INTRODUCTORY HANDOUT PHILOSOPHY 13 Winter, 2019
INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY---ETHICS (revised January 7)
Professor (lecturer): Richard Arneson.
Teaching Assistants: Ayoob Shahmoradi and Tinghao (Shawn) Wang.
For further information about the course, which will change week by week, consult the Philosophy 13 course TritonEd page. Required and recommended readings (other than the Mill readings, which are available online), occasional class notes, this course syllabus, and eventually advance information handouts on the midterm, writing assignment, and final exam will be made available at this TritonEd page.
To access course materials in TritonEd, go to the TritonEd course web page, from the left-hand side of page menu click on "Content." A list of Phil 13 class materials will then show up on the screen.
Lectures: Tuesdays and Thursdays 12:30 p.m. to 1:50 in Warren lecture Hall 2204.
Discussion sections meet once a week: section #1, Mondays 3-3:50 p.m. in WLH 2114; section #3, Fridays 9-9:50 a.m. in Centr. 217 B; section #4, Fridays 10-10:50 a.m. in Centr. 217 B.

The final exam for this course will be a regular 3-hour exam comprehending all course materials including readings and background readings, course lectures, and powerpoint slides. The final exam will take place on Tuesday, March 19 from 11:30 a.m. to 2:30. If you enroll in this class, you must be free to take a regular final exam for this course at this time.

People disagree about moral and ethical issues. These are issues about what we fundamentally owe one another by way of conduct, and about what, if anything, is really good or choiceworthy in human life. We have these disagreements in ordinary life, not just in philosophy classes or in academic journals. If someone says "Abortion is wrong" and another person says "Abortion is not wrong," what sort of disagreement is this? One view is that moral disagreement is disagreement in attitude. One person is expressing a favorable attitude toward abortion, the other is expressing an unfavorable attitude. On this view, moral statements are not genuine assertions, and cannot be true or false. Another possible view is that moral claims are a type of order or command, so "abortion is wrong" means something like "Don't have an abortion!" On yet another view, moral claims make genuine assertions, and can be true or false, correct or incorrect. Most of the authors of the writings we will read in this class assume the third view just described is correct.

Moral codes concerning the right and the good differ from society to society and change over time within any single society. Is there some uniquely valid fundamental standard for determining what is right and good or not? We study two contrasting proposals for identifying fundamental standards. Call them "consequentialism" and "nonconsequentialism." One proposal holds that we should assess laws, social practices, actions and policies by their consequences. What's morally right is always the act or policy that would produce the best reachable outcome. In the nineteenth century, J. S. Mill argued for a utilitarian version of consequentialism. According to Mill, individual actions and social policies are morally better or worse, depending on the extent to which they promote or reduce the happiness (utility) of all humans (and other animals).

The other proposal as to the standard of morally right conduct rejects consequentialism. This family of proposals holds, in a slogan, that the right is prior to the good: We should respect persons by constraining our conduct toward them in certain ways, and we are permitted to pursue our conception of what is good only within the limits set by these moral constraints. Along with affirming moral constraints, nonconsequentialist morality also affirms options. So long as we aren't violating the moral constraints, each of us has wide freedom to choose and pursue our own projects and live as we choose, even if our choices and actions aren't maximizing good consequences. Some nonconsequentialists hold that some moral constraints are absolute and exceptionless: there are some things we may not do, whatever the consequences.

SKELETON OUTLINE OF THE COURSE:
Week 1. We jump in, examining two contested moral issues: (1) whether legal privileges now extended to marriage and married persons should be abolished, and (2) whether we can morally wrong someone without doing anything to the person, just by virtue of what we believe about the person, even if we have formed these beliefs in conformity with the best methods of figuring out what claims are true? We use the examples to explore how we can do moral reasoning.

Week 2. Tuesday: We look at J. S. Mill's utilitarianism, which says, we ought always to do whatever would maximally boost aggregate human happiness. Thursday: Robert Nozick denies that morality requires maximizing anything. Instead morality requires each person never to violate anyone else's moral rights. Moral rights should be interpreted

as natural moral rights and as side constraints on choice of what to do. From the natural moral rights standpoint, any form of consequentialism—not only utilitarianism—looks to be wrong. Nozick adds the suggestion that moral rights are negative duties not to harm others in certain ways not positive duties to aid anyone.

Week 3:
Tuesday: Amartya Sen upholds rights as morally fundamental but holds they sometimes should be treated as goals to be promoted not just constraints to be respected. The first claim conflicts with utilitarianism, the second with Nozick-style libertarianism. Thursday: Consider consequentialism again. If we are always morally required to be doing whatever would bring about the best outcome impartially assessed, is there any moral freedom to develop friends and be partial to them, and to pursue our own personal interests and commitments? Peter Railton answers Yes, there is moral freedom of this sort—not unlimited, but enough.

