

PHL 403 Midterm Review Guide
Very Tentative (i.e., Subject to Change)

The Midterm Exam will take place on October 1st, during class time. The exam will be closed-book and closed-notes. It will consist of two parts: (1) A section of concept- or argument-identification questions, in which I will ask you to explain some of the items listed below, and (2) a short essay section, chosen from the questions described below. I recommend that you prepare at least an outline of an answer to each of the four potential essay questions. I may or may not give you some choice in determining which essay question you will answer.

Reflective Equilibrium	Consequentialist Theory of the Right
Goodness of outcomes as a normative factor (in particular, which outcomes matter?)	Utilitarianism
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Value	Hedonistic Utilitarianism
Instrumental and Final Goods	Pluralistic Consequentialism
Psychological Hedonism	The Epistemic Objection to Consequentialism (and responses to it)
Ethical Hedonism	The Objective Account of Rightness
Value Hedonism	The Subjective Account of Rightness
Theories of Well-Being (and common objections to them):	Hybrid Accounts of Rightness
Quantitative Hedonism	Moral Theory as a Decision Procedure
Qualitative Hedonism	Moral Theory as a Criterion for Right Action
Mental State Theory	The Calculation Objection to Consequentialism (and responses to it)
Actual Preference Theory	Deontology
Ideal Preference Theory	Constraints
Objective List Theory	Consequentialist Responses to the Constraint Objection
Perfectionism	The Irrationality Argument Against the Existence of Constraints
The Total View (and objections to it)	Thresholds
The Mere Addition Paradox	Moderate Deontology
The Repugnant Conclusion	Absolute Deontology
The Average View	The Broad Conception of Harm
Culpability	The Narrow Conception of Harm
Culpability Discount Rates	The Global Interpretation of Doing Harm (and objections to it)
Welfarism	The Local Interpretation of Doing Harm (and objections to it)
Retributivism	Theories of Consent (and objections to them):
Egalitarianism	Actual Consent
Two conceptions of equality	Informed Actual Consent
Welfarist and Rawlsian Challenges to Egalitarianism	Hypothetical Consent
Theory of the Good	
Impersonal Values	
Theory of the Right	
Teleological Theories of the Right	

The Constraint Against Doing Harm
Whether Self-Defense Violates the
Constraint Against Doing Harm
Four Accounts of the Distinction Between
Doing and Allowing (and objections to
them)
The Constraint Against Intending Harm
(arguments for it and objections to it)
Possible Justifications for the Constraint
Against Lying
The Definition of Lying

The Conventionalist Theory of Promising
(and objections to it)
The Expectationalist Theory of Promising
(and objections to it)
The Uptake Requirement for Promising
Possible Justifications for the Constraint
Against Promise-Breaking
The Demandingness of Consequentialism
and Deontology
Options and the Options Paradox

Possible Essay Questions:

1. Egalitarianism
 - a. Explain the difference between welfarism and egalitarianism.
 - b. Is egalitarianism true? Give reasons for your answer.
 - c. Respond to an objection to the argument you gave in 1(b).
2. Doing Versus Allowing Harm
 - a. Explain the appeal of the claim that there is a morally significant difference between doing harm and allowing harm.
 - b. Explain the account of the distinction between doing and allowing harm that you believe is the most plausible. (You may, if you like, focus solely on the particular distinction between killing and letting die. You may also, if you like, focus solely on the case of withdrawing help.)
 - c. Critically evaluate this account of the distinction.
3. Intending Harm
 - a. Explain the appeal of the claim that there is a morally significant difference between (1) doing harm with an intention to do harm and (2) doing harm knowing that harm will occur, but not intending for that harm to occur.
 - b. Explain how the constraint against intending harm relates to the constraint against doing harm: (1) when do the two constraints agree? (2) when is the constraint against intending harm more permissive? (3) when is the constraint against doing harm more permissive?
 - c. Assess whether there is such a constraint as the constraint against intending harm.
4. Promising
 - a. Is conventionalism a more plausible theory of promising than expectationism? Give an argument in support of your answer.
 - b. Defend your answer to 4(a) against a strong criticism of your choice.
 - c. Given your answer to 4(a), why is promising-breaking morally wrong? More specifically, in those cases where it is morally wrong, what makes it morally wrong?