harm.
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1. According to the text, which of the following is a problem for the Doctrine of Doing and Allowing?
   1. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish doings from allowings.
   2. There seem to be cases in which allowing a harm is as bad as doing it.
   3. The results of some thought experiments seem to conflict with it.
   4. All of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 16: Ethical Pluralism: Prima Facie Duties and Ethical Particularism**

*Summary*

Every ethical theory examined thus far has been absolutist. This chapter examines two approaches to ethics that reject absolutism, the first of which is W. D. Ross's ethic of primafacieduties. A *prima* *facie* *duty* is defined as an excellent, non-absolute, permanent reason to do (or refrain from) something. Ross believed that we have many such prima facie duties and that each of them is fundamental, although any one can be overridden by competing reasons on a particular occasion. On Ross's view, there is more than one thing that has fundamental moral importance, and this explains why we are sometimes permitted to break moral rules. It also provides an explanation of the phenomenon of moral conflict and of why we feel regret even in cases where we don't think that we've done anything wrong.

Despite its advantages, though, Ross’s view suffers from some significant drawbacks. First and most obviously, it’s not clear, on his view, how we are supposed to know what our prima facie duties are. Ross insists that they’re self-evident—anyone with adequate understanding of them is justified in believing them. Whether there are self-evident moral claims is controversial. And whether Ross has identified the correct duties is even more controversial. But even if he’s right about our prima facie duties, we still lack a story about what to do when our prima facie duties *conflict*. Ross is forced to concede that, in such cases, there is no definite method for determining what to do. And so, when our duties conflict, we can never be certain about what is the right thing to do.

An even more radical approach to ethics, known as *ethical particularism*, rejects both absolutism *and* the notion that there are any prima facie duties. According to ethical particularism, whether a feature of a situation is morally relevant or not depends entirely on context. The primary challenge for particularism is that some things, such as justice, do seem to have at least some moral importance in all situations.

*Essay Questions*

1. Write an essay describing the central features of Ross's ethic of prima facie duties. Define the notion of a prima facie duty, and explain how a moral theory based on prima facie duties differs from monistic and absolutist moral theories.
2. What do you think is the biggest attraction of Ross's view? Explain why Ross's view has this attraction and why some competing ethical theories do not. Is this a sufficient reason to accept Ross's theory or not?
3. How does Ross claim that we come to have moral knowledge? Why might someone find such a view unsatisfying? How serious of a problem do you think this is for Ross's view?
4. According to Ross, how can we come to know the fundamental moral rules? Do you think that this is a legitimate way to come to know moral truths? If so, explain why. If not, explain a more viable alternative.
5. According to Ross, what should we do when our prima facie duties conflict? Do you think that this is a serious problem for his view? Why or why not?
6. What is ethical particularism? Define the theory, and explain how it differs from other ethical views. What is the biggest problem for ethical particularism? How might an ethical particularist respond to this problem?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. Ross's ethic of prima facie duties is a version of
   1. ethical absolutism.
   2. ethical monism.
   3. ethical particularism.
   4. ethical pluralism.\*
2. A *prima facie duty* is
   1. a moral reason to do or abstain from something.
   2. a consideration that can be overridden by other considerations.
   3. not really a duty.
   4. All of the above\*
3. Which of the following is *not* a prima facie duty identified by Ross?
   1. Nonmaleficence
   2. Beneficence
   3. Chastity\*
   4. Reparations
4. Which of the following correctly describes the relationship between absolutism and Ross's theory?
   1. Ross's theory is a version of absolutism.
   2. Ross's theory is neutral as to whether absolutism is true.
   3. Ross's theory faces the same problems as absolutism, including contradiction and irrationality.
   4. Ross's theory avoids the main problems facing absolutism, such as contradiction and irrationality.\*
5. According to Ross, the fact that we appropriately regret something is a test for knowing
   1. when we have acted wrongly.
   2. what our prima facie duties are\*.
   3. when we are being emotional.
   4. what to do when our duties conflict.
6. If Ross's theory is true, then
   1. it is never permissible to break any moral rule.
   2. some moral rules may never permissibly be broken, but others may be.
   3. any moral rule may sometimes permissibly be broken.\*
   4. there are no moral rules.
7. Which of the following is not identified by the text as an advantage of Ross’s view?
   1. It makes sense of why we experience moral conflict.
   2. It explains why we feel moral regret.
   3. It accommodates our sense that there is more than just a single fundamental moral consideration.
   4. It explains why moral rules may never acceptably be broken.\*
8. Which of the following arguments against absolutism is also a threat to Ross’s view?
   1. The *argument from contradiction*
   2. The *argument from disaster prevention*
   3. The *argument from irrationality*
   4. None of the above\*
9. According to Ross's theory,
   1. moral rules tell us exactly how we should behave in all situations.
   2. it is self-evident how we ought to behave in certain situations.
   3. there is no mechanical way to determine how we ought to behave.\*
   4. there is no truth about how we ought to behave.
10. Why does Ross reject consequentialism?
    1. Because consequences are not morally important
    2. Because there are no absolute moral rules
    3. Because consequentialism conflicts with our deepest beliefs about what is truly morally important\*
    4. All of the above
11. According to Ross’s theory, in order to know what to do when prima facie duties conflict, we must
    1. appeal to more fundamental moral principles.
    2. ask ourselves what a virtuous person would do.
    3. bring our experience and insight to bear on the case.\*
    4. think about a world in which everyone acted in the way we’re considering.
12. Ethical particularists reject
    1. ethical monism.
    2. ethical absolutism.
    3. the existence of prima facie duties.
    4. All of the above\*
13. According to particularism,
    1. there are no moral rules.\*
    2. there are no moral duties.
    3. moral rules only apply in particular situations.
    4. Both a and b
14. Particularists claim that justice is
    1. always the most important moral consideration.
    2. always an important moral consideration, though not always the most important one.
    3. sometimes an important moral consideration and sometimes not.\*
    4. never an important moral consideration.
15. If particularism is true, then
    1. nothing possesses permanent moral importance.\*
    2. many different things possess permanent moral importance.
    3. there are many true moral rules, but none of them is absolute.
    4. there are many absolute moral rules.
16. What is a prima facie duty?
    1. A permanent, non-absolute reason to do something\*
    2. Something that appears to be a duty but might not actually be morally relevant
    3. An absolute moral principle that coexists with other absolute principles
    4. A legal obligation to fulfill one's contracts
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1. Which of the following claims would Ross accept?
   1. The morality of an action is always determined by its consequences.
   2. There is a supreme principle of morality.
   3. There are several absolute moral rules.
   4. Justice is always an important moral consideration.\*
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1. Which of the following is *not* included on Ross's list of prima facie duties?
   1. Gratitude
   2. Justice
   3. Self-improvement
   4. Promotion of beauty\*
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1. According to Ross's theory, regret
   1. is always irrational.
   2. is evidence that something of value has been sacrificed.\*
   3. is appropriate only when one has behaved immorally.
   4. is a prima facie duty.
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1. Which of the following does Ross's theory explain?
   1. Why what is good for us is up to us
   2. Why we sometimes experience moral conflict\*
   3. Why there are many different kinds of good life
   4. Why some moral rules may never be broken
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1. What did Ross think is the relationship between justice and well-being?
   1. Behaving justly is always more important than promoting well-being.
   2. Promoting well-being is always more important than behaving justly.
   3. Sometimes behaving justly is more important than promoting well-being and sometimes not.\*
   4. The demands of justice will never conflict with promoting well-being.
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1. How does Ross think we can know our prima facie duties?
   1. By deducing them from other moral principles
   2. They are self-evident.\*
   3. Through a process of circular reasoning
   4. None of the above—Ross did not think we could know our prima facie duties.
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1. How does Ross think we can know what the right thing to do is when our prima facie duties conflict?
   1. By deducing it from other moral principles
   2. It is self-evident.
   3. Through a process of circular reasoning
   4. None of the above—Ross did not think there was a definite method for determining right action in such cases.\*
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1. Which of the following would ethical particularists accept?
   1. There is a supreme principle of morality.
   2. There is sometimes a fact of the matter about what we ought to do.\*
   3. There are some true moral rules, but they all have exceptions.
   4. All of the above
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1. According to the text, what is the most serious problem for ethical particularism?
   1. It lacks unity.
   2. It lacks an account of moral knowledge.
   3. Some things seem to possess moral importance.\*
   4. It falsely claims that some moral rules are exceptionless.
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**Chapter 17: Virtue Ethics**

