

Introduction To Philosophy 2

Professor Ramsey

Course Objectives

- **Introduction to Central Themes**
 - **Repository For Unanswered Questions**
 - **Is There A God?**
 - **What Makes An Action Right?**
 - **Do We Have Free Will?**
 - **How Do We Know What Is Real?**
 - **Focus On Topics in Metaphysics, Ethics and Epistemology**

Course Objectives (cont.)

- **Introduction to Important Philosophers**
 - **Note: We Study Certain People Because Of What They Said About Important Issues; We Don't Study Certain Issues Because Important People Wrote About Them.**
 - **Emphasis Upon Both Classical And Contemporary Thinkers**
 - **Emphasis Upon Western Analytic Tradition**

Course Objectives (cont.)

- **Introduction to Doing Philosophy**
 - **Ideals of Good Reasoning:**
 - **Clarity and Precision**
 - **Valid Arguments and Defensible Premises**
 - **Intellectual Integrity**
 - **Note: None Of This Comes Naturally**
 - **The Tragedy Of Your Education Up To This Point**
 - **Asking Hard and Dangerous Questions**
 - **Hard Because About Things Taken For Granted**
 - **Dangerous Because We May Not Like The Answers**

Course Objectives (cont.)

- **Appreciation of Our Own Ignorance**
 - **The Wisdom Of Socrates:**
 - “Wisdom Is Knowing What You Don’t Know”
 - **Virtually Nothing Taken For Granted**
 - **Examine Fundamental Beliefs -- Often Wind Up Believing Less Than Before**

Philosophical Method

- **Logic: A Calculus For Good Reason**
- **Clarification, Not Obfuscation**
 - **Distinctions and Disambiguation**
- **Examples and Counterexamples**
 - **Revealing Our Deepest Convictions**
 - **Testing Our Principles and Definitions**

Logic: Primary Philosophical Tool

- **Logic Gives Us Rules For Reasoning**
- **Arguments And Their Parts**
 - **Premises**
 - **Sub and Main Conclusions**
- **Note: Relation Between Premises and Conclusion Is What Matters**
 - **Calculus For Generating New Beliefs On Basis Of Old Ones**

Types Of Argument: Two Main Forms Of Inference

▪ Deductive Inference

- **Validity: If The Premises Are True, The Conclusion Must Be True**
- **Distinguishing Validity From Truth**
 - **Arguments: Valid Or Invalid; Not True Or False**
 - **Premises: True Of False; Not Valid Or Invalid**
 - **Logicians Care More About Truth Preservation Than Truth**
 - **Soundness: Valid AND True Premises**

Logical Schema

- **Symbolic Variables**
- **Some Common Deductive Forms:**
 - **Categorical Syllogism**
 - **Modus Ponens**
 - **Modus Tollens**

Non-Deductive Reasoning

- **Inductive Inference**
 - **Probability: If The Premises Are True, The Conclusion is Probably True**
 - **Inference To Next Case**
 - **Universal Generalization**
- **Inference To Best Explanation**
 - **Appealing To Best Hypothesis**
- **Fallacies**

PHILOSOPHY OF **RELIGION**

- **Preliminary Issues:**
 - **Agreement vs. Tolerance**
 - **Different Religions ARE Incompatible**
 - **Religious Claims Aren't True FOR Individuals**
 - **Reason and Faith**
 - **Unusual Standards For Belief**
 - **Recent Trends Go Against Western Tradition**
 - **Classic Trinity Of Arguments For Belief In God:**
 - **Ontological, Cosmological and Teleological**

The Ontological Argument

- **Background: Important Concepts, Ideas and Distinctions:**
 - *A Priori* and *A Posteriori* Arguments
 - **Existing vs. Non-Existing Things**
 - Everest vs. Fountain of Youth
 - **Possible vs. Impossible vs. Necessary Things**
 - Unicorns, Round Squares and ???

Background For Ontological Argument (cont.)

- **Existence In Reality vs. Existence in Understanding**
 - **Undiscovered Planet Has Only Former**
 - **Sherlock Holmes Has Only Latter**
 - **George Bush Has Both**
- **Perfections**
 - **“Great-Making” Qualities; Properties That Make Something Better**
 - **Key Idea: Existence In Reality Is A Perfection**

Background (cont.)

- **“Reductio ad Absurdum” Argument**
 - **Assumes Negation Of Conclusion To Establish Conclusion**
 - **Show Negation Of Thesis Leads To Contradiction**
- **Anselm’s Definition of God:**
 - **The Being Than Which No Greater Is Possible**
 - **Historical Roots**

The Argument

- **1. God Exists In The Understanding**
- **2. God Is A Possible Being**
 - **Even Atheists Allow 1 & 2**
- **3. If Something Exists Only In The Understanding And Could Have Existed In Reality, Then It Could Have Been Greater Than It Is**
 - **Natural Assumption -- Date Example**

The Argument (cont.)

- **4. Suppose God Exists Only In The Understanding**
 - **Reductio Premise -- Assumes The Opposite Of What Anselm Is Trying To Show (That God Exists In Reality Too)**
- **5. Then God Might Have Been Greater Than He Actually Is**
 - **Follows Directly From 1, 2, 3 & 4**

The Argument (cont.)

- **6. God Is A Being Than Which A Greater Is Possible**
 - Follows Directly From 5
- **7. The Being Than Which No Greater Is Possible Is A Being Than Which A Greater Is Possible**
 - Restates 6 Substituting Anselm's Definition For 'God'
 - Key Point: This Is A Contradiction

The Argument (cont.)

