

**Philosophy 160**  
**Essay Exam 1**

**Answer all the following questions** in three pages. Use 11-point Times New Roman font with double-spacing and 1- inch margins. Do not include the questions, an introduction, or any other information that is not relevant. Just include your answers. These must be completed by 12:00 noon (the beginning of class) on September 25. Keep them face-down during the in-class exam. Hand them in at the end with your multiple choice test and answer sheet. Late exams will not be accepted. You may discuss the exam with your peers, but your answers must be your own work (if two or more exams resemble one another too closely, all the authors will lose points).

**1. Consider this passage:**

"It sure seems hard to come up with a general account of what makes actions morally right. All the people who tried to do this in the past, like Socrates and Aristotle and the Confucians, deserve our respect. Still, I'm convinced that one approach people won't work. This is the idea, based on a passage from the New Testament, that all there is to morally right conduct is treating other people as you would want them to treat you.

There is this guy I went to school with, Max, who creates a lot of problems for this theory. Max suffers from extremely low self-esteem; he has a very poor self-image. Even though he wants to treat other people with loving kindness - even though he always does so - he could never accept considerate treatment back from others. When people treat him in a loving and caring way - like by making him a cake for his birthday - he shakes his head and says "I'm sorry, I'm not worthy." He begins to cry, and he sometimes tries to run away and hide.

You see, Max thinks that he deserves to be punished and degraded. No one knows why, but he wants other people to cause him pain and humiliation. He liked it when the teacher made him stand in the corner, and when the principal gave him corporal punishment, and when the gym teacher made him do pushups until he got sick. Of course, he never treats other people like this, and he certainly doesn't think that would be right. But according to this approach based on the Golden Rule, it would be right for him to treat others like this. Consider: how does Max want other people to treat him? He wants them to degrade and humiliate him. So if the Golden Rule were all there was to morality, it would be morally okay for Max to degrade and humiliate other people. But obviously it would be wrong for him to do this. Therefore, we should reject this approach."

- This passage contains a two-premise argument against the moral theory called GR. **Extract this argument from the text; write it down using numbered lines.**
- Next, **explain your extraction, going line-by-line.** Provide the *rationale* for each of your two premises, one at a time. Be sure to explain GR when explaining line 1. (If you don't think that they are true, save that for later; for now, just explain why the author - or anyone, for that matter - might justifiably believe the premises.) Do not get into the rationale for line 2 when discussing line 1, or vice versa.
- Next, **evaluate each line of your extraction.** State whether you believe it is true or false **and why.** (Do not feel under pressure to agree or disagree with the premises; just state your real opinion.) Go **line-by-line.**
- Next, **evaluate the argument as a whole.** Is it valid? Is it factually correct? Is it sound? What conclusion should we draw from this case about the truth of GR?

**2. DC states that morally right actions are ones that do not violate any of God's commands. Socrates pointed out that this does not really tell us what *makes* actions morally right. One way of interpreting DC so that it *does* tell us what *makes* actions morally right is **theological voluntarism.** **Explain** and **evaluate** this argument, going line-by-line, just as above. When explaining line 1, be sure to thoroughly explain theological voluntarism and the thinking behind it in your own words.**

1. If theological voluntarism were true, then murder is wrong *merely* because God forbids it.
2. But what makes murder wrong is *its actual effects*, including how it causes unnecessary suffering and deprives its victim of a valuable future.
3. Therefore, theological voluntarism is false.

**3. Following the same pattern, **explain** and **evaluate** this argument against CR based on the case of Fauziya. When explaining line 1, be sure briefly to explain who Fauziya was, what society she was from, and what her situation was.**

1. If CR is true, then it is morally permissible for the doctor in Togo to mutilate Fauziya against her will.
2. But it is not morally permissible for him to do this.
3. Therefore, it is not the case that CR is true (i.e., CR is false).