*Summary*

The ethical theories discussed until this point have dealt primarily with the question of which actions are morally right. *Virtue ethics*, an ethical tradition that traces its roots to Aristotle, approaches ethics from a different starting point by asking what kind of person one should strive to be. According to virtue ethics, an act is morally right just because it is the one that a virtuous person, acting in character, would do in that situation. Virtue ethics is a form of ethical pluralism because it endorses a number of ethical rules, one corresponding to each of the virtues. Such rules tell us to be honest, display courage, and so on. If virtue ethics is true, there is no simple method for determining what we ought to do; knowing the right thing to do often requires emotional maturity and the kind of moral understanding that can be gained only by experience and training. This is in part because virtues are complex character traits that influence a person's perceptions, thoughts, and motives as well as his behavior. To be truly virtuous, a person must not only understand that an action is right but also be motivated to do it, without reluctance, for the right reasons. To possess such a character, virtue ethicists claim, is essential if one is to have a good life.

Virtue ethics faces a number of objections. One common criticism is that virtue ethics fails to provide adequate guidance when it comes to deciding how to behave in particular situations or deciding which people should serve as role models. Others charge that by asking us to behave as a perfectly virtuous person would, virtue ethics demands too much of us. Still others complain that virtue ethics doesn't tell us how we should behave in situations in which different virtuous people would behave differently. None of these is a knock-down criticism of the theory, but each points to areas in which virtue ethicists have more work to do. One final criticism is more serious, however. According to virtue ethics, actions are right *because* virtuous people would perform them. This seems to get the order of explanation backward. If virtuous people have reasons for behaving as they do, it seems natural to say that these reasons, not the virtuous person's actions, are what make actions right. To concede this, though, is to give up on the virtue ethicist's account of right action.

*Essay Questions*

1. What aspects of morality do virtue ethicists accuse other ethical theories of ignoring? How does virtue ethics address these aspects of morality? Does this make virtue ethics superior to other ethical theories? Defend your answer.
2. What is a virtue? How are virtues acquired? Do you agree with Aristotle's claim that virtue is essential to the good life? Why or why not?
3. How do we come to have moral knowledge, according to virtue ethics? In what ways does this account of moral knowledge differ from the accounts given by previous theories? Which do you think is better, and why?
4. Some have claimed the virtue ethics is too demanding. Why might someone think this? How serious of an objection is this to the theory? How do you think a virtue ethicist would reply to this claim?
5. Write an essay explaining the *priority problem* for virtue ethics. How is this problem similar to a common objection to the Divine Command Theory? Does the objection succeed in refuting virtue ethics? Defend your answer.
6. Explain the *Argument from Tragic Dilemmas*. How do you think a virtue ethicists should respond to this objection? Do you find this response satisfying? Why or why not?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. According to virtue ethics, the fundamental moral question is:
   1. What kinds of things are intrinsically good?
   2. What kind of person should I be?\*
   3. What is the right thing to do?
   4. What would benefit me most?
2. In the West, virtue ethics traces its origins back to
   1. Aristotle.\*
   2. Immanuel Kant.
   3. John Stuart Mill.
   4. W. D. Ross.
3. According to virtue ethics, actions are right just because
   1. there are good reasons to perform them.
   2. they would be performed by a virtuous person.\*
   3. they benefit everyone and harm no one.
   4. All of the above
4. Virtue ethics is a form of
   1. consequentialism.
   2. ethical absolutism.
   3. ethical pluralism.\*
   4. None of the above
5. According to virtue ethics, the simple formula for right action is:
   1. Act so as to maximize well-being.
   2. Treat others as you want them to treat you.
   3. Do what you think is best.
   4. None of the above—there is no simple formula.\*
6. According to virtue ethics, moral understanding is a species of
   1. theoretical knowledge.
   2. practical wisdom.\*
   3. unreflective opinion.
   4. None of the above—moral understanding is impossible.
7. According to virtue ethics, emotions
   1. tend to make us violate our duties.
   2. are irrelevant to morality.
   3. would be entirely absent from a virtuous person.
   4. play a crucial role in moral understanding.\*
8. Aristotle believed that virtue
   1. is inborn.
   2. must be acquired through training.\*
   3. is guaranteed to make us happy.
   4. Both b and c
9. According to Aristotle, the ultimate good is
   1. pleasure.
   2. virtue.
   3. eudaimonia.\*
   4. continence.
10. According to the text, the best way for the virtue ethicist to reply to the *argument from tragic dilemmas* is to maintain that
    1. tragic dilemmas are impossible.
    2. a virtuous person never faces tragic dilemmas.
    3. in some extraordinary circumstances, normally vicious actions are virtuous.\*
    4. it is sometimes morally permissible to not act virtuously.
11. One common objection to virtue ethics is that
    1. it is too demanding.
    2. it does not give adequate guidance about what we should do.
    3. it does not provide a way of determining who our role models should be.
    4. All of the above\*
12. According to virtue ethics, how do we become more insightful in selecting moral exemplars?
    1. By becoming morally wiser\*
    2. By observing who others select as moral exemplars
    3. By growing older
    4. Through trial and error
13. Why is the contradiction problem a threat to virtue ethics?
    1. Because people disagree about who is virtuous and who isn’t
    2. Because vicious people sometimes act virtuously
    3. Because different virtuous people might act differently in the same situation\*
    4. Because different virtues imply different duties
14. According to virtue ethics,
    1. the concept of duty is defined in terms of the concept of virtue.\*
    2. the concept of virtue is defined in terms of the concept of duty.
    3. the concepts of duty and virtue are completely independent.
    4. there is no such thing as duty.
15. The priority problem is a problem
    1. that is shared by virtue ethics and the Divine Command Theory.\*
    2. that is unique to virtue ethics.
    3. that is shared by all ethical theories.
    4. for other ethical theories but not for virtue ethics.
16. What notion should be at the heart of ethical theory, according to virtue ethics?
    1. Duty
    2. Intrinsic value
    3. Moral character\*
    4. Pleasure

