

100%

Section I. Define each of the following terms and phrases in as detailed, clear and precise a manner as time allows.

[2 pts. each; 20 pts. total]

1. moral skepticism: the idea that morality is subject only to ^{those} what people think, ~~feel~~ feel / believe about it. 2 types of moral skeptics: "limited to one issue or full-blown in that all of morality is subject only to what people think/feel/believe.

2. genuine inquiry: scientific inquiry. Seeking truths about the world regardless of what the outcome may be.

3. prima facie moral obligation: A genuine moral obligation that may be trumped by more important moral obligations. Lying to your grandma that her hair looks good when it actually does not.

4. philosophy: An area of inquiry that seeks the truth of fundamental & pervasive questions such as the existence of God, absolute good, nature of human experience, etc.

5. polygamy: having more than one spouse at the same time

6. supererogatory: an action that if not done wouldn't be immoral, but if done would be morally good

7. ~~take reasoning~~ Reasoning motivated by accepting a claim b/c you think it will help you / advantage you w/c regard to truth of claim

8. validity: An argument is valid when the truth of the premises would guarantee the truth of the conclusion

9. argument: A set of statements consisting of premises + a conclusion. Premises = reasoning / evidence for accepting the conclusion

10. dilemma: A situation that has 2 outcomes, both unfavorable, 2 horns to the situation
 could be more precise: "a choice b/w 2 options..."

Section II. First write the name of the argument form in the space provided. Then indicate whether the given argument is valid or invalid by circling the appropriate word. [3 pts. each; 6 pts. total]

11. P Q If Miami lost to Louisville, then Hurricane fans are sad. Miami did not lose to Louisville. $\text{not } P$ Therefore, Hurricane fans are not sad. $\text{not } Q$	name of this argument form: <u>Denying the antecedent</u> circle one: valid <u>invalid</u>
12. P Q If Iran has nuclear weapons, then North Korea is satisfied. Iran has nuclear weapons. P Therefore, North Korea is satisfied. Q	name of this argument form: <u>Modus Ponens</u> circle one: <u>valid</u> invalid

Section III. In the space provided, answer each of the following questions in as detailed, clear and precise a manner as time allows. [24 points total]

13. Explain the concepts of objectivity and subjectivity, and illustrate those concepts with examples. 8 pts.

Objectivity means real. It is the idea that something is true regardless of what people think, feel, or say about it. Objective truths include a heliocentric solar system, ~~2+2=4~~ $2+2=4$, & Dr. Lane is a man. Certain person thoughts can be objective as well. I can think I dreamt about tigers when I actually (objectively) ~~did~~ dreamt about dinosaurs. It doesn't matter what I thought I ~~dreamt~~ dreamt about. Subjectivity means that things are ~~not~~ subject to what people think, feel, or say about them. There is no objective goodness (or badness) of rancid ~~goats~~ goats milk. What makes it good or bad is what people say about it, their opinions.

✓ 14. State one version of the Limited Cultural Differences Argument (LCDA) and explain how Rachels criticizes it. 8 pts.

LCDA goes 1. Some ~~the~~ cultures think infanticide - killing of babies is right. 2. Some cultures think it is wrong. 3. therefore it is neither ^(objectively) right or wrong. It is a matter of cultural belief not subject to a universal law. Rachels counters by saying that this argument is invalid. It is such because the premises state truths about what people believe in morality & the conclusion says how morality is. The conclusion does not logically follow from premises. 2 people can disagree on a particular thing and one may be right & the other wrong. Even if both parties are wrong there may still be an objective right.

15. State the Traditional Argument Against Abortion and explain how it is susceptible to the fallacies of equivocation and begging the question. 8 pts.