- **8. It Must Be False That God Exists Only In The Understanding**
 - **Rejection of 4 (The Claim That God Exists Only In The Understanding)**
 - **If 1, 2 & 3 Are Obvious, And 5, 6 and 7 Follow Directly From Prior Premises, 4 Must Be Wrong!!!**
- **9. Therefore, God Exists In Reality As Well As Understanding**
 - **Follows From 1 & 8**
 - **Establishes That God Really Exists!!!**

Objections And Replies

- **Gaunilo's Objection: Argument Too Strong**
 - **Proving The Existence Of The Perfect Island**
 - **First Reply: Argument Concerns Only Things In General (Not Any Specific Thing)**
 - **Second Reply: Fully Perfect Island Not Possible**
 - **But What About A Semi-Perfect Island???**

Objections And Replies (cont.)

- **Kant's Objection: Existence Is Not A Predicate**
 - **Attacks Premise (3), Claiming Statements Presuppose Existence**
 - **Reply: Many Statements Clearly Don't Presuppose Existence**
 - **Statements About Mythical Beings**

Objections And Replies (cont.)

- **Possibility Objection: Anselm's God Not Possible**
 - **Analogy With Integers -- No Greatest One**
 - **Reply: Perhaps God Is Like Angles, Not Integers**
 - **We Can't Say One Way Or The Other**

Objections And Replies (cont.)

- **Rowe's Objection: We Must Distinguish Between Talking About Properties Which Make Up A Concept, And Talking About Whether Or Not A Concept Is Instantiated**
 - **Example: Magico vs. Magican**
 - **Crux Point: Anselm Shows That No Non-Existent Being Would Qualify As God; Not That God Actually Exists**

Further Considerations

- **Is It Really OK To View Existence And Non-Existence As Properties?**
 - **Metaphysical Worries About Rowe's Analysis**
 - **Use-Mention Errors**
 - **Confusing Representation With Thing Represented**
 - **Constructing A New Analysis**

The Cosmological Argument

- **Aquinas: 1225--1274; Clarke: 1675--1729**
- **Background**
 - **Sources Of Explanation: Three Options:**
 - **Explained By a) Other, b) Nothing, c) Self**
 - **Principle of Sufficient Reason**
 - **Individual Things & Events Need An Explanation**
 - **Positive Facts Need An Explanation**

The Argument

- **First Version:**
 - **A. Things Are Moved/Changed/Caused By Something Else**
 - **B. This Cannot Go On Forever**
 - **Problems With Infinite Regress**
 - **C. Therefore, There Must Be A First Mover/Changer/Cause**
 - **E. This Is God**

The Argument (cont.)

- **Second Version:**
 - **A. Every Being Is Either Dependent Or Self-Existent**
 - **B. Not Every Being Can Be Dependent**
 - **C. Therefore, There Must Be A Self-Existent Being**
 - **D. This Is God**

Objections And Replies

- **Attacks On First Version:**
 - **Why Must Uncaused Event Be God?**
 - **Reply: Misunderstanding Point Of Argument**
 - **What's Wrong With Infinite Regress, Where Individual Events Are Each Explained By Another, *Ad Infinitum***
 - **Reply: But What Explains Series Of Events?**
 - **Appealing To Second Part Of PSR**

Objections And Replies (cont.)

- **Attacks On Second Version:**
 - **Fallacy Of Composition -- Just Because Members Of Set Need Explanation, The Set Itself Does Not**
 - **Reply: Again, Second Part Of PSR**
 - **But Why Accept PSR???**
 - **Replies: 1) Intuitive; 2) Presupposition Of Reason**
 - **Why Doesn't PSR Apply To God?**
 - **Appeal To Self-Existence?**

The Teleological Argument

- Aquinas, Paley (1743-1805)
- **The Argument: Two Ways To View It:**
- **First Way: Argument By Analogy**
 - 1. Aspects Of Natural World Are Like Machines
 - 2. Machines Are Produced By Intelligent Design
 - 3. Therefore, Aspects Of Natural World Are Produced By Intelligent Design (God)

Key Questions Regarding First Premise:

- **Which Aspects Of Natural World Are Like Machines?**
 - **Solar Systems?**
 - **Organisms?**
- **In What Ways Are These Aspects Of Natural World Like Machines?**
 - **Moving Parts?**
 - **Regularity?**
 - **Teleology!**

The Focus On Functionality

- **Biological Systems And Organisms**
 - **Regularity Plus Teleology**
 - **Internal Parts And Sub-Systems With Clear Purposes**
 - **The Link Between Functionality And Intelligent Design**
 - **Purposefulness Implies Intention**

The Teleological Argument (cont.)

- **Second Way: Inference To Best Explanation**

1. **World Contains Many Well-Crafted Machines With Functional Parts**

2. **Best Explanation For This Is An Intelligent Craftsman/Designer**

3. **Therefore, There Exists An Intelligent Craftsman/Designer (God)**

- **Garden Analogy**

Objections And Replies

- **Hume's Criticisms (First Way)**
 - Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion: 1779
 - **Take Analogy Seriously: Suggests Imperfect God(s)**
- **Darwinian Criticism (Second Way)**
 - **Evolution Provides Alternative Explanation**
 - **Apparent Design From Random Processes: "The Blind Watchmaker"**
- **Teleology Resurrected: "Fine Tuning"**
Arguments About The Universe

Theodicy And The Problem Of **Evil**

- **The Argument Against Western Theism:
Reason To Doubt That A Christian God
Exists**
 1. **Christianity Assumes God Is Omniscient,
Omnipotent, Perfectly Good, And Loves Us**
 2. **Massive Evil Exists**
 - **Moral Evil (Suffering Caused By Us)**
 - **Natural Evil (Suffering Caused By Nature)**

The Argument Against Theism (cont.)