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the relationship between duty and virtue, according to virtue ethics?
   1. Duty is defined as what a virtuous person would do.\*
   2. Virtue is defined as a character trait that leads us to do our duty.
   3. The two concepts are independent of one another.
   4. If one does one's duty, virtue is unnecessary.
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1. What is a *moral* *exemplar*?
   1. A non-absolute moral rule
   2. A person who serves as a role model\*
   3. A situation that illustrates the consequences of a moral principle
   4. A person to whom the moral rules do not apply
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1. Which of the following does virtue ethics have a hard time explaining?
   1. Moral complexity
   2. Moral education
   3. The role of emotions in morality
   4. How we can know who our role models should be\*
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1. What does moral understanding require, according to virtue ethics?
   1. The application of absolute rules to particular cases
   2. Calculation about the effects of one's actions
   3. An exceptional amount of intelligence
   4. Emotional maturity\*
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1. How did Aristotle think that virtue could be acquired?
   1. It is inborn.
   2. One must have a conversion experience in which one experiences the good directly.
   3. Virtue is acquired through education and training.\*
   4. It is impossible to become virtuous.
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1. How do virtuous people differ from vicious people?
   1. In their behavior
   2. In their thoughts
   3. In their perceptions
   4. All of the above\*
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1. What do people seek above all else, according to Aristotle?
   1. Eudaimonia\*
   2. Ataraxia
   3. Pleasure
   4. Power
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1. What is a *tragic* *dilemma*?
   1. A situation in which one has two options, only one of which will have a good outcome
   2. A situation in which a good person's life will be ruined, no matter what she does\*
   3. A situation in which one must choose between self-interest and morality
   4. A situation in which it is impossible to behave morally
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1. Which of the following is a statement of the *priority problem*?
   1. Virtue ethics wrongly defines duty in terms of virtue instead of vice versa.\*
   2. A person can be virtuous without having all her priorities straight.
   3. The consequences of an action sometimes have priority over one's intentions.
   4. Virtue ethics lacks a way of ranking moral principles in terms of importance.
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**Chapter 18: Feminist Ethics**

*Summary*

Many of the great philosophers of the Western tradition have made false and damaging claims about women while simultaneously disregarding female experiences and perspectives. Feminist ethics is a general approach that seeks to remedy these flaws by affirming the moral equality of women and the value of their experiences. Starting with the work of psychologist Carol Gilligan, many feminists have argued that women have distinctive ways of thinking about morality that have been unfairly regarded as inferior to those of men. Feminists ethicists also emphasize the importance of taking into account the distinctive experiences that have often characterized women's lives, including vulnerability to rape and domestic violence, economic dependence on men, and responsibility for acting as primary care-givers to children and the elderly. The focus on care, in particular, has given rise to a distinctive ethical theory rooted in the feminist tradition.

The ethics of care takes a loving mother's care for her children as a model for all moral behavior. In contrast to traditional ethical theories such as utilitarianism or contractarianism, such a theory emphasizes the role of emotion in ethical behavior. Feminist ethicists who stress the importance of care deny that our moral duties can be summarized in one simple rule and reject the abstraction and impartiality that have traditionally characterized moral theory. Instead, they argue that morality often requires being sensitive to the particular features of our circumstances and giving special consideration to those about whom we care. Furthermore, feminist ethicists stress the importance of cooperation and downplay the importance of rights, focusing instead on our responsibilities to one another.

Feminist ethics faces several challenges. Because emotions can sometimes distort our judgments rather than improving them, feminist ethicists need a more developed account of which emotions play a legitimate role in moral theorizing. The ideals of justice, individual rights, and impartiality do seem to have moral significance, and any defensible ethical theory must account for this. Despite the feminist emphasis on cooperation, competition need not always be a negative thing. Finally, any approach that emphasizes sensitivity to particular situations must provide some account of how we can come to know what the right thing to do is. To be plausible, feminist approaches to ethics must address these difficulties.

*Essay Questions*

1. In what ways have Western philosophers traditionally marginalized and shown disrespect for women? How does feminist ethics seek to address this problem?
2. What are some of the distinctive experiences of women, and how have feminist ethicists suggested that these should inform our moral theorizing? Do you think they are correct in thinking this?
3. Compare and contrast the ethics of care with one of the ethical theories discussed previously. What advantages do you think the ethics of care has over the alternative theory you've chosen? In what ways is the other theory preferable? Which do you think is ultimately more satisfactory, and why?
4. Write an essay discussing the ethical value of *impartiality*. Why do feminists downplay the importance of impartiality, and why have other philosophers held it to be important? Is impartiality an important ethical value or not?
5. Write an essay discussing the ethical concept of *rights*. What role has this concept traditionally played, and why do feminists think that it has been overemphasized? Do you agree with the feminist critique? Why or why not?
6. What role do emotions play in feminist ethics? How does this differ from the way that emotions are regarded by other ethical theories? Do emotions play an essential role in morality? Defend your answer.

*Test Bank Questions*

1. Throughout most of history, Western philosophers have often
   1. made false and damaging claims about women.
   2. ignored female perspectives on ethical issues.
   3. discounted the philosophical interest of women's experiences.
   4. All of the above\*
2. Feminist ethics claims that
   1. men and women should always be treated the same.
   2. the experiences of women are vital to a full understanding of morality.\*
   3. there are no innate differences between men and women.
   4. All of the above
3. Carol Gilligan claimed that
   1. women tend to respond to moral conflict differently from men.\*
   2. women are innately more compassionate than men.
   3. all women share a common approach to morality.
   4. men tend to be more morally developed than women.
4. Carol Gilligan noted that many women never advance beyond which of Lawrence Kohlberg’s stages of moral development?
   1. The stage of seeing moral rules as potential threats
   2. The stage of viewing morality as dependent upon our social roles and relations\*
   3. The stage of viewing morality as a tool for maintaining social order
   4. The stage of viewing morality as requiring obedience to abstract rules of justice
5. Which feature of the moral life is highlighted by feminist ethics?
   1. The importance of vulnerability
   2. The importance of not having control over important aspects of one’s life
   3. The importance of dependence and connectedness to others
   4. All of the above\*
6. Feminists often claim that moral theories have traditionally given too much value to
   1. human dignity.
   2. compassion.
   3. autonomy.\*
   4. pleasure.
7. The moral theory that takes the mother/child relationship as a basis for ethics is known as
   1. the ethic of care.\*
   2. ethical pluralism.
   3. the ethic of procreation.
   4. maternalism.
8. According to feminist ethics, an action is right if and only if
   1. it treats men and women equally.
   2. it does not violate anyone's rights.
   3. it is performed out of a motive of care.
   4. None of the above\*
9. According to feminist ethics, emotions
   1. are central to moral motivation and moral discovery.\*
   2. motivate us to act morally but do not help us to discover how we should act.
   3. usually distort our views about morality in negative ways.
   4. are irrelevant to morality.
10. Feminist ethicists tend to think that our behavior should be based on
    1. an impartial consideration of the interests of all those who are affected.
    2. the application of absolute ethical rules.
    3. a sensitive appreciation of the complexities of a situation.\*
    4. All of the above
11. Feminist ethicists argue that traditional moral theories have overemphasized \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ at the expense of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_.
    1. competition; cooperation
    2. calculation; emotion
    3. impartiality; special relationships
    4. All of the above\*
12. Many feminists believe that rights
    1. are not emphasized enough in ethical theory.
    2. are overly emphasized in ethical theory.\*
    3. are the key to understanding morality.
    4. Both a and c
13. Which of the following is a potential problem for the ethics of care?
    1. It is too demanding.
    2. It cannot account for the special obligations we have to our family and friends.
    3. It makes acting morally too easy.
    4. It threatens to restrict the scope of the moral community too greatly.\*
14. According to the text, what is one potential cost to downgrading the moral importance of impartiality?
    1. Without impartiality, we have no moral duties to strangers.
    2. Impartiality is an important corrective for prejudice and bias.\*
    3. Without impartiality we can’t account for self-regarding duties.
    4. None of the above—there is no obvious cost.
15. One challenge for feminist ethics is that
    1. some moral rules have exceptions.
    2. it does not give concrete guidance about how to resolve moral conflicts.\*
    3. sometimes it is appropriate to treat men and women differently.
    4. partiality is sometimes justified.
16. Which of the following philosophers believed that women are the moral equals of men?
    1. Aristotle
    2. St. Thomas Aquinas
    3. Rousseau
    4. None of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following best describes feminist ethics?
   1. It is a particular ethical theory.
   2. It is a family of ethical theories.\*
   3. It is an account of what rights people have.
   4. It is a psychological theory about gender difference.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to the text, which author allowed feminist ethics to “come into its own”?
   1. John Stuart Mill
   2. Susan B. Anthony
   3. Carol Gilligan\*
   4. Elizabeth Cady Stanton

