I Some follow up on Moral Relativism.
> **A. Small groups** Discuss your arguments for and against Moral Relativism. Agree on one or two and write your group's candidates on the board
> **B. Plenary** Discussion One.

II Rachels Chapter 3: *Subjectivism* (From Tuesday)
> **A. Small Group** discussion:
>> (1) What, according to Rachels is the Subjectivism. He distinguishes two versions: simple subjectivism and emotivism. How do they differ, in what respect are they the same.
>> (2)   Rachels advances two arguments against simple subjectivism: that it cannot account for our fallibility and it can't account for disagreement. Do you find them compelling? How does emotivism escape these arguments?
>
> **B Plenary** Discussion Two
>
> **C. Small Group** discussion:
>> (1) Discuss Rachels' claims that Hume's fact/sentiment(feeling) distinction is a kind of false dilemma. What does he have in mind when he suggest the third alternative the "moral truths are truths of reason?" and offers two cases in which moral judgments stand up to reasons. He presents several cases to support his view that reasons apply to value judgments: that teacher is unfair, that Jones is a bad man, that Dr Smith is irresponsible, that a certain used-car dealer is unethical. Does he give an adequate moral proof in these cases? What more could there be. Do these cases establish that ethical reasoning is possible?
>> (2) Discuss Rachels' analysis of moral reasoning about homosexuality. Aside from the particulars about homosexuality, does Rachels adequately demonstrate that "moral thinking and moral conduct are matters of weighing reason and being guided by them …[and that this] is very different from following one's feelings."
>
> **D. Plenary** Discussion Three

BREAK   III   Rachels Chapter Four: *Does Morality Depend on Religion?*
> **A. In small groups**
>> 1. Discuss the divine command theory that an action is right if and only if God wills (commands) it, especially his use of the question from Plato's Euthophro. Is it right because God will it, or does god will it because it is right Evaluate Rachels' argument Is he successful in undermining the theory?
>> 2. What is the theory of natural law and how was it seen to link religion and morality? What is Rachels' "conclusion" about the theory? A commentator on the Sunday May 10, 2005 PBS program *Religion/Ethics Newsweek* said that the late Pope John Paul believed that human beings are made for communion with God , but that they lost the capacity for such communion (as the result of the Fall) and can regained it as a result of the suffering of Christ. As a consequence, the commentator suggested, the Pope believed that we ought to seek such communion. Assuming that this was indeed the Pope's position what do you think Rachels might have said about it given his comments in our text?
>> 3. The last section of the chapter argues that religious considerations "do not provide definitive solutions to the specific moral problems that confront us." Discuss whether he has made the case concerning the abortion issue.
>> 4. Discuss your view about whether morality depends on religion. How do you handle the considerations that Rachels raises.
>
> **B. Plenary** Discussion of Religion and Morality

Assignment: Read Rachels Chapter 5 *Ethical Egoism* for Tuesday, April 15. **1. Submit** a short essay that takes a stand about the relationship of religion and morality in the light of Rachel's arguments. **2. Post** an item on the forum that (a) pick out and briefly describe a choice or piece of behavior from the video "3:10 to Yuma" (it could be the one you picked for the Tuesday, April 8 assignment or another) and indicate how a moral relativist might evaluate the choice or behavior. **Extra Credit**. Constructively comment on your example or that from another student by posting a comment for the initial posting on the Forum. Your comment should discuss whether moral relativism provides appropriate moral guidance and what this results might indicate about moral relativism as an approach to morality.