3. God And Evil Are Inconsistent

- **Unpacking The Premise**
 - **God Would Know About Suffering (Omniscient)**
 - **God Could Have Prevented Suffering (Omnipotent)**
 - **God Would Want To Prevent Suffering (Loving, Perfectly Good)**
- **What Sort Of Inconsistency?**
 - **Strong: Logical Inconsistency (Problematic)**
 - **Weak: Evidential Inconsistency**

4. Therefore, Either God Or Evil Doesn't Exist

The Argument Against Theism (cont.)

5. The Existence Of Evil Is Indisputable

- **Suffering Of Both Forms Clearly Exists**

6. Therefore, The God Of Christianity Does Not Exist

- **Note: Like The Teleological Argument *For* God, The Argument Is Based On The Nature Of The World.**

Responses To The Argument And Rebuttals

- **First Response: Challenge (2, 5)**
 - **Denies Suffering Is Real**
 - **Rebuttals:**
 - **Makes God A Deceiver**
 - **Hard To Take Seriously**
- **Second Response: Challenge Premise (3)
In Many Ways**

Challenging Inconsistency Between God And Evil (cont.)

- **Parent Analogy:**
 - **Suffering Is For Reasons We Don't Comprehend**
 - **Note: Doesn't Explain Suffering; Just Suggests How Suffering May Be Consistent With God's Existence**
- **Rebuttals:**
 - **Bad Analogy; Parents Aren't Omnipotent**
 - **Double Standards**
 - **If Good Events Reflect God's Nature, Then Why Don't Bad Events?**

Theodicies: Making Sense Of Suffering

- **Counterpart Theory:**
 - **Just As Tallness Can't Exist Without Shortness, Happiness Cannot Exist Without Suffering**
- **Rebuttals:**
 - **Real Suffering Is Not Context-Dependent**
 - **Bill Gates And Rashid**
 - **The Objective Reality Of Chronic Suffering**
 - **Even If Context Dependent, Only Small Amount Of Suffering Would Be Needed**
 - **Not Suffering Vs. Appreciating Not Suffering**

Theodicy (cont.): Virtue Defense

- **Virtue Defense:**
 - **Virtues Like Sympathy, Compassion, Forgiveness All Require Suffering; God Wanted Virtues, So Suffering Must be Permitted**
- **Rebuttals:**
 - **Virtues Are Not Good In Themselves; Only Good Because They Allow Us To *Cope* With Suffering**
 - **Wrong To Allow Suffering So People Can Exhibit Compassion**
 - **Chemotherapy Analogy**
 - **Virtues Counter-Balanced By Vices**

Theodicy (cont.): Free Will Defense

- **Free Will Defense:**

- 1. Not Possible For Humans To Be Free And Incapable Of Doing Moral Evil**
- 2. A World In Which We Are Free Is Better Than One In Which We Are Restricted**
- 3. God Creates The Best Possible World**
- 4. Therefore, God Created A World In Which People Sometimes Do Moral Evil**

Free Will Defense: Rebuttals And Replies

- **What About Natural Evil?**
 - **Reply: We Freely Choose Not To Avoid Dangers**
- **Challenge (1): We Already Live With Restrictions, But Still Consider Ourselves Free**
 - **Reply: What Sort Of Freedom Matters?**
- **Challenge (2): Why Not Sacrifice Some Freedom For Less Suffering?**
 - **Look At Our Normal Views Of Justice**
 - **Reply: Many Reject Morality Of Preventative Restriction**

Rebuttals To Free Will Defense (cont.)

- **Challenge Validity Of Argument**
 - **Capacity To Do Moral Evil Needn't Lead To Actual Moral Evil**
 - **Why Not A World With Better Characters Who Freely Choose Not To Harm Others?**
 - **Responses:**
 - **Is Such A World The Best?**
 - **Soul-Making Theodicies: The Process Is More Important Than The End Result**

Freedom Problems In Christianity

- **Foreknowledge And The Problem Of Freedom**
- **God Knew Eons Ago About All Our Actions**
 - **We Can't Change The Past**
 - **We Can't Make God Wrong**
 - **So, We Can't Do Otherwise**
- **Reply: Taking God Outside Of Time**

MIND AND FREEDOM

- **Addressing The Mind-Body Problem**
 - **An Inconsistent Tetrad:**
 - **Mind Is Non-Material (Spiritual)**
 - **Body Is Material (Physical)**
 - **Mind And Body Interact**
 - **Material And Non-Material Do Not Interact**
- **Possible Solutions: Dualism And The Varieties Of Materialism**

Two Types Of Dualism

- **First Type: Substance Dualism: 2 Kinds**
 - **Interactionism (Descartes, Popular View)**
 - **Mind And Body Made Of Different Kinds Of Stuff**
 - **Thinking vs. Extended**
 - **Mind And Body Interact**
 - **BIG PROBLEM: HOW???**
 - **Parallelism (Leibniz)**
 - **Pre-Established Harmony**

Dualism (cont.)