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which claim did Carol Gilligan argue for in *In a Different Voice*?
   1. Women's psychologies are innately different than men's.\*
   2. Women tend to react to moral conflict differently from men.
   3. All women share a common moral outlook.
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What relationship plays a central role in the ethics of care?
   1. Mother/child\*
   2. Wife/husband
   3. Sister/brother
   4. Friendship between females

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following carries great moral value, according to the ethics of care?
   1. Competition
   2. Abstraction
   3. Partiality\*
   4. Reason

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to the text, what attitude do many feminists take toward rights?
   1. They have been insufficiently emphasized in moral philosophy.
   2. They have been overly emphasized in moral philosophy.\*
   3. Claiming rights unites people more often than it divides them.
   4. Both a and c

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following is the supreme principle of morality, according to feminist ethics?
   1. An action is right if and only if it maximizes utility.
   2. An action is right if and only if it shows care for others.
   3. An action is right if and only if it doesn't involve gender discrimination.
   4. None of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. How do feminists claim we can come to have moral knowledge?
   1. By impartially considering interests
   2. By rationally calculating what would be most beneficial to oneself
   3. By reliably applying moral rules
   4. By sensitively considering the particular circumstances\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to the text, which of the following is *not* a challenge for feminist ethics?
   1. Partiality is sometimes permissible.\*
   2. The theory threatens to restrict the scope of the moral community too greatly.
   3. Justice is an important moral value.
   4. Competition is sometimes valuable.

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 19: Ethical Relativism**

*Summary*

Ethical objectivism is the view that some moral standards are *objectively* *correct*—they apply to everyone even if people don't believe they do and even if obeying them fails to satisfy anyone's desires. The denial of ethical objectivism, often known as *moral* *skepticism*, comes in two basic forms: moral nihilism and ethical relativism. This chapter discusses ethical relativism, which itself comes in two varieties. The first is *ethical* *subjectivism*, the theory that an act is morally right just because I approve of it or my commitments allow it. The second theory, *cultural* *relativism*, states that acts are right just because they are allowed by the guiding ideals of the society in which they are performed. Despite their differences, both views agree that morality is a human creation and that the moral standards of one person (or group) are no better or worse than the moral standards of any other person (or group). Advocates are usually attracted to ethical relativism for some combination of the following reasons: 1) ethical relativism explains why morality is *for humans*; 2) ethical relativism is scientifically respectable; 3) ethical relativism easily explains the possibility of moral knowledge; and 4) ethical relativism is egalitarian in a certain respect.

Despite its attractions, ethical relativism has a number of problematic implications. Ethical relativists hold that morality is determined by personal or cultural opinion, which means that no individual's or group's basic opinions about morality can possibly be mistaken. Questioning one's own deepest ideals, or the ideals of one's society, is senseless on these views because such ideals are always by definition correct, rendering moral progress impossible. Furthermore, both subjectivism and cultural relativism seem to lead to contradictions because they say that the very same actions might be right (if one person or society approves) and wrong (if another disapproves). The theories can dodge this problem, but only at the cost of making all moral claims nothing more than reports of personal or cultural approval, thus making genuine moral disagreement impossible.

One strategy designed to solve these problems is to claim that the right action is the one that you *would* favor if you were fully informed and rational. Invoking *ideal* *observers* solves many of the problems of ethical relativism but raises a new problem of what to do in cases in which ideal observers would disagree. Such a view also faces the priority problem discussed earlier in the contexts of the Divine Command Theory and virtue ethics: It seems most plausible to say that ideal observers would approve of the appropriate things *because* such things are good; the ideal observers' approval does not *make* them good. To admit this, however, is to abandon ethical relativism.

