➡ Assignment for Friday May 9. **Read:** Chapter 9 to 238. **Submit: Exercise 8.1**#1 b,d,j #2 b,d,f,j;
Exercise 8.2 1 b, d, f , l , m;

Answers to Assignment for today Check your own assignment. Put a check √   next to answers that are similar, an **X** next ones that miss the mark, and a question mark **?** next to any that are problematic

---

Submit Exercise 7.1 #1f,h**;   Exercise 7.2** #6,#8**; Exercise 7.3** #1j; #2 b,f, j, #3 b**; Exercise 7.4** #1 d.f. #2 d,f.

Exercise 7.1 #1 f,h

1f.   In this context, "equal" is ambiguous. It could mean equal in rights or equal in terms of some other conditions—for example, equal income, equal interest in a lively night life, and so on. The statement is most clearly true if the first clause is interpreted in the first sense and the last clause in the second sense. Using either interpretation in both clauses renders the statement false.

.1h   "Treat students equally" is ambiguous in this context. In one sense, equal treatment might involve exactly the same educational experience. In another sense, equal treatment could be interpreted to allow for differences as long as students had equal opportunity or equal legal rights. Interpreted in the first way, the sentence is true. Schools can't (and shouldn't) treat students exactly the same(regardless of interests, talents, and so on). But it is false given the second interpretation because students can be given (roughly) the same opportunities or legal rights. Further, the second interpretation is vague.

Exercise 7.2 #6,#8

#6. Something is a <u>family </u>if and only:
(1) A group of persons.
(2) These persons have common ancestry.
(3) These persons live under the same roof.

#8 Something is <u>human</u> if and only if:
(1) It has an IQ of at least 20.
(2) It has self-awareness.
(3) It has self-control.
(4) It has a sense of time.
(5) It has the capability of relating to others.
(6) Other (unspecified) conditions.

Exercise 7.3 #1j; #2 b,f,j, #3 b

1j. Counterexample: If all nominees were dictated by those in power, a society would not be democratic, even though it satisfied the three stated conditions.

2b. "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."

2f. The theory does ultimately elucidate, though only insofar as the technical expression "aesthetically successful" is tied to creative imagination. Of course, a conceptual theory of "creative imagination" would also be needed.

2j. The theory does elucidate. Being a work of art is tied to a designation by some groups ("the art world"). How these groups are constituted and how they "confer" the status of "candidate for appreciation" needs more elucidation.

3b. The conditions are not contradictory, but not all majorities are willing to protect the rights of the minority. If such is the case, then in a given context, democratic decisions might be impossible.

Exercise 7.4 #1 d.f. #2 d,f.

1d. *Conceptual Theory:*
    Something is a work of art if and only if:
        (1) It is man-made.
        (2) Some society or subgroup of a society has conferred upon it the status of candidate for
           appreciation.
Criticism:
The major difficulty for this theory is elucidating the concept of a group conferring the status of candidate for appreciation. On the surface, this account would seem to treat any object some group puts forward for appreciation as art. But does a child's mud pie become a work of art
merely because he and his friends proudly offer it to their parents?

1f. *Conceptual Theory:*
A grouping is <u>a family</u> if and only if:
        (1) It is a sexually expressive or parent-child relationship in which people live together
           with commitment in an intimate personal relationship.
        (2) Its members see their identity as importantly attached to the group, which has an
           identity of its own.
Criticism:
Although several terms need more elucidation ("commitment")," intimate,""identity," the conceptual theory is fairly clear. We can, however, construct counterexamples. Two
adult sisters living together could be considered a family, but their relationship need not be sexually expressive or parent-child. A crew in a biosphere or a space lab might
live together with some measure of sexual expressiveness and even intimate interpersonal relationship without being a family.

2d. *Conceptual Theory:*
    An activity is a <u>violation of the civil rights of women</u> if and only if:
        (1) It promotes their subordination on the basis of sex.
        (2) Other (unspecified) conditions.
    Something is <u>pornography</u> if and only if it involves sexually explicit exploitation of women graphically or in
        words.
Argument:
(1) If something is pornography, then public sale of it involves sexually explicit exploitation of women
    graphically or in words. (FROM THEORY)
(2) If something involves sexually explicit exploitation of women graphically or in words, then it promotes the
    subordination of women on the basis of their sex.
(3) If an activity promotes the subordination of women on the basis of their sex, then it violates their civil rights.
    (FROM THEORY)
_____
∴ Public sale of pornography violates the civil rights of women.

    Criticism:
The conceptual theory restricts pornography to material featuring women. Pornography aimed at male homosexuals could serve as a counterexample. Public sale of such material would not seem to violate the civil rights of women. The theory and the argument based on it could be modified to overcome this objection. There remains, however, the issue of whether civil rights are violated by pictures and literature. Are the civil rights of black Americans violated by anti-black literature when this is not accompanied by action? What are the limits, that is, of freedom of expression?

 2f *Conceptual Theory*
    A relationship is a <u>marriage</u> if and only if
        (1) It is a union between a man and a woman,
        (2) It is sanctioned by the state,
        (3) It is in accordance with the laws of God.

Argument.
(1) A relationship is a <u>marriage</u> if and only if it is a union between a man and a woman, it is sanctioned by the state, it is in accordance with the laws of God.
(2) "Gay marriage" is not a union between a man and a woman and is not in accordance with the laws of God.

(3) If (1) and (2), then "gay marriage" is not real marriage. (IMPLICIT)

(4) If "gay marriage" is not real marriage, then it is unacceptable. (IMPLICIT)
_____
∴ "Gay marriage" is not acceptable.

Criticism.
The conceptual theory does not elucidate the phrase "in accordance with the laws of God." There are differences among religions about what this phrase means. If it is narrowly interpreted to demand a religious or covenant wedding, then many widely accepted marriages would not be "acceptable." It would also seem to allow "sham marriages," that is, marriages for the sole purpose of obtaining citizenship (though in some cases these might not be sanctioned by the state) as well as "marriages of convenience between gay men and a lesbian women. Even if we accept the conceptual theory, we could challenge the implicit premise 4. It is not clear that gay union is **unacceptable** just because it doesn't fit a narrow definition of "marriage." Social practices change and evolve over time. Badminton might have evolved as an inauthentic form of tennis (or vice versa) but that is not reason at all against playing it.