- **Second Type: Property Dualism**
 - **“Irreducible Properties” Of Certain States**
 - **Reducibility vs. Irreducibility**
 - **What Sorts Of Properties?**
 - **Qualitative: Raw Feels**
 - **Qualia States: Pains, Tickles, etc.**
 - **Intentional: Aboutness, Truth And Falsehood**
 - **Propositional Attitude States: Beliefs, Desires, etc.**
 - **Deep Worry: Epiphenomenalism**

Problems With Dualisms

- **Neurological Dependency Of The Mental Undermines Substance Dualism**
 - **Drugs And Brain Disorders Should Not Undermine Mental *Capacities***
- **No Sign Of Non-Physical Causation**
- **Craziness Of Epiphenomenalism**
- **New Respect For Matter In Age Of Computers**
- **Explanatory Weakness Of Dualism**
- **Problem Of Other Minds**

Type-Identity Theory (Basic Materialism)

- **Background:**
 - **Key Question: What Makes Something A Mental State?**
 - **Reductionism In Science**
 - **Example: Water Is H₂O**
 - **Core Assumption:**
 - **To Discover The Essence Of Something, We Focus Upon Its Physical Composition**

Type-Identity Theory

- **Central Claim:**
 - **Mental States Are Defined By Virtue Of Their Underlying Neurological Make-Up. In Short, Types Of Mental States Are Simply Types Of Brain States.**
- **Virtues:**
 - **No Interaction Problem**
 - **No Deep Worries About Other Minds**
 - **Makes Psychology Part Of The Natural Sciences**
 - **Evolutionary And Developmental Plausibility**

Problems With Identity Theory

- **Appeals To Leibniz's Law**
 - **Minds And Brains Seem To Have Different Properties**
 - **Reply: Look At Historical Analogues**
- **Material Chauvinism**
 - **Martian And Brain Transplant Thought-Experiments And What They Show**
 - **Reply: Functionalist Materialism**

Jackson's Argument Against Physicalism

- **The “Knowledge Argument”:**
 - **A) Mary Knows All Physical Facts About Color Vision**
 - **B) Mary Does Not Know All Facts About Color Vision**
 - **Demonstrated By Mary's Learning When Seeing Red**
 - **C) Therefore, Some Facts About Color Vision Are Left Out Of Physical Account**
 - **D) Therefore, Some Aspects Of Color Vision (And Other Qualia) Are Non-Physical**

Why Epiphenomenalism?

- **Causal Closure Of The Physical World**
- **No Evidence Of Gaps In Neurological Processing**
- **Apparent Problems With Epiphenomenalism Can Be Handled**
 - **Apparent Causal Role Of Qualia Is Simply That: Apparent**
 - **Evolution Need Only Select For Brain States**

Problems With Jackson's Argument

- **Argument Also Works Against Dualism**
- **Fallacy Of Equivocation**
 - **Two Senses Of “Know”**
 - **Knowledge By Description (Discursive)**
 - **Knowledge By Acquaintance (Non-Discursive)**

FREEDOM AND **DETERMINISM**

- **The Clash Between A Modern Account Of Thought On The One Hand, And Free Will, Human Agency And Moral Responsibility On The Other.**
- **Setting Out The Problem And Some Proposed Solutions**

Premise 1: Universe Governed By Deterministic Laws

- **Matter Obeys Causal Regularity And Laws**
- **No Uncaused Events**
- **Potential For Exact Predictability**
 - **Laplace's Demon/Super-Computer**
 - **Note: We Should be Thankful That The Universe Is Deterministic In This Way**

Premise 2: We Are *Part* Of This Deterministic Universe

- **Plausibility Of Physicalism**
 - **Mental Processes = Brain Processes**
 - **Recall Arguments Against Dualism**
 - **No Evidence Of Neurological Anomalies**
 - **Brain Governed By Laws Of Physics**
- **Note: Even Property Dualisms Admit Behavior is Governed Solely By The Brain!**

Conclusion 1: Human Actions Are Determined!!!

- **Human Action Determined By Brain Activity**
- **Brain Activity Governed By Interaction Of:**
 - **Genetic Endowment**
 - **Environmental Stimuli: Prior And Current**
 - **Laws Of Physics And Chemistry**
- **Brain As Organic Computer**
 - **Complex But Determined Programs**
 - **Potential For Manipulation (Being Sphekish)**
 - **Note: Determinism Is Not Same As Fatalism**

Conclusion 2: We Aren't Really Free!!!

- **Hard Determinism:**
 - **Freedom Requires Ability To Do Otherwise**
 - (Given Certain Background Conditions)
 - **We Lack The Ability To Do Otherwise**
 - (Because We Are Determined)
 - **Therefore, We Aren't Free**
- **Freedom Is An Illusion!!!**
 - **Like A Train That Thinks It “Chooses” To Go Down A Certain Path**

Conclusion 3: We Don't Have Moral Responsibility!!!

- **Ought Implies Can**
 - **To Say You Ought To Do Otherwise, We Must Assume You Can Do Otherwise.**
 - **Determinism Denies You Can Do Otherwise.**
 - **Therefore, It Is Wrong Say You Ought To Do Otherwise.**
- **Responsibility Requires Freedom.**
 - **Comparing Different Cases: Psychopath vs. Stroke Victim**

Replies To Hard Determinism

- **Two Main Strategies:**
 - **1: Deny Determinism**
 - Appeal to Quantum Indeterminacy
 - **2: Deny Determinism and Freedom Are Really Incompatible**
 - **Compatibilism (Soft Determinism): Rethinking Freedom**

Denying Determinism

- **Quantum Indeterminism**
 - Spontaneous Events At Quantum Level
 - Probabilistic, Not Deterministic Laws
- **Responses:**
 - Appeal to Hidden Variables
 - Quantum Indeterminism Irrelevant For Us
 - Is Randomness What We Want for Freedom???
 - How Will Being Spastic Help?

