

Philosophy 160
Essay Exam 2

Answer all the following questions in three pages. Be sure to answer all parts of each question. Use 11-point Times New Roman font with double-spacing and 1-inch margins. Do not include the questions, an introduction, or any other irrelevant information. Just include your answers. These must be completed by 12:00 noon (the beginning of class) on Wednesday, November 6. Hand them in at the end of class with your in-class exam. 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:

"I don't know why some people are *still* act-utilitarians. This theory has monstrous implications about what is right and wrong. It leads to doing things that are totally unfair. Consider this example. Suppose the President could enact either of two different tax laws. Under law #1, each citizen would pay exactly 10% of their income in taxes. Under law#2, all members of the President's political party would pay *no* taxes at all, but each member of the opposition party would pay 20% of their income in taxes. Suppose the same amount of revenue would be collected in either case. Also suppose that the pain of paying 20% of your income in taxes is *just over twice as much* pain as would be involved in paying 10% of your income in taxes, but that paying no taxes at all would cause no pain and bring just a little bit of pleasure. With these realistic assumptions, it seems like enacting law#1 and enacting law#2 would be *equal* in terms of hedonic utility. So here's the problem. If act-utilitarianism were true, then it would be morally okay for the President to enact either taxation scheme. But that's not so! Tax law#2 would be totally unfair, and so it would be morally wrong to enact it. This case refutes act-utilitarianism."

- This passage contains a three-line argument against **act-utilitarianism (AU)**.
 - **First, state and explain AU**; define all technical terms associated with this theory ("hedonic utility," "maximizes," "alternatives") and explain how Bentham was thinking about pleasure and pain.
 - **Second, extract** the author's argument from the text; write it down using numbered lines.
 - **Third, explain** the argument, going **line-by-line**. Write a short paragraph providing the *rationale* for each of the premises (you don't have to provide a rationale for the conclusion). Here, say why the author of the argument believes the premises to be true.
 - **Fourth, evaluate** each line. State whether **you** believe it is true or false **and why**. Again, go **line-by-line**.
 - **Fifth, evaluate the argument as a whole**. Is it valid? Is it factually correct? Is it sound?

2. Explain and evaluate this argument against **Hedonistic Egoism (HE)** based on The Case of the Rural Italian Church. Go line-by-line, just as you did on Q1. First, succinctly tell the story that goes along with this case *in your own words*. Then explain line 1. When explaining line 1, be sure to thoroughly explain **HE** and the concept of "hedonic agent utility". Then explain line 2. Then evaluate each premise, one at a time. Finally, evaluate the argument as a whole.

1. If HE is true, then it is morally obligatory for Rebecca to steal the painting from the rural Italian church.
2. But it is not morally obligatory for Rebecca to steal the painting from the rural Italian church.
3. Therefore, HE is false.

3. Following the same pattern, explain and evaluate this argument against **Kant's Formula of Humanity (CI2)** based on The Case of Ebola Quarantine. First, succinctly tell the story that goes along with this case *in your own words*. Then explain line 1. When explaining line 1, be sure to thoroughly and carefully explain **CI2** and the four things involved in treating people as ends-in-themselves. Then explain line 2. Describe how a **Pluralist** might justify line 2. Then evaluate each premise, one at a time. Finally, evaluate the argument as a whole, clearly stating and justifying your own view.

1. If CI2 is true, then it is morally wrong for the CDC to quarantine Casey against his will.
2. It is not morally wrong for the CDC to do this; it is morally permissible for them to do this.
3. Therefore, CI2 is false.