

Write your name: _____

	Dusan Galic	Jennifer Kittlaus	Bill Simkulet
Circle the time	M, 9:30	M, 8:30	F, 8:30
of your discussion	W, 3:30	M, 10:30	F, 9:30
section below your	H, 2:30	W, 3:30	F, 10:30
TA's name:	H, 3:30	H, 8:30	F, 11:30

Test on normative ethics

This test has four sections, each containing five questions worth five points each. You must write the answers to the multiple-choice questions in the following blanks. Please also remember to write your name, above.

$\frac{D}{1}$ $\frac{F}{2}$ $\frac{J}{3}$ $\frac{N}{4}$ $\frac{D}{6}$ $\frac{E}{7}$ $\frac{I}{8}$ $\frac{O}{9}$
 $\frac{C}{11}$ $\frac{G}{12}$ $\frac{J}{13}$ $\frac{P}{14}$ $\frac{B}{16}$ $\frac{H}{17}$ $\frac{I}{18}$ $\frac{P}{19}$

I. Ethical Egoism

- What principle is associated with ethical egoism?
 - Every human action is motivated by pleasure.
 - Every human action is motivated by self-interest.
 - Each person should always act so as to derive the most pleasure from life as possible.
 - Each person should always act so as to advance his or her self-interest as much as possible.
- How is ethical egoism different from psychological egoism?
 - It isn't - ethical egoism is the same as psychological egoism.
 - Ethical egoism is a theory about how people ought to act, while psychological egoism is a theory about how people actually act.
 - Psychological egoism depends on ethical egoism, while ethical egoism does not depend on ethical egoism.
 - Ethical egoism depends on psychological egoism, while psychological egoism does not depend on ethical egoism.
- Rachels says that an ethical egoist might have occasion to say something like this: "It is to our advantage to enter into mutually beneficial arrangements with other people. To benefit from these arrangements, we need to be able to rely on them to keep their promises to us. But we can hardly expect others to keep their promises to us if we do not keep our promises to them. Therefore, from the point of view of self-interest, we should keep our promises." Why might an ethical egoist say something like this?
 - to show how ethical egoism requires some revision in our common-sense moral judgments
 - to show that ethical egoism implies moral judgments that agree with our common-sense moral judgments
 - to describe a rival theory's account of the obligation to keep promises, in order to discredit that rival theory
 - to describe how people normally think of the obligation to keep promises, in order to show what is wrong with this way of thinking about the obligation to keep promises
- Rachels claims that ethical egoism is unacceptably arbitrary. How is this claim related to one of the claims for or against ethical egoism that Rachels discusses earlier in the chapter?
 - It shows that altruism is self-defeating.
 - It is in conflict with the claim that ethical egoism is compatible with common-sense morality.
 - It provides an example of how ethical egoism cannot handle conflicts of interest.
 - It shows that ethical egoism is logically inconsistent.
- Suppose Mr. and Mrs. Howell are trying to decide how to spend the afternoon. Mrs. Howell most wants to listen to the opera on the coconut radio, while Mr. Howell wants to play Monopoly. Suppose each of them regards ethical egoism as the correct theory of normative ethics. What advice would ethical egoism give each of them for resolving their conflict of interest?

II. Utilitarianism

6. Utilitarianism says that, in any circumstance, the right thing to do is _____.
 - (A) whatever God commands
 - (B) whatever will be most immediately useful
 - (C) whatever will make you as happy as possible
 - (D) whatever will make every affected as happy as possible
7. Why, according to utilitarianism, does animals' well-being matter, morally?
 - (E) because animals can feel pain
 - (F) because animals have rights similar to the rights of humans
 - (G) because there are legal protections that ensure the well-being of animals in certain contexts
 - (H) because humans are descended from animals, and so if humans count, morally, then animals do, too
8. What, according to utilitarianism, is the relationship between (1) the question "What things are good?" and (2) the question "What things are right?"
 - (I) 1 has to be answered before 2 because what things are right depends on what things are good.
 - (J) 2 has to be answered before 1 because what things are good depends on what things are right.
 - (K) Either can be answered first, and that will determine the answer to the other one.
 - (L) Each can be answered independently of the other one.
9. What is meant by the objection that utilitarianism is too demanding?
 - (M) Utilitarianism requires us to pursue our careers, family lives, and personal projects at the expense of more important moral concerns.
 - (N) Utilitarianism requires moral people to respond to important moral concerns such as helping the less fortunate, while allowing immoral people to pursue their careers, family lives, and personal projects.
 - (O) There are some acts that it would be good to do, but that are not really required by morality - they are beyond the call of duty. Utilitarianism, however, says that such acts are actually required and, thus, demands more from us than a good moral theory would.
 - (P) There are no acts that it would be good to do, but that are not really required by morality - none that are beyond the call of duty. Utilitarianism, however, says that some acts are, in fact, beyond the call of duty, and, thus, demands more from us than a good moral theory would.
10. Opponents of utilitarianism often claim that the implications of utilitarianism, for particular cases, often conflict with the judgments of common-sense morality. Describe an example of a situation (it can be one discussed in class, or your own, and it can be a real-life case or an imaginary one) in which this is this case. That is, describe a situation in which utilitarianism says that a certain act is the right thing to do, but in which common-sense morality would regard that act (the one deemed right by utilitarianism) as the wrong thing to do.

