

Tuesday April 26, 2011 Schedule for the Day

Am: Critical Reasoning Review Session

- Comment's on Friday's Assignment
- Discussion of Today's Assignment
- Description of Exam
- Review Workshop
- Time permitting—Individual work with David

Pm: Ethical/ Critical Reasoning

- Workshop on Conceptual Theories: Reconstruction and Criticism
- Application of these techniques to the ethical theories we have covered
- A brief discussion of the ethical reasoning portion of the exam
- Additional Time for individual work with David

Comments on Critical Reasoning Exercise 4.4 + for Friday, April 22

Short passages in 4.4 A Generally quite good, BUT
Sometimes it was not clear what the reconstruction was.
Sometimes the question of soundness (validity plus all true premises
was not clearly answered
Sometimes there was no indications of relevant Implicit Premises and
hence of a “Charitable Interpretation”

Longer Passage Ex. 4.4 B on “Racial Profiling”
There was some problems with this longer passage

Longer, “Racial Profiling” Passage from Friday’s Assignment

Reconstruction 1:

- (1) If we don’t ethnically profile young male Muslims, then we continue to overlook (avert our eyes from an obvious) effective way of identifying potential terrorists.*
 - (2) If we continue to overlook an effective way of identify potential terrorists, then the survival of the West is put in jeopardy (the West cannot survive).*
 - (3) The survival of the West **should** not be put in jeopardy. IMPLICIT*
- ∴ We should ethnically profile young male Muslims.*

Problem with “should”. Strictly speaking the argument is not valid

Reconstruction 2:

- (1) The ethnic profiling young male Muslims will (obviously) (effectively?) identify potential terrorists*
 - (2) We should do whatever will more effectively identify potential terrorists.*
- ∴ We should ethnically profile young male Muslims.*

This version is valid (a version of Predicate Instantiation), but the second premise of reconstruction 2 assumes that we *should* do whatever will more effectively identify potential terrorists.

Counterexamples come easily to mind. Doing an extensive background check of every single passenger on every airline flight would more effectively identify potential terrorists but would make airline travel virtually impossible.

Reconstruction 3:

- (1). Most terrorists in recent decades have been young male Muslims.*
 - (2) If 1., then profiling young males of Asian or Middle Eastern descent can more effectively identify potential terrorists.*
 - (3) The U.S has a compelling interest in saving citizens from a terrorist attack.*
 - (4) Profiling can be done without using ethnicity as the sole criterion.*
 - (5) If 3. and 4., then profiling young males of Asian or Middle Eastern descent would not violate the U.S. Constitution.*
 - (6) If profiling young males of Asian or Middle Eastern descent can more effectively identify potential terrorists and doing so would not violate the constitution, then the U.S. should profile young males of Asian or Middle Eastern descent.*
- ∴ The U.S. should profile young males of Asian or Middle Eastern descent.*

We can break the if/then connection in premise 2 by pointing out that it would soon become obvious to terrorist groups that passengers with certain stereotypical characteristics were being profiled. These groups could simply use confederates who didn't look like young males of Asian or Middle-Eastern descent. Moreover, profiling under these circumstances could breed a false sense of confidence.

The if/then connection in premise 6 can also be called into question. It doesn't take account of the possibility that there are better alternative approaches to countering terrorism. Body-imaging of all airline passengers (which was introduced after this op/ed piece was written, and more thorough screening of cargo, are strategies that may well be more effective than profiling, especially given the likely counter-strategies that could be employed by terrorists if profiling were initiated.

Discussion of Chapter 5 Exercises: Start with C2, C4, then A2, C12

DEFINITION OF THE CONNECTIVES

Possible Situations		Conjunction	Disjunction	Conditional	Biconditional	Negation	
Row	$\square \Delta$	$\square \& \Delta$	$\square \vee \Delta$	$\square \rightarrow \Delta$	$\square \leftrightarrow \Delta$	Row	$\square \quad \neg \square$
1	T T	T	T	T	T	1	T F
2	T F	F	T	F	F	2	F T
3	F T	F	T	T	F		
4	F F	F	F	T	T		

**C2. (1) If A, then not B.
(2) Not B.
∴ Not A.**

Initial Assignments

A B

T T

T F

F T

F F

Premises

$A \rightarrow \neg B$

T F F

F T T

F T F

F T T

$\neg B$

F F

T T

F F

T T

Conclusion

$\neg A$

F

F

T

T

Problem

OK

Any Possible situation in which ALL the premises are True and the Conclusion is False?

