Section 1. Define each of the following terms and phrases in as detailed, clear and precise a manner as time allows. [2 pts. each; 14 pts. total]

1. argument: A set of statements, the first of which (premises) set out to prove or provide evidence for another statement or proposition (conclusion).

2. soundness: An argument is sound if it is valid and the premises are in fact true.

3. moral skepticism: The belief that there is no objective moral truth; it has two forms. There's a generalized one ("full blown moral skepticism") or in specific situations (infanticide).

4. subjective: Something is subjective when there is no fact of the matter; it is simply what people feel, believe, or think about something.

5. inculcation: Learning (particularly morality) by urging or repetition.

6. genuine inquiry: Inquiry in which the desire is to seek truth, no matter what that truth may be.

[definitions are continued at the top of the next page]
7. Sham reasoning: Is a genuine commitment to an inquiry, though no matter what is found the inquirer's original thoughts or beliefs will not be changed, despite whatever evidence they are presented with.

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; 9 pts. total]

8. If ethics is boring, then I get a lot of sleep.
   Ethics is not boring.
   Therefore, I do not get a lot of sleep.
   name of this argument form: Denying the Antecedent
   circle one: valid invalid
   not Q.

9. If Martha is out of jail, then Donald is happy.
   Donald is not happy.
   Therefore, Martha is not out of jail.
   name of this argument form: Modus Tollens
   circle one: valid invalid
   not Q. therefore, not P.

10. If Roberts is confirmed, he will be the new Chief Justice.
    Roberts is confirmed.
    Therefore, he will be the new Chief Justice.
    name of this argument form: Modus Ponens
    circle one: valid invalid

Section III. In the space provided, answer each of the following questions in as detailed, clear and precise a manner as time allows. [27 points total]

11. State the five claims that go together to make up Moral-Cultural Relativism. 10 pts.

   1. A society's moral code determines what is right or wrong w/in that society.
   2. There is no objective standard from which we can judge a society's practices to be morally inferior to our own.
   3. Our own society's code holds no special status; it is simply one among many.
   4. There are no moral truths that hold for all people at all times.
   5. We must adopt a tolerance toward other cultures' practices; it is mere arrogance to do otherwise.
12. According to Rachels, (1) what two lessons can we learn from studying Moral-Cultural Relativism, and (2) what caveats should accompany each lesson? 6 pts.

1. Most of our morality comes from conditioning & inculcation rather than reasoning.
   - What we believe to be objectively moral/immoral isn't necessarily objectively moral/immoral.

Caveats:

2. This does not imply that any of our morality is objectively true.

   This does not mean that none of what we believe is objectively moral/immoral.

13. State the three claims about God that are implied by Divine Command Theory (these are the claims that have to be true in order for it to be possible that DCT is true). 6 pts.

1. God exists
2. God approves of some actions & disapproves of others
3. God commands actions that are morally right & disapproves actions that are morally wrong.

14. What is a dilemma, and what are the three possible ways of responding to one? 5 pts.

A dilemma is an ethical situation where there are two (sometimes 3) choices, neither of which is morally appetizing, though a choice must be made; each choice is a 'horn.'

Possible responses:

(1) Grasp the first horn
(2) Grasp the second horn
(3) Go between the horns: choose another action that wasn't originally presented (this is not always possible).
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 (1) Marquis' account of why it is wrong to kill an innocent human being and (2) his FLO Argument against abortion. Do you think his argument is sound? Why or why not?

B. Discuss the Platonic Argument Against Divine Command Theory. 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?

---

Marquis claims it is wrong to kill an innocent human being because it robs them of the most valuable thing they have: their potential valued future, a future-like-ours (FLO). What this means is the positive experiences, activities, projects, and enjoyments that they could have (reminisce about at the retirement center while playing checkers). Killing an innocent human being robs them of potentiality, and Marquis doesn't like that. On to fetuses (or is it fetii?)

The FLO Argument goes as follows:

1. If an action prevents a being from having an FLO, then it is prima facie morally wrong to commit that action.
2. Killing a fetus prevents it from having an FLO.
3. Therefore, killing a fetus is prima facie morally wrong.
4. In the vast majority of abortions there are no other moral considerations that outweigh the prima facie obligation not to kill fetuses.
5. So the vast majority of abortions are immoral.
A definition of prima facie is necessary; this is a genuine moral obligation that can be overridden by a stronger moral obligation (like war; people say killing is wrong, but feel that protecting themselves in this manner is the right thing to do!). Other than that, it is somewhat straightforward. On to soundness analysis.

The argument is valid, as its an extension of modus ponens (if the premises were true, the conclusion would be as well, their truth guarantees the conclusion's truth, & it is impossible for them to be true & the conclusion false @ the same time (r)). Are they true?

Marquis said that it was a fetus at 10 or 14 days, right (due to the possibility of twinning)? I would ask when does it have a heartbeat? This is how the medical profession defines whether an adult is alive or dead, so why not a fetus? Especially since Marquis is applying what goes for an adult to a fetus? Since this is a clinical definition of living or dying, it would make more sense if this were the deciding factor. That's one inconsistency.

Another is that FLO can be a bit misleading, as it is a generalized future that he speaks of—does that mean that lunatics, criminals, & other fringes of society aren't allowed the FLO's consideration—are these marginalized FLO's? Yes, it says "activities, projects, & enjoyments," but that could entail things that the generalized FLO might find distasteful, like S&M (Sado-Masochism, etc.) or Death Metal. It's not clear enough. It also leaves a bit of room for good & evil—where does this fit in? Depending on believe, an FLO might contain an equal amount of good & evil in balance (this is stretching a bit).
So the potential for evil is just as probable as good. But enough about that.

I like Marquis' argument; it is one of the most convincing I've heard concerning pro-life over pro-choice. However, my own cynicism won't allow me to accept all of his terms—so I deem it unsound due to premises 1 and 2 not being concrete enough in terminology.

Sorry, Marquis.

Very good... I really need you need a bit more detail regarding Marquis' own position. But your own detailed comments help to make up for this.