*Essay Questions*

1. What does it mean to say that an ethical standard is objective? In what ways do ethical relativists deny the objectivity of ethics, and why do you think they do so? Is morality objective? Defend your answer.
2. Explain the advantages of ethical relativism. Do you think that these really are advantages? Do they give us good reason to favor ethical relativism over objectivist theories? Explain and defend your response.
3. Write an essay comparing and contrasting the theories of cultural relativism and individual subjectivism. Is one of these theories more plausible than the other? Does either one provide a plausible account of morality?
4. What is moral progress? Why is moral progress impossible if ethical relativism is true? How serious of a problem is this for the theory?
5. Do relativism and subjectivism generate contradictions? Why might someone accuse the theories of doing so? How could a relativist or subjectivist respond?
6. Define the notion of an *ideal observer*, and explain the role that ideal observers could play in a modified version of subjectivism. How does invoking ideal observers solve some of the traditional problems for subjectivism? What new problems do ideal observer theories face?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. Objective moral standards are
   1. those that all moral theories agree upon.
   2. those that apply to everyone, regardless of what they believe.\*
   3. those that are knowable to all.
   4. All of the above
2. Moral skepticism is
   1. the view that there are no objective moral standards.\*
   2. the denial that our culture's moral code is correct.
   3. the denial that our individual moral beliefs are always correct.
   4. the view that the same moral standards apply to everyone.
3. Moral nihilists believe that
   1. all moral truths are relative to a culture.
   2. all moral truths are relative to an individual.
   3. there are moral truths, but we cannot know them.
   4. there are no moral truths.\*
4. All ethical relativists agree that
   1. there are no moral truths.
   2. moral truths are determined by individuals.
   3. moral truths are determined by society.
   4. None of the above\*
5. Someone is a cultural relativist if he or she believes that
   1. different cultures have different moral codes.
   2. the moral code of a society is a fallible guide to our moral obligations.
   3. the guiding ideals of a society determine what is right or wrong.\*
   4. our culture's basic moral code is worse than those of at least some other cultures.
6. According to ethical subjectivism, whether an act is right or wrong is determined by
   1. the consequences of the action.
   2. personal approval.\*
   3. cultural approval.
   4. All of the above
7. According to ethical subjectivism, what is intrinsically valuable?
   1. Whatever you think is intrinsically valuable
   2. Whatever society thinks is intrinsically valuable
   3. Your own opinions
   4. Nothing\*
8. If ethical subjectivism is true, then one's deepest moral commitments are
   1. always right.\*
   2. sometimes right and sometimes wrong, depending on the person.
   3. usually wrong.
   4. always wrong.
9. According to ethical subjectivism, questioning whether your moral commitments are right is
   1. impossible.
   2. nonsensical.\*
   3. important.
   4. inconsequential.
10. If cultural relativism is true, then the moral values of our culture are
    1. superior to the values of other cultures.
    2. inferior to the values of other cultures.
    3. the exact same values that all other cultures have.
    4. no better or worse than the moral values of other cultures.\*
11. According to ethical subjectivism,
    1. things are good simply because we like them.\*
    2. we often like things because they are good.
    3. whether something is good is independent of whether we like it.
    4. there are no truths about what is good.
12. If cultural relativism is true, then
    1. cultures can make moral progress, but individuals cannot.
    2. individuals can make moral progress, but cultures cannot.\*
    3. both individuals and cultures can make moral progress.
    4. neither individuals nor cultures can make moral progress.
13. If ethical subjectivism does not generate contradictions, then moral disagreement
    1. is widespread.
    2. is rare.
    3. is impossible.\*
    4. is immoral.
14. The problem of contradiction applies to
    1. ethical subjectivism.
    2. cultural relativism.
    3. Both of the above\*
    4. None of the above
15. According to *ideal observer* subjectivism, an action is morally right if
    1. I approve of it.
    2. a third party would approve of it.
    3. everyone approves of it.
    4. I would approve of it if I were fully informed and perfectly rational.\*
16. Which of the following would the ethical objectivist accept?
    1. Morality is determined by the guiding ideals of a society.
    2. Morality is determined by personal opinion.
    3. There are no moral truths at all.
    4. None of the above\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following would a cultural relativist accept?
   1. Morality is determined by the guiding ideals of a society.\*
   2. Morality is determined by personal opinion.
   3. There are no moral truths at all.
   4. None of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following is *not* a version of moral skepticism?
   1. Moral nihilism
   2. Ethical objectivism\*
   3. Ethical subjectivism
   4. Cultural relativism

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following would a cultural relativist *not* accept?
   1. Different societies have different moral codes.
   2. Individuals can be mistaken about what is morally required of them.
   3. Some societies have better moral codes than others.\*
   4. There are no objective moral standards.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What does cultural relativism imply about *iconoclasts* who oppose the conventional moral wisdom of a society?
   1. They are always a source of moral progress.
   2. They are always morally mistaken.\*
   3. They can be morally correct but are often morally mistaken.
   4. They are impossible.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to ethical subjectivism, what is the relationship between a thing being good and someone approving of it?
   1. The only reason people approve of things is because those things are good.
   2. Whether something is good is independent of whether anyone approves of it.
   3. Good people approve of good things, whereas bad people approve of bad things.
   4. Things are good only because people approve of them.\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. If cultural relativism is true, what happens when the moral code of a society changes?
   1. Such changes always indicate moral progress.
   2. Such changes only rarely indicate moral progress.
   3. Such changes never indicate moral progress.\*
   4. It is impossible for a society's moral code to change, according to cultural relativism.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. If I say, “The death penalty is immoral,” what does this mean, according to ethical subjectivism?
   1. The death penalty is objectively morally wrong.
   2. My society disapproves of the death penalty.
   3. I disapprove of the death penalty.\*
   4. This claim is meaningless, according to ethical subjectivism.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is an *ideal observer*?
   1. A fair third party who negotiates disputes
   2. An improved version of oneself who is fully informed and perfectly rational\*
   3. Someone who comes to moral verdicts by using thought experiments
   4. None of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to the text, what is the most serious problem for ideal observer subjectivism?
   1. Ideal observers would approve of things because they were good and not vice versa.\*
   2. It cannot account for moral disagreement.
   3. It makes moral progress impossible.
   4. It makes questioning one's own commitments pointless.

*Appears on the student website.*

**Chapter 20: Moral Nihilism**

*Summary*

As we saw last chapter, one way of denying the objectivity of ethics is to claim that ethics is somehow relative, either to personal opinion or to cultural norms. A more radical option, *moral nihilism*, denies that there are any moral standards or moral facts at all. Nihilists claim that there is a sharp distinction between facts and values and that although facts really exist, values do not. Moral nihilism comes in two important forms: the error theory and expressivism. According to the error theory, there are no moral features in the world, and because our moral judgments are attempts to describe the moral features of things, these judgments are always false. Error theorists claim that all moral views are based on a mistaken assumption: that there are objective moral standards that give us reasons for action regardless of our desires. Some have argued against the error theory on the grounds that its widespread acceptance would be a disaster. This is a mistake, however, because the consequences of everyone accepting a theory do not provide evidence of the theory's truth or falsity. Whether the error theory is true depends on (a) whether morality really does essentially involve the assumptions that it is objective and provides us with categorical reasons and (b) whether these assumptions are true.

Expressivists agree with error theorists that there are no moral features in the world and thus that no moral claims can be true. According to expressivism, however, moral judgments are not attempts to describe the moral features of things but instead express our attitudes and emotions. By portraying the aim of moral discourse as something other than stating facts, expressivists can deny that there are any moral facts while refraining from charging our moral practice with a serious error. The theory also manages to avoid some of the challenges facing relativism and subjectivism. Expressivism does encounter several problems, however. It has a hard time explaining the possibility of moral argument, because it denies that moral claims can be true. The theory also cannot allow for the possibility of amoralists—people who make moral judgments but are not motivated by them. Furthermore, it is not clear how expressivists would even understand what people are saying when they make more complicated moral claims, or claims about moral knowledge.

*Essay Questions*

1. Write an essay comparing and contrasting ethical relativism and moral nihilism. Explain why someone might be attracted to each of these views. Is one of these theories preferable to the other? Defend your answer.
2. What assumption do error theorists claim is at the heart of morality? Do you agree that this assumption is crucial to morality? Do you think the assumption is true?
3. Why doesn't the error theory count as a moral theory? What kind of a theory is it? Why can't such theories be tested by appealing to the results of people accepting them?
4. Describe the expressivist account of moral language, and explain how it differs from the views of ethical objectivists, relativists, and nihilists. What are the advantages of this account? What are the disadvantages?
5. What is it for an argument to be logically valid? Why is expressivist inconsistent with the possibility of valid moral arguments? How serious of a problem do you think this is for the theory?
6. Write an essay comparing and contrasting error theory and expressivism. Which account do you think is more plausible? Explain and defend your response.