Week 4. Tuesday: Bernard Williams urges that consequentialism conflicts with integrity—standing fast by what one cares about. What gives a person a reason for action is always a desire she has. Consequentialism can demand that one do something that has no connection whatsoever to any on of one's desires, and is thereby alienating. More generally, moral claims give reasons for action only if one wants to be moral. Thursday: Mill considers the objection against utilitarianism to the effect that maximizing happiness conflicts with doing justice, and justice should take priority. Mill's discussion can be regarded as a utilitarian response to the Nozick and Sen discussions.

Week 5. Tuesday: According to W. D. Ross, utilitarianism (more broadly, consequentialism) interprets all moral duties as duties of beneficence, duties to improve the world. But there are several fundamental (prima facie) moral duties: Don't lie!, Keep your promises,! don't kill innocent nonthreatening persons!, and so on. We can know the basic (prima facie) duties, but knowledge of what to do when these duties conflict is hard to acquire. When duties conflict, there may be not always be a right answer as to what one ought to do all things considered. Thursday: Avishai Margalit struggles with the issue, are there common sense moral rules that bind us absolutely, admit no exceptions, whatever the consequences of adhering to them? He considers whether one should never make a "rotten compromise" come what may.

Week 6. Tuesday: Samuel Scheffler considers what might be the ultimate source of moral reasons to favor one's friends and others to whom one has special ties.

Weeks 6-8. Is there a moral duty to obey the law as such? This means, is there a duty to obey the law, up to a point, independently of its content? A related question: Can states permissibly issue authoritative commands to members of society and coercively enforce them? Some say No to one or both questions. Course readings suggest different grounds for Yes answers: (1) a natural duty account (this comes in two versions—a Good Samaritanism version and a duty-to-promote-justice version), (2) an account building on the Hart-Rawls "principle of fairness," and (3) an associative duty account. Robert Nozick and A. John Simmons pour cold water on the principle of fairness account. Tommie Shelby argues that in racial relations the U.S. today is not a tolerably just society. So in this society duties of civic obligation based on reciprocity among all citizens, which in other circumstances might ground a duty to obey the law as such, do not arise.

Weeks 9-10. We return to questions about the moral duties generated by special ties such as friendship, love, parent-child relations, relations among colleagues and comrades united in a project, and fellow members of a nation state or national community. A central question is whether partiality toward friends, close family members, and fellow countrymen can be morally permissible, and even morally required.

THE AIMS OF THE COURSE are (1) to improve our skills at reading and understanding difficult writings and thinking clearly about complex issues and writing about those issues (2) to become more aware of the structure of our own moral views and of moral positions opposed to our own.

COURSE TEXTS: All course readings are available for downloading at the course TritonEd page, except for Mill's *Utilitarianism,* which is available on line at a link provided (see Schedule of lecture topics and readings, weeks 1 and 3).

READINGS & FURTHER RECOMMENDED READINGS. The required readings for each class are listed as "Readings" or (in two cases) "Background readings" on the Schedule of Lecture Topics and Readings below. Background readings are required, but will not be fair game for I-Clicker quizzes or in-class writing exercises. For some classes there will be a further list of "Recommended readings" in smaller print—like this. These MERELY RECOMMENDED NOT REQUIRED

readings will not show up on exams. They are optional. I include them for anyone who wants to explore the topic for that day a bit further.

CLICKERS QUESTIONS & IN-CLASS WRITING EXERCISES. At some points during lectures an I-clicker question will be posed, and so each enrolled student must have an iclicker for this course. Some of these questions will test your understanding of some feature of the reading for that class or of the day's lecture; for these, you get credit both for answering and for answering correctly. Sometimes open-ended discussion or food-for-thought questions might be posed; for these types of question, your participation will count but no assessment of your answer will be made. In addition, sometimes students at lecture will be asked to do in-class writing exercises, which will be collected and count toward class participation and performance for that day. The point of these writing exercises is to get us actively thinking about course materials.

NO USE OF ELECTRONIC DEVICES (COMPUTERS, I-PHONES, I-PADS AND SO ON) is permitted during class. If you want to take notes during class, you can use pens and paper. This rule applies to lectures and also to section meetings.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS: Attendance at lectures is required, but will not affect the course grade except as it registers in the Clicker quizzes and in-class writing exercises. Regular participation in discussion section meetings is required. There will be a midterm takehome exam (about 1500 words) in class (due on Thursday of week 3), a short writing assignment (about 2000 words), topics to be assigned in lecture, and a regular comprehensive final examination. On your exams and the writing assignment you will be graded according to the clarity of your prose, the cogency of your arguments, and the soundness of the understanding of course materials that you exhibit. The final examination will comprehend all course materials including required & background readings, lectures, and powerpoint slides accompanying lectures and posted at the course Triton-Ed page.