Re-conceptualizing The Problem

- **Initially, Problem Seemed To Stem From Materialism Assumption**
- **But Now, Whether You Are A Materialist Or A Dualist, It Seems We Only Have Two Choices:**
 1. **Thought Processes Are Casually Determined**
 2. **Thought Processes Are Random**
- **Apparently Neither Gives Us Freedom!!!**
- **A Libertarian Solution?**
 - **Indeterminism Without Randomness?**

Compatibilism (Soft Determinism)

- **Competing Accounts of Freedom**
 - **Metaphysical Freedom (HD): Freedom At Least Requires Ability To Do Otherwise**
 - **Moral Freedom (COMP.): Freedom Only Requires Ability To Do What You Want**
- **Key Point: Debate Between HD and Compatibilism Is NOT Over Whether Or Not We Are Determined. It Is Over The Correct Analysis Of Freedom!**

Arguments For Compatibilism

- **How Can We Act Differently From What We Want?**
- **Ability To Do Otherwise Would Never Be Utilized!!!**
 - **HD Analysis Of Freedom Suggests It Would Be Irrelevant To Our Lives**
 - **The Twin-Earth Scenario**
- **Hume: Freedom Requires Determinism**
 - **Alternative Appears To Be Loss Of Control**

Problems With Compatibilism

- **Type 1 Counterexamples: Manipulative Neuroscientist/Hypnotist/Brainwasher**
- **Type 2 Counterexamples: Locke's Room Example**
 - **Being Free vs. Being Lucky**
- **Key Point: We Can Do What We Want And Not Be Free!**

The Debate:

- **HD:** Free acts require the ability to do otherwise; we don't have that, so we aren't free.
- **COMP:** No, your analysis of freedom is mistaken; freedom only requires that we do what we want. We often do this, so we are free.
- **HD:** No, YOUR analysis of freedom is mistaken since there are cases where people do what they want, but clearly are not free (i.e., brainwashing, etc.)

The Debate (cont.):

- **COMP:** Wait, those cases don't count as counter-examples to our analysis of freedom since in those cases, the person isn't really acting on her own wants; instead, the wants have been installed by outside forces.
- **HD:** Oh yea? Well if determinism is true, everyone's wants and beliefs are installed by outside forces -- what's the relevant difference between brain-washing and ordinary childhood?
- **COMP:** Oh yea? Well, your mother . . .

ETHICS

- **The Importance Of Careful Reasoning**
 - **Consequences Of Bad Ethical Thought**
- **Two Critical Questions:**
 - **1. What Is The Scope Of Ethical Principles?**
 - **Is Some Form Of Relativism Correct?**
 - **2. What Is The Justification For Ethical Principles?**
 - **What Ultimately Makes An Act Right Or Wrong?**

Important Distinctions To Bear In Mind:

- **Morally Permissible vs. Morally Forbidden vs. Morally Obligatory**
- **Legal vs. Moral**
- **Particular Moral Judgments vs. General Moral Principles**

MORAL OBJECTIVISM VS. SUBJECTIVISM

▪ Objectivism

- The Moral Status Of An Action Is Completely Objective: Conflicting Views Cannot All Be Right**
 - Not Dependent Upon Attitudes, Preferences or Culture**
 - Moral Claims Are True Or False In The Same Sense As Scientific Claims**

▪ Subjectivism

- The Moral Status Of An Action Is Not Completely Objective: Conflicting Views Can All Be Right**
 - Depends On Attitudes, Preferences Or Culture**
 - Moral Claims Are True Or False In The Same Sense In Which Fashion Claims Are True Or False**

A Popular Form Of Subjectivism: Cultural Relativism

- **The “Cultural Differences Argument”:**
 - 1. Different Cultures Have Different Moral Codes**

Appeal To Famous Cases
 - 2. Therefore, There Are No Objective, Universal, Culturally Independent Facts Or Considerations Which Determine The Truth Or Falsehood Of Different Moral Claims**

Problems With The Cultural Differences Argument

- **Extreme Consequences Of Relativism:**
 - **Can't Justify Criticizing Other Societies**
 - **Can't Justify Criticizing Aspects Of Our Own Society**
 - **No Such Thing As Cultural Progress**
 - **Sometimes Used In Self-Refuting Manner**
- **Argument Is Invalid**
- **Rethinking The First Premise**
 - **Necessary Conditions For Societies**

Important Distinctions To Bear In Mind:

- **Morally Permissible vs. Morally Forbidden vs. Morally Obligatory**
- **Legal vs. Moral**
- **Particular Moral Judgments vs. General Moral Principles**

JUSTIFYING MORAL PRINCIPLES AND BELIEFS

- **Grounding Morality Through Theological Considerations (Divine Command Theory):**
 - **An Act Is Right If And Only If God Permits It; An Act Is Morally Wrong Iff God Forbids It.**
 - **Practical Problems:**
 - **Whose Interpretation Of God?**
 - **Reply:**
 - **Defining Feature Of Morality Need Not Be Easy To Discern**

Problems With Theological Analyses Of Morality (cont.)

- **Plato's Dilemma:**
 - **Is An Act Right (Wrong) Because God Allows (Forbids) It, Or Does God Allow (Forbid) It Because It Is Right (Wrong)?**
 - **If Former, Then:**
 - **Arbitrariness: Torturing Innocent Children Could Be Good**
 - **God's Own Goodness Is Uninteresting (Tyrant Analogy)**
 - **If Latter, Then:**
 - **Morality Is Not Based Upon God's Commands**
 - **Note: Other Properties Of God Also Admit Of Independent Analyses**

Quinn's Rebuttal

- **God's Commands Are Not Fully Arbitrary**
 - **The Constraining Role of *Divine Goodness***
 - **Reply: Does This Fully Remove Arbitrariness?**
- **Divine Command Theorists *Should* Allow Counter-Intuitive Cases**
 - **Historical Examples**
 - **Abraham and Hosea**

ACT UTILITARIANISM

- **Background: John Stuart Mill**
 - 1806-1873
 - From Philosophy Prodigy To Burnout
- **Formulations Of The Doctrine**
 - Mill: “Actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to promote the reverse of happiness”

Formulation Of The Doctrine (cont.)