*Test Bank Questions*

1. According to moral nihilism, whether an action is morally right is
   1. relative to a culture.
   2. relative to individual opinion.
   3. objective.
   4. None of the above\*
2. Moral nihilists believe that
   1. facts exist but values do not.\*
   2. values exist but facts do not.
   3. both facts and values exist.
   4. neither facts nor values exist.
3. The two main types of moral nihilism are
   1. expressivism and the error theory.\*
   2. relativism and subjectivism.
   3. monism and pluralism.
   4. skepticism and dogmatism.
4. Both error theorists and objectivists believe that
   1. moral judgments are attempts to describe the moral features of things.\*
   2. some moral claims are true.
   3. the point of moral judgments is to vent our emotions.
   4. nothing is ever morally required of us.
5. Both expressivists and objectivists believe that
   1. moral judgments are attempts to describe the moral features of things.
   2. some moral claims are true.
   3. the point of moral judgments is to vent our emotions.
   4. there is no fundamental error at the heart of our moral practice.\*
6. Both error theorists and expressivists believe that
   1. moral judgments are attempts to describe the moral features of things.
   2. no moral claims are true.\*
   3. the point of moral judgments is to vent our emotions.
   4. some moral claims are true.
7. Error theorists deny the existence of
   1. objective values.
   2. categorical reasons.
   3. moral requirements.
   4. All of the above\*
8. According to the text, why is the *argument from disastrous results* unsound?
   1. Because error theory is true
   2. Because widespread acceptance of error theory wouldn’t have disastrous results
   3. Because the truth of a theory does not depend on the results of everyone’s embracing it\*
   4. All of the above
9. What is a metaphysical theory?
   1. A theory about what the world is truly like and what really exists\*
   2. A theory which claims that everything in the universe is physical matter
   3. A theory about the human body
   4. A theory about what we know and how we know it
10. According to expressivism, when we make moral judgments, we make an effort to
    1. speak the truth.
    2. report the moral features possessed by various actions, motives, or policies.
    3. Both of the above
    4. None of the above\*
11. According to expressivism, sincere moral judgments are
    1. always true.
    2. always false.
    3. sometimes true and sometimes false.
    4. a kind of emotional venting.\*
12. Which of the following is *not* an advantage of expressivism?
    1. It neatly explains the nature of moral disagreement.
    2. It captures our views about what we are intending to do when we make moral judgments.\*
    3. It solves the problem of contradiction.
    4. It supports our view that emotions are a central part of moral judgment.
13. If expressivism is true, then it is impossible to
    1. avoid error when one is making moral judgments.
    2. avoid endorsing contradictions.
    3. make a valid moral argument.\*
    4. change one's moral judgments.
14. According to expressivism, amoralists are
    1. impossible.\*
    2. widespread.
    3. very rare.
    4. correct.
15. Expressivists cannot account for the existence of
    1. moral disagreement.
    2. moral knowledge.\*
    3. moral motivation.
    4. moral emotions.
16. What is the relationship between ethical relativism and moral nihilism?
    1. Ethical relativism is a version of moral nihilism.
    2. Moral nihilism is a version of ethical relativism.
    3. They are competing theories that cannot both be true.\*
    4. They are completely independent theories that could, in principle, both be true.
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1. What is the relationship between expressivism and moral nihilism?
   1. Expressivism is a form of moral nihilism.\*
   2. Moral nihilism is a form of expressivism.
   3. They are competing theories that cannot both be true.
   4. They are completely independent theories; the truth of one doesn't require the truth of the other.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What is the fundamental “error”that the error theory seeks to debunk?
   1. The idea that our culture is superior to other cultures
   2. The idea that one's own moral views are better than other people's
   3. The idea that moral claims seek to describe the world
   4. The idea that morality is objective and requires things of us independently of our desires\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following claims would an error theorist *not* accept?
   1. There are no moral features in this world.
   2. The main aim of moral judgments is to express emotions.\*
   3. No moral judgments are true.
   4. There is no moral knowledge.

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following claims would cultural relativists and error theorists both accept?
   1. Moral judgments aim to describe the moral features of things.\*
   2. Whether a moral judgment is correct depends on the standards of one's culture.
   3. There is no moral knowledge.
   4. There are no moral features in the world.
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1. What is a categorical reason?
   1. A reason that applies to us only because acting on it will make us better off
   2. A reason that applies to us only because acting on it will get us what we want
   3. A reason that applies to us regardless of whether acting on it gets us what we want\*
   4. A reason that applies to us only if we accept its authority
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1. What is the function of moral claims, according to expressivism?
   1. To describe the moral features of things
   2. To vent our feelings\*
   3. To describe the moral codes of our society
   4. All of the above

*Appears on the student website.*

1. How might an expressivist translate the claim that stealing is wrong?
   1. I disapprove of stealing.
   2. The act of stealing has the moral feature of being wrong.
   3. Don't steal!\*
   4. Both a and c
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1. Which of the following theories is inconsistent with the claim that there can be valid moral arguments?
   1. Ethical objectivism
   2. Ethical subjectivism
   3. Ethical relativism
   4. Expressivism\*

*Appears on the student website.*

1. Which of the following is impossible, according to expressivism?
   1. A person who is motivated by her moral judgments
   2. A person who is not motivated by her moral judgments\*
   3. A moral judgment that is not based on a fundamental error
   4. A moral judgment that is neither true nor false
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**Chapter 21: Eleven Arguments against Moral Objectivity**

*Summary*

This chapter examines eleven arguments against ethical objectivism, ordered from the least serious challenges to the most serious, along with objectivist replies. (1) *Morality is objective only if moral rules are absolute.* This claim is mistaken because it conflates questions about morality's *status* with the distinct question of whether moral rules have exceptions. (2) *There is no objective truth, so there are no objective moral truths*. The claim that there are no objective truths cannot possibly be true, so this argument fails. (3) *Because everyone has an equal right to his or her moral opinions, all moral opinions are equally plausible.* From the fact that everyone has a *right* to an opinion, it does not follow that all opinions are equally plausible. (4) *If morality is objective, then dogmatism is acceptable.* To suggest that morality is objective is not to claim that we know the moral truth in its entirety; we should be open to the possibility that we're mistaken about it and be open-minded. (5) *If ethical objectivism is true, it is permissible to be intolerant of others*. In fact, ethical objectivism is much better than skepticism at supporting tolerance. After all, claiming that tolerance is valuable requires thinking that some moral views (namely, intolerant ones) are mistaken. (6) *Ethical objectivism cannot account for cultural variation.* While ethical objectivists insist that some moral standards apply universally, they can readily admit that basic moral principles might have different applications in different circumstances.