YES, SO INVALID

DEFINITION OF THE CONNECTIVES

Possible Situations		Conjunction	Disjunction	Conditional	Biconditional	Negation	
Row	$\square \Delta$	$\square \& \Delta$	$\square \vee \Delta$	$\square \rightarrow \Delta$	$\square \leftrightarrow \Delta$	Row	$\square \quad \neg \square$
1	T T	T	T	T	T	1	T F
2	T F	F	T	F	F	2	F T
3	F T	F	T	T	F		
4	F F	F	F	T	T		

C4. (1) If A, then B.
 \therefore If not B, then not A
 "contrapositive"

<u>Initial Assignments</u>		<u>Premises</u>	<u>Conclusion</u>	
A	B	$A \rightarrow B$	$\neg B \rightarrow \neg A$	
T	T	(T)	F T F	OK
T	F	F	T F F	
F	T	(T)	F T T	OK
F	F	(T)	T T T	OK

Any Possible situation in which ALL the premises are True and the Conclusion is False?

NO ALL ARE OK, SO VALID

Furthermore, the columns are the same so the two statements are EQUIVALENT (True together and False together)

Glimpse Beyond Assignment: Some Terminology for the conditional

C4. (1) If A, then B.

\therefore If not B, then not A
“contrapositive”

Statement:	If A, then B
Converse	If B, then A

Contrapositive:	If not B, then not A
Inverse	If not A, then not B

Note: the Inverse is the contrapositive
of the converse

Discussion of Chapter 5 Exercises

DEFINITION OF THE CONNECTIVES

Possible Situations		Conjunction	Disjunction	Conditional	Biconditional	Negation	
Row	$\square \Delta$	$\square \ \& \ \Delta$	$\square \vee \Delta$	$\square \rightarrow \Delta$	$\square \leftrightarrow \Delta$	Row	$\square \qquad \neg \square$
1	T T	T	T	T	T	1	T F
2	T F	F	T	F	F	2	F T
3	F T	F	T	T	F		
4	F F	F	F	T	T		

2. Initial Assignments Premises Conclusion

A	B	C	$A \rightarrow B$	$B \rightarrow C$	C	
T	T	T	T	T	T	OK
T	T	F	T	F	F	
T	F	T	F	T	T	
T	F	F	F	T	F	
F	T	T	T	T	T	OK
F	T	F	T	F	F	
F	F	T	T	T	T	OK
F	F	F	T	T	F	Problem

Any Possible situation in which ALL the premises are True and the Conclusion is False?

YES, SO INVALID

DEFINITION OF THE CONNECTIVES

Possible Situations	Conjunction	Disjunction	Conditional	Biconditional	Negation
Row $\square \Delta$	$\square \& \Delta$	$\square \vee \Delta$	$\square \rightarrow \Delta$	$\square \leftrightarrow \Delta$	Row $\square \quad \neg \square$
1 T T	T	T	T	T	1 T F
2 T F	F	T	F	F	2 F T
3 F T	F	T	T	F	
4 F F	F	F	T	T	

C8.

<u>Initial Assignments</u>			<u>Premises</u>		<u>Conclusion</u>	
A	B	C	$(A \& B) \rightarrow C$	$A \& \neg C$	C	
T	T	T	T	F	T	
T	T	F	F	T	F	
T	F	T	T	F	T	
T	F	F	T	T	F	Problem
F	T	T	T	F	T	
F	T	F	T	F	F	
F	F	T	T	F	T	
F	F	F	T	F	F	

Any Possible situation in which ALL the premises are True and the Conclusion is False?