- P1. It is ~~not~~ immoral to kill innocent human beings
- P2. Fetuses are innocent human beings ✓
- 3. Therefore it is immoral to kill fetuses

This argument is susceptible to equivocation - using different meanings of ambiguous term in each premise because it could mean in P1 that human beings are moral persons & in P2 that human beings are genetic persons. If this is the case it is not valid and shall be thrown out. However if it means the same meanings in each premise it begs the question. It assumes in its premises something to be true, but what it assumes true is what is being argued. If it meant genetic human in both premises P1 would beg the question. If it meant moral human in both premises

P2 would beg the question

Section IV. In the space provided, answer **ONE** of following questions. Your answer to this question should be as detailed, clear and precise as time allows. In other words, **tell me everything you know about the question asked.** If you omit something that is relevant to the question, I will assume that you do not know the material you are omitting. *Do not attempt to answer more than one question.* [50% of your total test grade]

A. Discuss the Platonic Argument Against Divine Command Theory (DCT). As part of your discussion, you should explain in detail the consequences that are supposed to follow if DCT is true and the consequences that are supposed to follow if DCT is false. Do you think this is a sound argument? Why or why not?

B. Discuss Warren's pro-choice view, including her distinction between different senses of "human being," her account of personhood, and her response to criticisms based on similarity and potentiality. Do you think

Warren's defense of abortion works? Defend your answer.
DCT implies 1. God exists 2. He says certain actions are right & certain actions are wrong 3. Those he approves of are right & those he forbids are wrong.

A. The Platonic Argument against Divine Command Theory says: Are things morally good/bad because God commands them or does God command what is morally good/bad. This sets up a ~~bad~~ dilemma in which either way you choose to look at the nature of morality, it is unappealing to someone who believes in an all good & powerful God. Let's say DCT is true ~~and~~ actions are morally good or ~~bad~~ because God commands them. The problem here is that God's commands become ~~to~~ arbitrary or without moral reason. There is nothing bad about murder ~~other~~ other than the fact that God forbids it and nothing good about helping your ~~and~~ grandpa other than God approves of it. God has no moral reason to say things are good or things are ~~bad~~ bad. This being so, if God said rape was morally good, then rape would in fact be morally good. This is why his moral commands are arbitrary. He could have some non-moral reason for commanding as he does. ~~For example,~~ For example, his commands could be aimed at our happiness, but this is uncertain due to God's uncertain nature. How do we know he isn't tricking us and actually making us unhappy. After all, ^{according to DCT} he would have no moral reason not to trick us. The next unfortunate by-product of accepting DCT is that the goodness of God seems irrelevant. Many Christians claim that God is all good and can do no wrong, so we should trust his judgements, however arbitrary, and realize he has the best for us in mind. The problem here is that what Christians deem as God's "good" nature (he would never ~~be~~ lie, cheat, steal, kill) seems ⁴ to be

Nothing more than God's approval of his own arbitrary judgements of good actions. ~~His~~ His goodness seems to be nothing more than an approval of self. If ~~you~~ said murder was good, God would be all-good in murdering. ✓

Now let's say DCT is false and certain actions are good or bad. Another way to say this is that God understands some actions to be good & others bad ~~and~~ not because he commanded them but because they are, in and of themselves, good or bad. This implies that there is a certain objective code of morality independent of God's will. All ^{a good} God can do is point us in the right direction of this code. ^{that God commands}

This ~~also~~ implies that God is not all powerful or omnipotent & there are certain things even God is subject to. It throws out a theological conception of Good & Evil and hurts the credibility of many religions.

So, the logical flow of ~~Plato's~~ ^{Plato's} argument is such: Either A = DCT is true or B = DCT is false. If A, then C = the ~~consequences~~ consequences of accepting DCT. If B then D = the consequences of ~~denying~~ denying DCT. A religious person must concede that the consequences of accepting DCT are far more ~~severe~~ severe than denying it. If you deny it you could still ~~accept~~ accept that God is ~~not~~ good (he points us toward right moral code) & his commands are with reason (supported by the right moral code). I believe this is why St. Thomas Aquinas ~~choose~~ choose this path. I believe it is a sound argument. I understand that there might be a way to go "between the horns" & find support of DCT w/o the negative consequences ^{of} but I ~~am~~ have not heard this proposition. ~~It~~ It seems that God is more like a ~~perfect~~ perfect being living in complete accord with morality and instead of praising ~~to~~ him we should ~~focus~~ focus on being more like him. ✓

This question = A+ = 100%

[see back]