- **Key Point: Emphasis Upon *Consequences* of Actions**
- **Questions About Mill's Definition:**
 - **“Tend To Produce Happiness”**
 - **“Tend To Produce” or “Produce”?**
 - **Which Things Produced Really Count?**
 - **What Is Meant By ‘Happiness’?**
 - **Whose Happiness?**
 - **Can We Measure Happiness?**

Formulating Utilitarianism (cont.)

- **Introducing A Notion Of Utility**
 - Subtracting *Dolars* From *Hedons*
- **Note: Total Utility Is What Matters**
- **So:**
 - **Moral Acts Can Sometimes Produce Pain (But Overall They Produce Less Pain Than Other Options)**
 - **Immoral Acts Can Sometimes Produce Pleasure (But Overall They Produce Less Pleasure)**

Formulating Utilitarianism (cont.)

- **Revised Formulation: An Act Is Right IFF There Is No Other Act The Agent Could Have Performed That Has Higher Utility**
- **Virtues:**
 - **Captures Common Sense Views Of Morality**
 - **Grounds Morality In Something Objective**
 - **Trying To Derive An “Ought” From An “Is”**

Problems With Utilitarianism

- **“Doctrine Of Swine” Objection**
 - **If Util. Is Correct, Then Only Relevant Moral Consideration Is Amount Of Pleasure**
 - **False That The Only Relevant Moral Consideration Is Amount Of Pleasure**
 - **Therefore, Util. Is False.**
- **Mill’s Response: Introduce A Quality Variable**
 - **Three Dimensions: Duration, Intensity, Quality**

Problems With Utilitarianism (cont.)

- **“Too High Of Standard” Objection**
 - **If Util. Is Correct, Then An Act Is Right Only If It Stems From A Motive To Promote Best Interests Of Society**
 - **False That Right Acts Must All Stem From Such A Motive**
 - **Therefore, Util. Is False**
- **Mill’s Response: Take Consequentialism Seriously (Duties vs. Motives)**

Further Difficulties For Utilitarianism

- **Harming The Innocent**
 - **The “Rawlsian” Alternative And The Moral Point Of View**
- **Trivial Acts**
- **Supererogatory Acts**
- **Common Response: Problems Rest Not With Utilitarianism, But With Our Common Attitudes**
 - **“OutSmarting” The Critics**

THE ETHICS OF ASSISTANCE

- **Preliminary Comments**
 - **Making Philosophy Relevant For Our Lives**
 - **The Controversial Nature Of Peter Singer**
 - **Stepping Back And Thinking About Our Own Moral Integrity**
 - **Do We Have What It Would Take To Do The Right Thing In A Culture That Is Morally Misguided?**

Singer's Argument:

- 1. Suffering And Death From Lack Of Food, Shelter And Medical Attention Are Very Bad Things.**
- 2. If We Can Prevent Very Bad Things From Happening, Without Sacrificing Something Of Comparable (Any) Moral Value, Then We Are Morally Required To Do So.**
- 3. Therefore, We Are Morally Required To Prevent Suffering And Death From Lack Of Food, Shelter And Medical Attention Without Sacrificing Something Of Moral Value.**

Motivating The 2nd Premise

- **Three Cases: The “Shallow Pond”, Unger’s “Vintage Sedan”, And “The Envelope”**
- **The Vintage Sedan vs. The Envelope**
 - **5 Reasons To Think Behavior In The Envelope Case Is Morally Worse:**
 - 1) Cost Is Less
 - 2) Number Affected By Inaction Is Greater
 - 3) What Is Lost Is Greater
 - 4) Victims Are Not Responsible For Situation
 - 5) Victims’ Behavior Is Not Morally Dubious

Hard And Disturbing Facts

- **Number Of Humans Dying Preventable Deaths Daily: 25,000 (1,000 Per Hour)**
- **Age Group Of Most Deaths: Under 6**
- **Cause Of Most Deaths: Depleted Immune Systems From Chronic Malnourishment**
- **UN Target Request For Assistance From Developed Nations: 0.7% of GNP**
- **Nations That Meet Target: Denmark, Sweden, The Netherlands, Norway**
- **Typical Nation: Japan at 0.27 %**
- **Worst Contributor: America at 0.1 %; 0.14 % With Private Contributions**
- **Americans Spend: 14 Billion On Foreign Assistance
50 Billion On Entertainment Industry
379 Billion On Military Budget**

Responding To The Cases (Explaining Conflicting Intuitions)

- **Three Possibilities:**
- **The Envelope Scenario Is Significantly Different From The Pond/Sedan Scenario**
 - **Reply: Modify Cases To Show That Adding Or Subtracting Alleged Relevant Feature Makes No Difference**
- **Our Normal Intuitions About The Pond/Sedan Case Are Mistaken: It Is Morally OK Not To Help**
 - **Reply: If We Know Anything About Morality, We Know Not Helping Is Seriously Wrong**
- **Our Normal Intuitions About The Envelope Case Are Mistaken: It Is Morally Wrong Not To Give**
 - **Note: Many Plausible Explanations For This Mistaken Attitude**

Key Features Of 2nd Premise

- **Irrelevance Of Proximity**
 - Distance May Make Us Feel Less Obligated, But It Doesn't Remove Actual Obligation
 - Appeals To Ignorance And Inability No Longer Plausible
- **Irrelevance Of Others' Involvement**
 - Inactivity May Make Us Feel Less Obligated, But . . .
- **Only Need To Prevent Bad, Not Promote Good**