YES, SO INVALID

Exercise 6.2 A2

Callous though it sounds, I do not believe we have an obligation to redistribute wealth to the less fortunate. The reason that I believe this is that what a person earns is rightfully hers. No one else has a claim to it.

A2. Begging the question. To say that no one else has a claim to something sounds like a reason for concluding that you don't have an obligation to give it. But the premise is so close to being the same assertion as the conclusion that anyone who doubted one would probably doubt the other.

**Exercise 6.2 B6, B8 Not
Applicable**

Exercise 6.3 #2

Politicians should keep in mind, when they are deciding whether abortion is right or wrong, that we pro-lifers have big families who grow up to be part of the voting public. Pro-abortionists tend to have no families at all.

#2 Appeal to Force

Exercise 6.3 #6

You say we need to expand Head Start programs? There you go again, thinking we can solve problems by throwing money at them.

#6 Prejudicial language (“throwing money”).

Exercise 6.3 #8

More tax “incentives” for the ultra-rich? When are you going to grow out of that outdated, Reaganite, “trickle-down” mentality?

#8 Prejudicial language “ultrarich,” “Reaganite,” “trickle-down”).

Exercise 6.4 B2

If U.S. antiterrorist policies are effective, then there will be fewer terrorist attacks on Americans. There have been fewer attacks. So the antiterrorist policies have been effective.

B2. Affirming the consequent

Exercise 6.4 B4

Rudi says that the government should provide more jobs for people. He should know. He couldn't get a job on his own if he had to. I had to look for months before I found work. My family even ran low on food. It was humiliating to plead with employers for a job. But I stuck it out and found work, and people like Rudi can do the same.

B4. Attacking the person, appeal to pity.

Exercise 6.4 B2

There is no need for schools to make a conscious effort to select multicultural materials, since every author's viewpoint is unique. Any curriculum that includes several authors will provide diverse viewpoints, and any curriculum that reflects diverse viewpoints will have the effect of a multicultural curriculum.

B6. Equivocation ("diverse viewpoints," diversity)

Exercise 6.4 B8

Two congressional committees have issued scathing reports which condemn about every aspect of the cancer insurance industry and the product it offers to the public. One committee recommended that the sale of cancer insurance to the elderly be banned by federal law. . . . Statements in the report of the committees, as quoted in news stories, are too ridiculous to be taken seriously, although a lot of congressmen apparently are not laughing. Neither should the public be laughing because the thrust of this blatant effort to destroy a private business is a new warning that bureaucratic wrath and bureaucratic thirst for power threatens our very freedom of choice and individual preference . . . and isn't it a bit frivolous to have congressional committees, which will BUY just about anything (\$660 billion worth a year and climbing), advising the public on how to spend \$25 to \$75 a year?

Millard Grimes, advertisement for American Family Life Assurance Company, originally published in the Columbus, Georgia, *Sunday Ledger-Enquirer*.

B8. Prejudicial language (“too ridiculous,” “bureaucratic wrath and bureaucratic thirst for power”), slippery slope resulting in a threat to “freedom of choice and individual preference.”

Exercise 6.5 #4

The company was responsible for sending Bert into the chamber without properly checking for poisonous gases. Clearly, Bert has suffered substantial nerve damage that confines him to his home and makes it difficult for him to carry out even the most mundane activities such as feeding himself. The action of the company has caused him great physical pain and psychological suffering. He deserves compensation.

#4. Is this a fallacious appeal to pity? This is debatable. All that is necessary to establish that Bert deserves compensation is to show that the company was responsible (the first sentence) and that Bert suffered damage. If a poor case had been made to establish responsibility, the arguer must be trying to compensate here by getting the audience to feel sorry for Bert because he can't feed himself. The degree of his suffering is irrelevant to whether he deserves compensation. But it would be relevant to the issue of how much compensation he deserves. So it is not fallacious with respect to issues of amount of compensation (assuming responsibility had been established).