GRADING: Your participation in discussion section meetings counts for 10 percent of your overall course grade; I-Clickers quizzes and in-class writing exercises at lecture classes count for 15 per cent of your final course grade, the midterm takehome exam counts for 15 per cent, the writing assignment for 25 per cent, and the final examination for 35 per cent.

Only medical excuses certified by a note from your physician or a comparable certified excuse will be accepted for late submission of the writing assignment or absence from the midterm exam, or to justify the assignment of an Incomplete course grade.

GRADING FOR PASS/NOT PASS STUDENTS. If you are enrolled in this course on a pass/not pass basis, and have an A minus or better average on the midterm takehome exam, the writing assignment, lecture participation, and section participation, going into the final exam, you have already earned a PASS grade in the course and are excused form taking the final exam. Be sure to check with your TA if you believe you have qualified to pass the course without taking the final exam as just described, to make sure there are no misunderstandings.

DISCUSSION SECTIONS. A discussion meeting for each section will occur once a week. Participation and performance at section meetings will contribute to your course grade Your TA will explain the details. Apart from grades, the discussion sections are essential to the learning process because they provide the opportunity for a structured dialogue in which your opinions on ethical issues can be expressed, debated, and clarified. Helped by your TA, you learn from your classmates and they from you. Also, the TA will offer a different perspective on the issues from what the lectures provide.

DISABILITY. If you have a certified disability that requires accommodation, you should register with the campus Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD) and provide me a current Authorization for Accommodation (AFA) letter issued by that Office. A copy of this same letter should also be given to the OSD liaison person in the Philosophy Department at the start of the term, so accommodation can be arranged,. Please let me know your disability status at the start of the course, so I can work with the office to comply with the accommodation it stipulates as appropriate.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY. Integrity of scholarship is essential for an academic community. The University expects that both faculty and students will honor this principle and in so dong protect the validity of University intellectual work. For students, this means that all academic work will be done by the individual to whom it is assigned, without unauthorized aid of any kind. No dishonesty or cheating, in other words. See the University Policy on academic Integrity at http://students.ucsd.edu/academics/academic-integrity/index.html/

OFFICE HOURS: You are welcome and encouraged to come to my (Arneson's) office hours or those of your TA whenever you want to talk about the course material and themes, the assignments, or any other course-related concerns you have.

Writing: Your success in this class will depend in part on your ability to express yourself clearly. The course readings provide exemplars of clear philosophical writing. At the TritonEd course page are some handouts with tips about how to write philosophy essays. As you work on your writing assignment (due on Tuesday, November 21 (the Tuesday just before Thanksgiving holiday). your TAs and I can help you talk through your ideas. Another resource is the UCSD Writing Center (located at 127 Mandeville; writingcenter@ucsd.edu). Their staff can help you with drafts of essays and generally provide advice for you at all stages of the writing process.

SCHEDULE OF LECTURE TOPICS AND READINGS
Note: All readings are available at the TritonEd course page, except for the Mill reading, excerpts from *Utilitarianism* (week 2), available online

Week 1. January 7-13.
TUESDAY: Introduction to moral argument. A criticism of marriage as traditionally understood and a rejection of state recognition of marriage in any form. Can there be correct answers to moral disputes? Moral reasoning seeks reflective equilibrium.
Reading: Clare Chambers, "Marriage as a Violation of Equality." Background reading: Jonathan Glover, "The Scope and Limits of Moral Argument."
Recommended reading: Thomas Nagel, "Right and Wrong"; John Rawls, "Some Remarks on Moral Theory"; Ralph Wedgwood, "Is Civil Marriage Illiberal?"; Douglas Husak, "Liberal Neutrality, Autonomy, and Drug Prohibitions."
THURSDAY: Another moral issue to illustrate methods of moral reasoning. Can we wrong a person without doing anything at all, just by virtue of our beliefs about the person, even if those beliefs are formed in conformity with the best methods for figuring out what is true?
Reading: Rima Basu, What We Epistemically Owe to One Another." Same background Glover reading as for Tuesday.
Recommended reading: George Sher, "A Wild West of the Mind"; also Russ Shafer-Landau, "Introduction" to his *The Fundamentals of Ethics.*

Week 2. January 14-20.
TUESDAY: Mill's utilitarianism. The right and the good. Utilitarianism: what is morally right is maximally bringing about what is good.
Reading: J. S. Mill, *Utilitarianism*, chapters 1 & 2. Available at http://www.utilitarianism.com/mill1.htm
Recommended reading: Robert Nozick, "The Experience Machine"; Richard Kraut, "Desire and the Human Good."
THURSDAY: Moral rights; natural moral rights; rights as side constraints.
Reading: Robert Nozick, "Moral Constraints and Moral Goals," chapter 3 of his *Anarchy, State, and Utopia.*
Recommended reading: Richard Arneson, "Side Constraints, Lockean Individual Rights, and the Moral Basis of libertarianism."