Radical Consequences Of Singer/Unger Argument

- **Traditional Demarcation Between Duty And Charity Is Mistaken**
 - **Helping Needy Is Morally Obligated**
 - **Immoral Not To Help Needy!**
- **Rethinking Types Of Giving**
 - **Helping Those In Need vs. Helping Those *Really* In Need**
 - **Note: Given Our Actual Situation, Rarely Need To Sacrifice One Form Of Giving For Another**

Objections To Singer's Argument

- **Too Drastic**
 - **Reply: Progress Sometimes Requires Drastic Revisions**
 - **Slavery Analogy**
 - **Congruence With Catholic Tradition**
- **Extreme Socialism**
 - **Reply:**
 - **Dubious Assumption All Socialism Is Bad**
 - **Arguments Requires Only Preventing Very Bad Things From Happening (Not Making Everyone Equal)**

Practical Objections:

- **Always Will Be Starvation**
 - False Assumption
 - Work For Population Control; Contribute Wisely
 - Return To Drowning Child Case
- **Responsibility of Government**
 - Work To Change Government
- **Giving Will Undermine Our Economy**
 - Confusing Two Scenarios
 - All Give: Only Small Amount Required
 - Few Give: Little Impact

EPISTEMOLOGY

- **Exploring Our Access To The Truth; Examining Human Reason, Perception And Knowledge**
- **Three Great Philosophers And Their Different Epistemologies:**
 - **Descartes, Locke and Berkeley**

DESCARTES' PROJECT

(Background)

- **Descartes (1596-1650)**
 - **“Father” Of Modern Philosophy; Multi-Talented Genius**
 - **A Deeply Committed Catholic**
- **The Goal: An Edifice Of Knowledge**
 - **The Inverted Pyramid**
- **The Ground Rules: Avoid Error**
 - **Certainty And Justification**
 - **Chains Of Justification**
 - **Need For Certainty In First Link**

Descartes' Project (cont.)

- **Seeking A Solid Foundation For The Inverted Pyramid Of Knowledge**
 - **Requirement: Absolute Certainty**
 - **Primary Tool: The Wrecking Ball Of Cartesian Doubt**
 - **Cartesian vs. Ordinary Doubt**
 - **Labor Saving Device: Grouping Beliefs By Virtue Of Their Type Of Support**
 - **Questioning Sources Of Beliefs**

Getting To Work: Seeking The Foundation

- **First Assault On The Senses: The Argument From Illusion**
 - **Reply: Senses Seem To Work OK Much Of The Time**
- **Second Assault On The Senses: The Dreaming Argument**
 - **Key Point: We Can't Be Certain That We Aren't Now Dreaming**

Seeking The Foundation (cont.)

- **Third Assault On Senses; Primary Assault On A Priori (Mathematical) Beliefs And (Almost) Everything Else: The Deceiving Demon Argument**
 - **Clearing The Decks With Doubt**
 - **No Source Immune From Deception**
 - **Note: Don't Need To Believe Demon Is Real; Only Possible**

Seeking The Foundation (cont.)

- **The “Cogito”**
 - **“I Exist” Is Necessarily True Every Time I Think It**
 - **Even To Be Deceived We Must Exist And Have Mental States**
- **Other Works: “Cogito Ergo Sum”**
 - **“I Think Therefore I Am”**
 - **Certainty About The Content Of The Mind**
 - **We May Not Know If Thoughts And Experiences Are Accurate, But We Can Know We Are *Having* Such Thoughts And Experiences**
- **Descartes’ Archimedian Point**

Time Out: Reflection On Descartes' Legacy

- **Defining Our True Essence: A Thinking Thing**
 - **Most Influential Account Of Dualism**
- **The “Ego-Centric Predicament”**
 - **Trying To Penetrate The Screen Of Perception**
 - **Avoiding *Solipsism***

Rebuilding The Pyramid:

- **Goal: Establish We Can Trust Clear And Distinct Thoughts And Perceptions**
- **Available Resources: Contents Of The Mind**
 - **Concept Of God**
 - **Ancient Principles**
 - **Reality Comes In Degrees**
 - **Cause Must have As Much Reality As Effect**
 - **An Idea's Source Must Have As Much Formal Reality As The Idea's Own Objective Reality**
- **Next Step: Establishing God's Existence**
 - **Idea Of God Must Come From God!**

Rebuilding The Pyramid (cont.)

- **Next Step: Clear And Distinct Ideas Must Be Accurate**
 - **God Is Not A Deceiver**
- **Next Step: Establishing Truth Of Beliefs About The World**
 - **If Clear And Distinct Perceptions Of World Are Accurate, Then The World Must Really Exist As We (Generally) Believe It Does.**

The Problem With Descartes' Project: The Cartesian Circle

- **Why Suppose Ancient Principles Are Correct?**
 - **Justification Appears To Be That They Are Believed Clearly And Distinctly**
 - **Appeal To The “Light Of Nature”**
 - **But The Reliability Of Things Understood Clearly And Distinctly Is The Very Thing We Must Establish!!!**

The Enduring Problem Of Perception

- **The Representational Theory Of Perception**
 - **No Direct Perception Of Anything Except Inner Representations**
 - **Naïve View: Inner Representations Fully “Resemble” That Which They Represent**
 - **Key Problem: What Justifies Resemblance Assumption???**
 - **Note: Direct Comparison Between Representation And Represented Is NOT Possible!**
 - **Two Questions:**
 - **Why Not Be A Solipsist?**
 - **Even If Not Solipsistic, Why Believe In Resemblance?**