Exercise 6.5 #8

The ease with which the 9/11 terrorists entered the United States illustrates the dilemma we face regarding our borders. We must either tighten border security to the point at which virtually all unauthorized immigrants are screened out, or we will live with an unacceptably high risk of another major terrorist attack.

#8 The question is whether this is a false dilemma. It is questionable whether the only alternative to living with an unacceptably high risk of another major terrorist attack is the extreme border closing initiative that would be necessary to screen out virtually all unauthorized immigrants. A more targeted security program coupled with economic incentives to limit organized border crossing might provide a reasonable degree of security

Exercise 7.1 B2

If the average couple has more than two children, the population will rise drastically. But we should prevent the population from rising drastically. So we should prevent the average couple from having more than two children. *(Note that this argument has been altered from the version presented in Chapter 4 so that the shift in wording has been eliminated.)*

Reconstruction:

(1) If the average couple has more than two children, the population will rise drastically.

(2) We should prevent the population from rising drastically (under all circumstances)

∴ We should prevent the average couple from having more than two children.

Assessment:

The argument is valid (at least if we adjust for “should”). The expression “average couple” in the conclusion might be interpreted as meaning a couple that is typical in a variety of ways—for example, income, education, and so on. Construed in this way, the conclusion enjoins us to *prevent* them from having more than two children. But the term “average couple” in premise 1 is plausibly interpreted as a mathematical construct. Population will grow only if the number of children is (somewhat) greater than the number of people in couples. But this average can be obtained if some (perhaps other-wise typical) couples have considerably more than two children and others have no children at all. Not everybody is a member of a couple, not all couples have children, war and disease take a toll; so premise 1 is true, if at all, only if the average number of children per couple is significantly greater than two.

Exercise 7.1 B2

Equal rights for women should not be constitutionally guaranteed. This follows from the fact that men and women are different physiologically and emotionally. But if this is so, then men and women are not equal. And if men and women are not equal, then they should not be called “equal” by the law.

Reconstruction:

- (1) Men and women are different physiologically and emotionally.*
 - (2) If men and women are different physiologically and emotionally, then they are not equal.*
 - (3) If men and women are not equal, then they should not be called “equal” by the law.*
 - (4) If men and women should not be called “equal” by the law, then equal rights for women should not be constitutionally guaranteed. (IMPLICIT)*
- ∴ Equal rights for women should not be constitutionally guaranteed.*

Assessment:

The argument is valid, but the expression “equal” is used equivocally. As used in premise 3, it means having (or being entitled to) equal legal rights. Premises 1 and 2 depend on interpreting “equal” in terms of physical and emotional characteristics.

Discussion of the Exam Scheduled for Friday, April 29, 9:30-12:30

Last Ditch questions 8:45-9:30, Exam 9:30-12:30

The exam will be **closed book** and consist of a series of short answer questions. For example,

Critical Reasoning Portion—The Bulk of the Exam

- Picking out the main conclusion and supporting premises as in Chapter 1;
- Circling conclusion and premises in a fully articulated argument that contains indicator words or putting them in standard form as in Chapter 2;
- Writing out the patterns for arguments as in Chapter 2 and 3;
- Providing the form of an argument pattern from the list on p. 34-35 and distinguishing *modus ponens* and *modus tollens* from related fallacies as in the self-administered quizzes.
- Adding missing(implicit) premises or conclusion as in Chapter 3;
- Finding a pattern for an argument that is not an explicit version of the 7 in our list of basic argument patterns but may be an extended version of them ;
- Reconstructing arguments in longer passages as in Chapter three;
- Showing familiarity with the Principle of Charitable interpretation **including the addition of appropriate IMPLICIT premises or conclusion,**
- Applying the concept of deductive validity and the concept of soundness;
- Showing that an argument is invalid using the method of counterexample or producing an invalidating alternative as in Chapter 4;
- Casting doubt on premises as in Chapter 4,
- Showing invalidity using the truth-table method,
- Identifying fallacies in short passages and indicating why they might be persuasive.