The last five arguments raise more serious challenges. (7) *There is persistent disagreement about moral issues, even among informed and rational people*. Disagreement is insufficient to show that there is no objective truth in an area because disagreement occurs in many objective areas, including science. (8) *Morality is objective only if God exists, and God doesn't exist.* If God doesn't exist, then there are many objective laws (of physics, chemistry, etc.) that do not have lawmakers. Morality could be yet another domain in which this is true. (9) *Morality requires the existence of categorical reasons, and there are no categorical reasons*. To reject this, objectivists must either give up on the idea that morality involves categorical reasons or try to show that categorical reasons exist (perhaps by providing examples). (10) *Moral judgments motivate us, but beliefs cannot motivate us, so moral judgments aren't beliefs.* Objectivists must either deny that moral judgments always motivate us or claim that some (evaluative) beliefs can motivate us. (11) *Objective values have no place in a scientific world*. Objectivists must either deny that science provides the ultimate test of reality or try to accommodate moral values within a scientific worldview.

*Essay Questions*

1. Does ethical objectivism license intolerance or dogmatism? Explain why many have thought that it does, and explain how an objectivist might reply to this accusation.
2. Is belief in the objectivity of morality compatible with atheism? If so, explain why you think this is. If not, which should we reject?
3. Explain the argument from disagreement. How does the objectivist respond to this argument? Is there a way to modify the argument to avoid the objectivist’s response? Explain and defend your answer.
4. What is a categorical reason? Does morality require the existence of categorical reasons? Do categorical reasons actually exist? Defend your answers.
5. Many people have thought that the fact that we are motivated by our moral beliefs undermines the notion that morality is objective. Explain this argument in detail. Do you think it is a good one? Why or why not?
6. Is ethical objectivism incompatible with science? Why might someone think that it is, and how might an ethical objectivist respond? Which side is correct?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. The three possible accounts of the *status* of ethics are
   1. utilitarianism, Kantianism, and contractarianism.
   2. objectivism, relativism, and nihilism.\*
   3. hedonism, desire satisfaction theory, and objective theories.
   4. absolutism, pluralism, and particularism.
2. Ethical objectivism supports
   1. absolutism.
   2. dogmatism.
   3. Both of the above
   4. None of the above\*
3. The claim that there are no objective truths
   1. has been well confirmed by social science.
   2. is so deep that we cannot say whether it is true or false.
   3. cannot possibly be true.\*
   4. cannot possibly be false.
4. If everyone has an equal right to hold his or her own moral opinions, then
   1. ethical objectivism is true.
   2. ethical objectivism is false.
   3. ethical objectivism is incoherent.
   4. this does not tell us anything about whether ethical objectivism is true.\*
5. According to the text, if tolerance is valuable, then
   1. this supports ethical objectivism.\*
   2. this supports cultural relativism.
   3. this supports ethical subjectivism.
   4. this supports expressivism.
6. If ethical objectivism is true, then
   1. the application of basic moral principles must be identical in all cultures and societies.
   2. the application of basic moral principles might vary among different cultures and societies.\*
   3. cultures and societies determine which basic moral principles are true.
   4. None of the above
7. One problem for the claim that *if there is deep and persistent disagreement about something, it cannot be true* is that
   1. it fails to pass its own test.\*
   2. it implies that relativism is true.
   3. it licenses intolerance.
   4. None of the above
8. The fact that there is deep and persistent disagreement among scientists shows that
   1. scientific claims are not objective.
   2. that there can be deep and persistent disagreement about objective truths.\*
   3. ethical objectivism is false.
   4. None of the above
9. If atheism is true, then
   1. morality does not exist.
   2. some laws do not have lawmakers.\*
   3. morality is a human creation.
   4. None of the above
10. The *argument from categorical reasons* claims that
    1. there are no reasons that apply to us regardless of what we care about.\*
    2. ethical objectivism does not imply that there are categorical reasons.
    3. categorical reasons apply to us only if we care about them.
    4. All of the above
11. One way for an objectivist to reply to the *argument from categorical reasons* is to
    1. deny that categorical reasons exist.
    2. deny that moral requirements must provide us with reasons for action.\*
    3. deny that moral judgments are intrinsically motivating.
    4. deny that only desires can be intrinsically motivating.
12. Many people think that if moral judgments motivate us, then
    1. moral judgments are not beliefs.
    2. moral judgments cannot be true.
    3. ethical objectivism is false.
    4. All of the above\*
13. How can the ethical objectivist respond to the *motivational argument*?
    1. By arguing that moral judgments alone *aren’t* able to motivate us
    2. By arguing that beliefs alone *are* able to motivate us
    3. Both of the above\*
    4. None of the above
14. Occam's razor tells us to
    1. always maximize utility.
    2. never multiply entities beyond necessity.\*
    3. accept only claims that can be proven beyond doubt.
    4. always trust our senses.
15. How might an objectivist respond to the argument that ethical objectivism is false because values have no place in a scientific world?
    1. By maintaining that moral properties are natural properties
    2. By denying that science is the ultimate measure of morality
    3. Both of the above\*
    4. None of the above—there is no way for the objectivist to respond.
16. What three types of theory exhaust all the possible views of the status of ethics?
    1. Nihilism, relativism, and objectivism\*
    2. Skepticism, dogmatism, and quietism
    3. Monism, pluralism, and particularism
    4. Utilitarianism, Kantianism, and contractarianism
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1. What is the relationship between ethical objectivism and ethical absolutism?
   1. Ethical objectivism requires ethical absolutism.
   2. Ethical objectivism is consistent with, but does not require, ethical absolutism.\*
   3. Ethical objectivism is inconsistent with ethical absolutism.
   4. If ethical absolutism is false, then so is ethical objectivism.
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1. According to the text, which of the following does ethical objectivism support?
   1. Ethical absolutism
   2. Ethical nihilism
   3. Tolerance\*
   4. Dogmatism

*Appears on the student website.*

1. If ethical objectivism is true, which of the following must be true?
   1. We are permitted to force our moral views onto other people.
   2. It is OK to be dogmatic about one's moral views.
   3. Not all truths are subjective.\*
   4. All of the above
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1. What is the key assumption behind the claim that atheism is incompatible with ethical objectivism?
   1. God created absolutely everything.
   2. All laws require a lawmaker.\*
   3. Atheists are guaranteed to act immorally.
   4. Religion is most people's only motivation for acting morally.
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1. What kind of reasons is the objectivity of morality often thought to require?
   1. Categorical reasons
   2. Hypothetical reasons\*
   3. Prudential reasons
   4. Theoretical reasons
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1. What is the conclusion of the *motivational argument* inspired by David Hume?
   1. Morality is relative.
   2. Morality is subjective.
   3. Moral beliefs can't be true.\*
   4. Ethical objectivism is true.
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1. What is the term for the view that moral features are just ordinary scientific features?
   1. Moral nihilism
   2. Moral scientism
   3. Moral naturalism\*
   4. Moral physicalism

*Appears on the student website.*

1. What kind of claims tell us how things *ought* to be?
   1. Positive claims
   2. Normative claims\*
   3. Scientific claims
   4. Theoretical claims

*Appears on the student website.*

1. According to the text, what is wrong with thinking that a claim is true only if science can verify it?
   1. Such a claim does not pass its own test.\*
   2. Such a claim does not make room for religious knowledge.
   3. Such a claim ignores the failings of science.
   4. All of the above
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**Chapter 22: Is Moral Knowledge Possible? Five Skeptical Arguments**

*Summary*

This chapter examines five arguments for moral skepticism. Moral skepticism is the view that we cannot have moral knowledge. The chapter concludes that none of the arguments for moral skepticism can withstand scrutiny, and so the skeptical position should not be regarded as the default view.