From Rationalism To Empiricism

- **Rationalists: Plato, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, Chomsky**
- **Empiricists: Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Skinner**
- **Innate Knowledge vs. Knowledge Through Experience**
- **Competing Paradigms of Knowledge**
 - **Euclid vs. Newton**

LOCKE'S PROJECT

- **John Locke (1632-1704)**
- **Major Thinker In Metaphysics, Epistemology And Political Philosophy**
 - **Our Lockean Roots**
- **Rejecting Descartes' Rationalism For An Empiricist Picture**
 - **All Knowledge Based Upon Observation**
 - **Non-Deductive Reasoning Instead Of Proofs**

Locke's Arguments Against Solipsism

- **Inferences To Best Explanation: Puzzles For The Solipsist:**
 - **Why Can't We Have Visual Experiences In The Dark?**
 - **Why Can't We Control Sensory Experience?**
 - **Why Is There Always Coherence And Consistency In Experience?**
- **Answer: Best Explanation Is The Reality Of External, Mind-Independent, Material World**

Locke's Account Of Perception

- **Limited (Sophisticated) Representationalism**
 - **Primary Qualities: Motion, Number, Shape, Size**
 - **Features Of Things That Cause Similar Sensations In Our Minds -- We Can Experience As They Really Are**
 - **Secondary Qualities: Color, Taste, Smell, Hot & Cold**
 - **Power Of Things To Cause Dissimilar Sensations (Ideas) In Our Minds**

Defending The Distinction Between 2 Types Of Qualities

- **Atomism And Newtonian Matter**
 - **Physical Things Are Made Out Of Smaller Bits With Only Shape, Size, Configuration, Number**
 - **Scientific Perspective: Geometrical Properties Are What Matter For Matter**
- **Continuum From Warmth To Pain**
 - **Extreme Warmth = Pain**
 - **If Latter Is A Mental State, So Is The Former**

Variance Arguments

- **Basic Strategy: Show That Certain Features Of Our Experience Of Objects Cannot Be Actual Features Of The Object**
 - **First Version (Color, Taste):**
 - **It Is Impossible For Features Of Material Objects To Change Without Corresponding Change In Object**
 - **Thus, Aspects Of Our Sensory Experience Of An Object That Change When There Is No Corresponding Change In Object Are Not Qualities Inherent In The Object**
 - **Thus, Aspects Of Sensory Experience Of An Object That Change When There Is No Corresponding Change In Object Are Ideas**

Variance Arguments (cont.)

- **2nd Version (Warm And Cold):**
 - **It Is Impossible For Features Of Material Objects To Be Incompatible**
 - **Thus, Aspects Of Our Sensory Experience Of An Object That Are Incompatible Are Not Qualities Inherent In The Object**
 - **Thus, Aspects Of Our Sensory Experience Of An Object That Are Incompatible Are Ideas**

BERKELEY'S PROJECT

- **Bishop George Berkeley (1685-1753)**
 - **Eccentric Genius; Early “American” Scholar**
- **Background**
 - **Concern Over Ego-Centric Predicament**
 - **Defender Of Common Sense**
 - **Rethinking Primary-Secondary Quality Distinction**
 - **Critical Question: Why Suppose Any Resemblance Between Ideas And Matter???**

Berkeley's Idealism

- **The Only Things That Exist Are Minds And Their Ideas!!!**
 - **Paradox In Berkeley's Philosophy: Berkeley Viewed Himself As The True Anti-Skeptic; As The Defender Of Common Sense Views; But He Denies Reality Of Matter!**
 - **Crucial Distinction Between Ordinary Objects On The One Hand, And Mind-Independent Matter, On The Other.**
 - **The Former Is Fine; The Latter Is What's Dubious**

What's The Matter With Matter For Berkeley?

- **Hylas And Philonous: Goal Is To Avoid Skepticism**
 - **First Stage: Attacking Naive Representationalism**
 - **Continuum To Pain And Pleasure**
 - **Variance Arguments Again**
 - **Second Stage: Attacking Locke's Limited Representationalism**
 - **Use Locke's Own Arguments To Show The Primary Qualities Are Also Mind-Dependent**

Berkeley's Attack On Matter (cont.)

- **Variance Arguments For Primary Qualities**
 - **Size Depends Upon Perceiver**
 - **Different Shapes For The Same Object**
 - **Degree Of Motion Depends On Psychological Factors**
- **The Failure Of Abstraction**
 - **No Such Thing As Size Or Motion "In General"**

Berkeley's Attack On Matter (cont.)

- **Highlighting The Mysterious Nature Of Matter: The Uselessness Of “Substratum”**
 - **Matter Is Neither Perceivable Nor Conceivable!**
 - **All Experienced Qualities Are Ideas; Ideas Cannot Exist In A Non-Mental Substance**
 - **We Cannot Conceive Of Something With No Color Or Shape, Etc.**
 - **We Cannot Conceive Of Something Unconceived**
 - **No Basis For Inference To Mind-Independent Matter**
 - **Interaction Problems**

Berkeley's Defense Of Common Sense

- **All Qualities We Perceive Really ARE In The Object**
- **We CAN Trust Our Senses**
- **We CAN Know Things As They Truly Are**
- **Objects ARE Real**

Berkeley's Challenge: Unperceived Objects

- **If Objects Must Be Perceived To Exist, Then Do Things Pop Out Of Existence When No One Is Around???**
- **Berkeley's Reply:**
 - **To Avoid This Absurdity, There Must Be A Constant Perceiver Of Everything!**
 - **Only One Candidate: GOD**
 - **Berkeley Converts A Potential Criticism Into An Argument For God's Existence**