Short Ethical Reasoning portion

Presenting and criticizing some of the ethical theories we have covered as well as application to case—to be discussed this afternoon

SOME SAMPLE ITEMS FOR CRITICAL REASONING PORTION OF THE EXAM

In addition to tasks like those in the exercises, there will be a few multiple choice questions

- S1** According to your text, if someone appeals to your emotions by describing how badly you will be affected by some action you are considering, this person is
- a. making a fallacious appeal to pity.
 - b. confusing emotion with reason.
 - c. committing the straw man fallacy.
 - d. making a legitimate appeal to emotion.

d How badly you might feel could legitimately be relevant to what you decide to do, but not what you decide to believe. ½ credit for **b** the person need not be making this confusion

S2 The following arguments commits a fallacy.

I favor abortion, but there are some who apparently cannot see that it is justified. These opponents must think that an unwanted pregnancy is the result of sexual indiscretion, and that a woman should be punished for this indiscretion by being forced to bear a child.

- a. State the name of the fallacy committed
- b. Explain why it is a bad argument
- c. Why might it still be persuasive

a. State the name of the fallacy committed Straw man

b. Explain why it is a bad argument The opposing position is made to look weaker than it is. There are many other (perhaps better) reasons for opposing (at least some kinds of abortion)

c. Why might it still be persuasive

You are distracted from looking for an argument in favor abortion (the speakers position) and instead focusing your attention on a weaker argument thereby making the speakers position look stronger.

The “straw man” position is the following bad argument.

(1) Unwanted pregnancy is the result of sexual indiscretion.

(2) If so, women should be appropriately punished for sexual indiscretion bearing the child is the appropriate punishment.
therefore, abortion is not justified

The abortion issue seems to be in the news practically every week. There are rallies and political speeches. Various candidates are jockeying for political advantage by embracing one side or the other on this controversial issue. Abortion raises some fundamental issues that bring into conflict our very conception of humanity and our ideals of liberty. In spite of the importance of the topic, abortion should not be made the central issue in political campaigns. Candidates for public office differ in a variety of ways, some of which are more important to the fate of the country than abortion policy is. If we do not adequately deal with the deficit and terrorism, both our ideals of humanity and our liberty will be threatened. There should be no “litmus test,” no single criterion, in judging people for public life in our complex and increasingly vulnerable world.

(1) There are more important issues than abortion.

(2) If so, then there should be no litmus test.

∴ There should be no litmus test

Valid Modus ponens

Fallacies in Malkin “Bordering on Idiocy”

Prejudicial language yes, but fallaciously so? Are the prejudicial implications true? Is connection between illegal immigration reform and homeland security “fantastically obvious. Have all efforts to promote immigration reform been “blind and dumb.” Probably not.

False dilemma, Either reject amnesty and any form of amnesty or we permit terrorism

Either (completely close the borders or accept terrorism)
don't accept terrorism but don't completely close
the borders.

Your **Portfolio due Tuesday April 26th** should contain at least five (5) items (editorials, letters to editor, opinion pieces, short internet selection, short section from book or longer article, etc); for at least two (2) reconstruct an argument into standard form (with missing, implicit premises or conclusion supplied if necessary); evaluate at least one (1) of those you reconstructed by indicating whether it is valid (using common successful argument patterns or methods of chapter 4 or 5) and if so whether it is sound by casting doubt, if appropriate, on the premises.

On a Scratch Paper Write out the following Patterns –A self test

Modus Ponens

Modus Tollens

Disjunctive Argument

Hypothetical Argument

Chain Argument

Predicate Instantiation

Universal Syllogism

Fallacy of Affirming
the Consequent

Fallacy of
Denying the Antecedent

Afternoon Session

Ethics/Critical Reasoning

- **Reconstructing Conceptual Theories in Standard Form**
- **Criticizing Conceptual Theories: Counterexample, failure to elucidate, incompatible condition**
- **Application to the ethical theories we have covered**
- **Ethical Reasoning Portion of the Exam**

Reconstructing Conceptual Theories in a standard form

When can we consider two people to be married? This is a particularly difficult question in this age which has seen the rise of self-styled marriage contracts and even homosexual marriage. I would venture to say that marriage requires cohabitation. But it also requires having the intention of sharing love—by which, to be explicit, I mean sexual love.

