

PHI 330: Final Examination, Fall 2009

Instructions

Write well-developed, clear, organized answers to all the questions.

This is an exam that you complete outside of class. In completing the exam, you are free to refer to the readings and your notes, or to talk with other students about your answers. In fact, you are **encouraged** to work together with other students on this exam. But whatever you finally turn in **MUST** be your **OWN** writing, **IN YOUR OWN WORDS**, expressing **YOUR OWN UNDERSTANDING** at the time you wrote it.

Please limit yourself to 3000 words all together. (Word processing software generally can count the words for you.)

Each question counts equally. Submit answers printed on paper -- not electronically, and not hand-written. No fancy stuff like plastic covers, binders, elaborate cover sheets, money stuffed between pages, etc.

✚ DO NOT QUOTE OR CLOSELY PARAPHRASE ANYTHING WITHOUT CITING YOUR SOURCE. (Not even the textbook, or course materials.)

✚ DO NOT INCLUDE MORE THAN A FEW very BRIEF QUOTATIONS OF ANYTHING IN YOUR ENTIRE SET OF ANSWERS. Quotes are not required, and often just take up valuable space.

✚ THE ONLY GOOD REASON FOR QUOTING ANYTHING IS TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT A POINT YOU HAVE STATED IN YOUR OWN WORDS. **THE PENALTY FOR ILLEGITIMATE QUOTING IS "DEATH"**.

If you work with another student in preparing your answers, don't draft your actual answers together, and don't agree on exactly what examples you will use, or how you will express a particular point. When you work with someone, talk over the issues and share ideas, but don't do any outlining or writing together. Don't show your completed answer to someone else in order to help them; there are too many cases in which the helper ends up helping too much and then we have troubles.

Advice

The biggest problem with this kind of exam has been that students write answers that are too incomplete or sketchy. **Don't assume that the reader will "just know" what you're getting at.** Think of your audience as philosophically intelligent people who know nothing specific about this subject.

These questions can all be answered quite well simply by drawing ideas from our class discussions and the assigned readings. You are not expected to go out and find more sources. But you are *not* prohibited from finding more sources.

Your answers are graded on how well they answer the question that is asked. Don't shoot yourself in the foot by going off on a tangent, or by leaving out important aspects of the answer.

Questions

1. Summarize Peter Strawson's position regarding moral responsibility in human life, including the arguments Strawson provides in favor of the position. Explain why that position counts as a version of compatibilism.
2. Describe Pereboom's 4-case argument, explaining how it is supposed to work. What is the argument supposed to establish? How does Fischer respond to the argument?
3. What are Pereboom's reasons for rejecting libertarianism? What are Vargas' reasons for rejecting libertarianism? How are the two sets of reasons different?
4. What position does Pereboom argue is the best one to take regarding MR? What position does Vargas argue for? How are these positions different? Does Pereboom attempt to leave room for an internalist morality in his recommended society? Does Vargas?
5. What exactly is "source" freedom? What exactly is "leeway" freedom? How do they differ? At least two key questions have arisen repeatedly this semester regarding these two types of freedom:

Do human beings generally possess these types of freedom?

Are these types of freedom necessary to being MR?

What views about these two key questions do Kane, O'Connor, Fischer, Pereboom, and Vargas express? (You should explain how you arrive at your answers to this last question, so the answers are not simply "yes" or "no", and in some cases you may have to make some inferences or add some qualifications.)