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

1. inquiry:
   an attempt to discover truths about the world

2. conclusion:
   a statement in an argument that the premises are attempting to guarantee the truth of

3. validity:
   when the truth of the premises would guarantee the truth of the conclusion

4. subjective:
   when there is no truth to the matter, when it depends only on what people think/feel/believe about it

5. moral realism:
   the view that there is an objective moral truth

6. fake reasoning:
   an attempt to make a case for a claim to which you have no sincere commitment, but do so because you believe it will be for your benefit
7/prima facie moral obligation:

a genuine moral obligation that, in some circumstances, may be overridden or trumped by a stronger, more important moral obligation.

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]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Name of this argument form</th>
<th>Circle one:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If Howard Dean is the new party chairperson, then all party members will be happy. Not all party members will be happy. Therefore, Howard Dean is not the new party chairperson.</td>
<td>modus tollens</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>If Martha is leaving jail soon, then her stock value will rise. Her stock value will rise. Therefore, Martha is leaving jail soon.</td>
<td>affirming the consequent</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>If the Patriots lost the Superbowl, then the Eagles won. The Patriots lost the Superbowl. Therefore, the Eagles won.</td>
<td>modus ponens</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (that is, the society’s collective beliefs about morality) determines what is right and wrong in that society.
2. There is no objective standard with which to compare another society’s customs as being inferior to ours.
3. Our society deserves no special status; it is merely one among many.
4. There is no universal truth in ethics.
5. To attempt to judge another society’s moral code is mere arrogance on our part. We should adopt an attitude of tolerance towards other society’s customs.
12. State the three consequences of Moral-Cultural Relativism which, according to Rachels, are unacceptable: 6 pts.

1. It is not the case that another society's customs are inferior to ours.
2. To determine whether an action is moral or immoral, one simply needs to consult the standards of society.
3. It is not possible for a society to be able to become morally better than it was before.

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 commands (approves of) some actions and forbids (disapproves of) other actions.
3. The actions God commands are morally right and the actions God forbids are morally wrong.

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

A dilemma is a situation in which one is forced to accept one of two choices, neither of which are appealing in the least. One can respond by grabbing the first horn and taking the first choice, grabbing the second horn and taking the second choice, or "going between the horns" and finding an alternative that was not originally there.
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 Limited Cultural Differences Argument and the Provability Argument. As part of your discussion, you should explain why Rachels thinks they are not sound arguments. Do you think Rachels is right about this? Is so, why? If not, 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?

C. Discuss (1) Marquis’ account of why it is wrong to kill an innocent human being and (2) his FLO Argument against abortion. Do you agree with Marquis? Why or why not?

The Platonic Argument Against Divine Command Theory originated in Plato’s dialog, *Euthyphro*, with Socrates asking “Do the Gods love piety because it is pious, or is it pious because of their love for it?” Translated into modern terms, it can be restated as “Are actions good because God commands them, or does God command them because they are good?” The acceptance of the first argument would amount to accepting DCT (the view that actions are good solely because God commands them and others are bad because God forbids them) and the acceptance of the second argument would be rejecting DCT. Now, before one accepts either of these, their consequences must be elaborated upon.

In accepting that actions are good only because God commands them, one must accept that God’s commands are morally arbitrary. In a hypothetical world where God were to command murder, rape, baby kicking, and be jam eating—all these actions would be considered morally good. If God were to forbid compassion, love, and brushing hair—these actions would be considered morally bad. God has no moral reason for commanding such actions, so any of his commands are morally arbitrary. An even greater repercussion of this is that the doctrine of the goodness of God becomes empty. God is good only as long as he approves of himself. No matter what God commands, be it love or hate, as long as God commands himself as God, he is so. This is very difficult for some to accept, so many turn to the other horn of the dilemma.

The problem in accepting that God commands certain actions because they are good is that it places a standard of morality outside of
God's reach. In asserting a standard objective of humans and God, the question of God's omnipotence comes into play. The typical Judeo-Christian idea of God is that God is omniscient, omnipotent, and all-loving. If there was a standard of morality outside of God, then that would mean that there was something God did not/could not do. This is also a difficult horn to take because of this notion that encroaches on God's omnipotence. However, if one wishes to assert that DCT is false, one must accept these implications.

When the soundness of the argument is called into play, I cannot help but agree that it is sound. No matter which horn one takes, the logic is impeccable. And, personally, I cannot see an alternative horn. If one agrees to the assumptions (which, in my case, I differ on my idea of the nature of God), then one must take one of the horns. Each separate argument appears to be truthful and rationally valid. If I were to take these assumptions and believe as many do, I would have to accept the second horn and reject DCT. The whole idea of the arbitrariness of morality makes my skin crawl, I would much rather see a moral standard independent of God.

Very good!
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