(1) *We are not justified in believing any moral claims because well-informed rational people persistently disagree about moral claims.* The premise in this argument that we are not justified in believing claims if well-informed, rational people disagree has problems. If it is true, then we could have no knowledge on any controversial topic. Further, well-informed rational people have disagreed about the premise itself. (2) *Moral knowledge is impossible because we cannot be certain of moral claims*. This argument sets the bar for knowledge so high that almost no belief can meet it. (3) *No one has moral knowledge because no one has the authority to determine what is moral or immoral*. We can interpret “authority” to mean designated authority or author of morality, but in either case the argument fails. We don’t have to be a designated authority or author of morality in order to have moral knowledge. (4) *No one’s moral beliefs are justified because our beliefs have morally irrelevant influences*. While we do have reason to doubt someone’s moral beliefs if they are due entirely to irrelevant influences, moral knowledge remains possible as long as many of our beliefs have different origins. Finally, (5) *we can have no moral knowledge because moral claims are neither conceptual nor empirical truths*. This argument fails because we may be justified in our moral beliefs even if they are not empirical or conceptual truths.

*Essay Questions*

1. Which skeptical argument do you find to be the most persuasive? Describe at least one objection to the argument. In light of the objection, do you find the argument to be compelling overall? Why or why not?
2. Explain the skeptical argument from disagreement. How can the premises in the argument be defended? Which premise do you take to be the weakest, and why? Do you find the argument to be compelling overall? Why or why not?
3. Explain the skeptical No Certainty Argument. How can the premises in the argument be defended? Which premise do you take to be the weakest, and why? Do you find the argument to be compelling overall? Why or why not?
4. Explain the Argument from Authority. How can the notion of “moral authority” be interpreted? Does everyone lack moral authority? Why or why not?
5. Explain the Irrelevant Influences Argument. Which influences over our moral beliefs are “irrelevant”? In light of these influences, are any of our moral beliefs justified? Why or why not?
6. Reflect on your own moral upbringing. What has had the greatest influence over your personal moral beliefs? Do you believe your own moral beliefs to be justified? Why or why not?

*Test Bank Questions*

1. To get knowledge in any area is to have some beliefs about it that are
   1. true.
   2. justified.
   3. certain.
   4. Both a and b\*
2. Justified beliefs are
   1. certain.
   2. doubtful.
   3. always true.
   4. well-supported.\*
3. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is the view that we cannot have moral knowledge.
   1. Moral skepticism\*
   2. Moral objectivism
   3. Empiricism
   4. Conceptualism
4. According to the Argument from Disagreement, if well-informed, rational people persistently disagree about some claim, then
   1. we are justified in believing that claim.
   2. we are not justified in believing that claim.\*
   3. it is not a moral claim.
   4. None of the above
5. If it is true that we are not justified in believing some claim if well-informed, rational people persistently disagree about it, then knowledge about which of the following subjects could be called into doubt?
   1. Whether God exists.
   2. Whether morality is objective.
   3. Whether we have free will.
   4. All of the above\*
6. According to the No Certainty Argument, we can know a claim is true only if we are certain of its
   1. truth.\*
   2. consequences.
   3. structure.
   4. None of the above
7. According to the No Certainty Argument, moral knowledge is
   1. possible.
   2. easy to come by.
   3. justified.
   4. impossible.\*
8. To be *certain* is to have a belief that
   1. one feels extremely confident about.
   2. everybody agrees about.
   3. cannot be false and cannot rationally be doubted.\*
   4. is well-supported.
9. A problem with the No Certainty Argument is that
   1. it sets the bar for knowledge too high.\*
   2. it is invalid.
   3. it is uncontroversial.
   4. the premises are redundant.
10. According to the Argument from Authority,
    1. some moral authorities have moral knowledge.
    2. morality has an author who is the moral authority.
    3. no one has moral knowledge.\*
    4. all rational beings have moral authority.
11. According to the text, you can have moral knowledge
    1. even if you are not a designated moral authority.
    2. even if you are not the author of morality.
    3. only if you are a moral authority.
    4. Both a and b\*
12. According to the Irrelevant Influences Argument,
    1. no one’s moral beliefs are justified.\*
    2. only the beliefs of moral authorities are justified.
    3. we don’t have any beliefs.
    4. moral beliefs are irrelevant.
13. Knowledge requires beliefs that are not only true but also
    1. false.
    2. certain.
    3. justified.\*
    4. irrelevantly influenced.
14. How could one defend the claim that your moral beliefs are not justified because they are influenced by your parents or culture?
    1. Argue that it is extremely lucky if your parents or culture turned out to morally wise, and such luck is incompatible with knowledge.\*
    2. Argue that it is extremely unlikely that your parents would have taught you morality even if they knew moral truths.
    3. Argue that it is possible that your moral beliefs have other influences, too.
    4. None of the above
15. According to the Argument from Irrelevant Influences, which of the following influences over our beliefs are irrelevant?
    1. parents
    2. culture
    3. evolution
    4. All of the above\*
16. Evolutionary pressures work to instill beliefs that are
    1. true.
    2. good.
    3. adaptive.\*
    4. evil.
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1. According to the text, we have reason to doubt whether someone’s belief amounts to knowledge when the belief
   1. is due entirely to parental, cultural or evolutionary influences, and not at all to attentive reflection.\*
   2. is due in any part to parental, cultural, or evolutionary influences.
   3. is due to attentive reflection.
   4. Both a and b
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1. According to the text, even when our beliefs have irrelevant influences, moral knowledge remains possible so long as
   1. we do not attentively reflect on our beliefs.
   2. many of our beliefs have different origins.\*
   3. God exists.
   4. we learned from a designated moral authority.
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1. According to Hume’s argument, moral claims are
   1. not conceptual truths.
   2. not empirical truths.
   3. empirical truths.
   4. Both a and b\*
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1. According to Hume’s Argument,
   1. we can only know two sorts of claims: conceptual truths or empirical truths.\*
   2. we can only know empirical truths.
   3. we can only know conceptual truths.
   4. we cannot know any truths at all.
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1. According to Hume’s argument, we can have no \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ knowledge.
   1. conceptual
   2. empirical
   3. moral\*
   4. All of the above
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1. A conceptual truth is one that has which of the following features?
   1. It is a necessary truth.
   2. It is true just in virtue of its meaning.
   3. It can be known just by understanding it.
   4. All of the above\*
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1. What is an empirical truth?
   1. A necessary truth.
   2. A truth known just by understanding its meaning.
   3. A truth known only by relying on evidence from our five senses.\*
   4. A controversial truth.
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1. Which of the following is an empirical truth?
   1. The Pacific Ocean is larger than the Atlantic.\*
   2. Squares are not circles.
   3. Bachelors are unmarried.
   4. Both b and c
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1. Which of the following is a conceptual truth?
   1. The Pacific Ocean is larger than the Atlantic.
   2. Squares are not circles.
   3. Bachelors are unmarried.
   4. Both b and c\*
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