III. Kant's Moral Theory

11. What is a categorical imperative?
 - (A) a description of the various categories into which moral actions can be placed
 - (B) a moral evaluation of certain categories of action, such as lying, stealing, and killing
 - (C) a command that is meant to apply regardless of the purposes you aim to achieve
 - (D) a command that is meant to apply only on the assumption that you aim to achieve a certain purpose

12. Why does it matter how you describe an act, when you are testing it against the categorical imperative?
 - (E) because the categorical imperative determines a unique description for every possible act
 - (F) because you have to be truthful when describing your act, or you will be acting immorally
 - (G) because an act that you would not want everyone to do, under one description, might be one that you would want everyone to do, under another description
 - (H) because an act that might produce the best consequences, under one description, might be one that would not produce the best consequences, under another description

13. Why, according to Kant, do humans have intrinsic value while animals and inanimate objects have only instrumental value?
 - (I) Only humans can be happy or unhappy.
 - (J) Only humans can guide their conduct by reason.
 - (K) Only humans can mold their environment to suit their purposes, such as by making tools or by building shelters.
 - (L) Humans are more evolved than animals or, obviously, inanimate objects.

14. The second formulation of the categorical imperative may be interpreted as requiring that we always respect others' rationality. What does this mean, in practice?
 - (M) always abiding by the will of the majority
 - (N) affirming that others are as intelligent as oneself
 - (O) never using others or their property, whether with or without their consent
 - (P) allowing others to decide for themselves how they and their property will be used

15. Explain how to apply the first formulation of the categorical imperative to the case of making a false promise in order to get some money that you would like to have and would not otherwise have any way of getting.

IV. Social-Contract Theory

16. A central concept in social-contract theory is a state of nature. What is a state of nature?
- (A) a state governed by natural law
 - (B) a situation in which there are no social rules or government
 - (C) a situation in which people are naturally benevolent and altruistic
 - (D) a situation in which the problem of the prisoner's dilemma is usually solved
17. According to social-contract theory, the rules of morality are
- (E) dictated to humans by God for their spiritual improvement
 - (F) the rules that people would follow in the state of nature
 - (G) the rules for treating one another that will result in maximum overall happiness
 - (H) the rules for treating one another that people would agree on for their mutual benefit
18. In a prisoner's dilemma situation, if each person acts altruistically, then what each ends up with
- (I) is more than what each would have ended up with if each had acted self-interestedly.
 - (J) is less than what each would have ended up with if each had acted self-interestedly.
 - (K) is equal to what each would have ended up with if each had acted self-interested.
 - (L) could be more or less than what each would have ended up with if each had acted self-interestedly, depending on the circumstances.
19. According to social-contract theory, prisoner's dilemma situations help us to understand morality because
- (M) it is immoral to behave self-interestedly in a prisoner's dilemma situation.
 - (N) they are situations in which one must think about what the moral thing to do is.
 - (O) prisoners are usually people who have broken some law, and it is usually immoral to break a law.
 - (P) everyone would do better, in a prisoner's dilemma situation, if everyone behaves as social-contract theory requires (that is, behaves cooperatively) than if everyone behaves self-interestedly.
20. Consider the following situation (which you will recognize from the prisoner's dilemma handout):

The people of Los Angeles have a pollution problem. Suppose that one way to partially solve the problem is for each person to buy a pollution filter for his or her car that will decrease the pollution it emits. The filter costs \$100, and has to be replaced every year. Every person would, if he or she had the option, spend \$100 per year to buy the cleaner air that would result if everyone used one of these devices. But no one benefits enough from putting the device just on his or her own car to regard the \$100 expense as worthwhile.

What two features of this situation make this a prisoner's dilemma sort of situation?