This passage contains an apparent conceptual (definitional) theory that can be reconstructed into a standard form as:

Two people are married if and only if

(1) They live together

AND (2) They have the intention of sharing sexual love

A work of art can be characterized by noting two features. First, works of art are the product of man's activity, i.e., they are artifacts. But unlike most tools, which are also artifacts, a work of art is an artifact upon which some society or sub-group of a society has conferred the status of candidate for appreciation.

Something is a work of art if and only if:

- (1) It is man-made.**
- (2) Some society or subgroup has conferred upon it the status of candidate for appreciation.**

Conceptual Theories: Criticism 1, There are counterexamples

Sample: An action is morally right if and only if it is legal.

$A \leftrightarrow B$

(i) If an action is morally right, then it is legal.

$A \rightarrow B$

(ii) If an action is legal, then it is morally right

$B \rightarrow A$

Remember, to discredit a conditional we need a case in which the antecedent is true and the consequent is false.

(i) **Jay walking in order to give first aid** is morally right but is not legal

(ii) **Insulting a depressed friend to make the friend even sadder** is legal but is not morally right

$A \leftrightarrow B$ a. A film is pornographic if and only if it explicitly depicts the sex act.

Counterexample?

$A \rightarrow B$ *If a film is pornographic, then it explicitly depicts the sex act.*

A film might be suggestive enough to be considered pornographic, but might not *explicitly* depict the sex act.

$B \rightarrow A$ *If a film explicitly depicts the sex act, then it is pornographic*

A medical film might explicitly depict the sex act and not be pornographic

$A \leftrightarrow B$ An argument is valid if and only if it has true premises.

Counterexample?

$A \rightarrow B$ [Valid Argument with false premises]
(1) If Harding was the twenty-eighth president of the United States, then Coolidge was the twenty-ninth president.
(2) Harding was the twenty-eighth president of the United States.
[FALSE; HE WAS THE TWENTY-NINTH.]
 \therefore Coolidge was the twenty-ninth president

$B \rightarrow A$ [All true Premise, but Invalid Argument]
(1) Nixon was president.
(2) Reagan was president.
 \therefore John Wayne was president.

$A \leftrightarrow B$

An object is a work of art if and only if

- (1) It is made by humans;
- (2) It resembles an object in nature; AND
- (3) It is beautiful.

Counter-example?

$A \rightarrow B$

An object could be a work of art, say a painting, but could be non-representational violating condition 2, or be grotesque (rather than beautiful) violating condition (3) but still or it could be nonrepresentational

$B \rightarrow A$

An object could be a beautiful (say graceful) curve of metal that was trimmed off a larger sheet during a welding task (made by humans) and it could resemble a mountain range, but it might not be a work of art, just refuse for recycling.

Conceptual Theories: Criticism 2, Theory does not elucidate

- a. An argument is valid if and only if it follows from the premises.

The theory does not elucidate. “Follows from” is unclear. It could mean either that the conclusion is brought to mind by the premises or that its truth is guaranteed by the premises.

- b. An action is morally right if and only if it is the sort of action a morally upright person in possession of all the facts would choose.

“Morally upright” needs as much elucidation as “morally right.” In addition, it would be difficult in practice to know whether someone was “in possession of all the facts.”

c. Something is good if and only if

- (1) It is happiness itself; AND
- (2) It produces happiness.

Theory does elucidate. “Happiness” is surely better understood than “good,” although it too requires some explanation.

d. A book is pornographic if and only if

- (1) It offends standards of decency;
- (2) It has no redeeming social value.

Theory does elucidate, though, as the history of pornography litigation indicates, it is not easy to elucidate the concept of “standards of decency” and “redeeming social value

Conceptual Theories: Criticism 3, Incompatible conditions

A society is free if and only if

- (1) Everyone is permitted by the society to do as he or she pleases; AND
- (2) Everyone is encouraged by the society to realize his or her potential.