Week 3. January 21-27.
TUESDAY:**.** Amartya Sen against welfarist consequentialism & absolutist constraint-based deontology. Tradeoffs; overriding rights.
Reading: Amartya Sen, "Rights and Agency," sections 1-4 only.
THURSDAY: MIDTERM TAKEHOME EXAM DUE IN CLASS & AT TUNITIN
Thursday: Is reasonable commitment to our projects and to those we love compatible with overriding commitment to impartial morality and some alienation from anything we now believe and value?
Reading: Peter Railton, "Alienation, Consequentialism, and the Demands of Morality."

Week 4. January 28-February 3. These classes will be taught by guest lecturers.
TUESDAY. Integrity; reasons and desires; what we care about and the perhaps limited authority of morality.
Reading: Bernard Williams , "Consequentialism and Integrity."
THURSDAY: Utilitarianism and justice; utilitarianism & consequentialism; arguments against consequentialism.
Reading: Mill, *Utilitarianism*, chapter 5. Available at http://www.utilitarianism.com/mill5.htm
Recommended reading: Russ Shafer-Landau, "Consequentialism: Its Difficulties."

Week 5. February 4-10.
TUESDAY: Pluralism and a morality of pro tanto duties (any of which can be overridden in any particular circumstances by any combination of the others).
Reading: W. D. Ross, "What Makes Right Acts Right?"
Recommended reading: Brad Hooker, *Ideal Code, Real World,* excerpts; also Russ Shafer-Landau, "Ethical pluralism & prima facie duties."
THURSDAY: Are there any moral absolutes, any exceptionless moral requirements?
Reading: Avishai Margalit, excerpts from *On Compromise and Rotten Compromises.*

Week 6. February 11-17.
TUESDAY: What makes it the case that we have special duties to friends, closer family members, and so on?
Reading: Samuel Scheffler, "Relationships and Responsibilities."
Recommended reading: Richard Arneson, "Consequentialism versus Special Ties Partiality."
THURSDAY: What, if anything, makes state coercion of members of society morally acceptable? Can there be a duty to obey the law?
Reading: Christopher Wellman, "Liberalism, Samaritanism, and Political Legitimacy."

Week 7. February 18-24.
TUESDAY: Is there a duty to obey the law? The principle of fairness and the duty to obey the law.
Reading: Reading: Robert Nozick, "The Principle of Fairness," A. John Simmons, "The Principle of Fair Play."
Background reading: Richard Arneson, "Paternalism and the Principle of Fairness."
THURSDAY: Is there a duty to obey the law? The natural duty account.
Reading: Jeremy Waldron, "Special Ties and Natural Duties."

Week 8. February 25-March 3.
TUESDAY: Is there a duty to obey the law? The special associative tie account.
Reading: Samuel Scheffler, "Membership and Political Obligation."
THURSDAY: The obligation to obey the law and the circumstances of African-American ghetto residents,
Reading: Tommie Shelby: "Justice, Deviance, and the Dark Ghetto."

WEEK 9: March 4-10.
TUESDAY: Writing Assignment due via Turnitin.
TUES: Puzzles of friendship and love.
Reading: Harry Frankfurt, "Some Mysteries of Love."
Recommended reading: Niko Kolodny, "Love as Valuing a Relationship."
THUR: Friendship, love, and morally justified partiality.
Reading: Niko Kolodny, "Which Relationships Justify Partiality? General Considerations and Problem Cases."

Week 10. March 11-17.
TUESDAY: National and patriotic partiality.
Reading: Thomas Hurka, "The Justification of National Partiality."
Recommended reading: David Miller, "In Defense of Nationality."
Further Recommended reading: Michael Blake: "Distributive Justice, State Coercion, and Autonomy."
THURSDAY: Is patriotism immoral? Defending extreme cosmopolitanism.
Reading: Richard Arneson, "Extreme Cosmopolitanism Defended."
Recommended reading: Richard Arneson, "Is Patriotism Immoral?"

Arneson's office hours: Wednesdays 2-3 & Fridays 3:00-4:00 in HSS 8057.
Arneson's email: rarneson@ucsd.edu