Although the conditions are not contradictory, they might be incompatible if, as a matter of social psychology, people don't really want to do what can help them realize their potential. After all, not everyone wants to exert the effort to get the most out of their education. It seems likely that at least some people will not do what is necessary to realize their potential unless society intervenes to force or at least manipulate them into activities that help them to do so

- a. Listen then, Thrasymachus began. What I say is that “just” or right” means nothing but what is to the interest of the stronger party. Well, where is your applause? . . .

Plato, *The Republic*

Something is right if and only if it is in the interest of the stronger.

The expression “interest of the stronger” needs elucidation. If we interpret “stronger” to mean political rulers, as Plato points out in *The Republic*, then one important issue is whether we are talking about the real interest of the rulers or what they believe is in their interest. Even though justice may be in the *real* interest of rulers, counterexamples can be found in which rulers believe what is in their interest is not right. Hitler presumably believed that the concentration camps were in his (and Germany’s) best interest, but that did not make them right.

Love is a deep and vital emotion resulting from significant need satisfaction, coupled with a caring for and acceptance of the beloved and resulting in an intimate relationship.
Lamanna and Riedmann, *Marriage and Families*

A person is in a love relationship if and only if

- (1) they experience a deep and vital emotion resulting from significant need satisfaction**
- (2) they care for and accept the beloved**
- (3) An intimate relationship results from the emotion, care, and acceptance**

This conceptual theory contains a number of “semi-technical” terms, for example, “deep and vital emotion,” “need satisfaction” and “intimate relationship,” that need further elucidation.

A → B There are plausible interpretations of these terms that permit counterexamples. Some love relationships can exist in which acceptance is missing (a parent might not accept the life of a wayward offspring but still love him or her) or in which the relationship is not intimate. This is especially true if intimacy is construed as involving sexual relationship, continued and regular contact, or sharing of intimate details of one’s life. Longtime friends, living in different places, might not be sexually involved, meet only irregularly and place significant limits on personal disclosure.

B → A Battlefield comrades might be deeply and vitally involved emotionally in ways that satisfy their need for mutual survival, they might take care of and accept each other, and have intimate (though not sexual) relationships in which they share their innermost fears and aspirations. But the relationship might last only as long as the battle or war.

1. Divine Command Ethics

An action is morally right *if and only if* it is commanded (or follows a rule commanded) by God

2. Natural Law Ethics

An action is morally right *if and only if* it is accord with natural law.

An action is in accord with natural law if it promotes the function of human beings, especially the dictates of reason

3. Ethical Egoist

An action is morally right *if and only if* it is in the self interest of the actor.

4. Classical (Hobbesian) Social Contract Theory

An action is morally right *if and only if* it is in accord with the social contract.

An action in accord with social contract if and only if
it is in accord with the rules of mutually respectful
social living

5. Rawlsian Contractarianism

An action is morally right *if and only if* it is compatible with our
obligations and natural duties that would be assented
to in the original condition behind the veil of ignorance

6. Act Utilitarianism

An action is morally right *if and only if* it produces the greatest good
(happiness, pleasure, social utility) for the greatest number
(more than any alternative)

An action is morally right if and only if it produces more good than any
available alternative.

An action is good if and only if it produces happiness (pleasure) in normal individuals.

7. Rule Utilitarianism

An action is morally right *if and only if* it is accord with a rule that produces
the greatest good (happiness, pleasure, social utility) for the
greatest number (more than any alternative)

8. Kantian Ethics

An action is morally right *if and only if* it is accord with the categorical imperative,

An act is morally right *if and only if* it is in accord with a maxim by which the act can be willed to a universal law.

An act is morally right *if and only if* it treats humanity,
whether in the actors own person or in that
of another as an end and never as a means only

An act treats a person as a end *if and only if* it treats the person
as with dignity and respect

Short Ethical Reason Portion of the Exam:

- Presentation of an ethical theory as a conceptual theory
- Criticism of the theory using techniques from CR Chapter 7
- Application of two theories to a sample case.

That's All Folks