

Final Examination Study Guide

25 April 2011

The final exam will be offered at two times:

- **Thursday 5 May 2011 2pm-5pm LC 317**
- **Saturday 7 May 2011 9am-12noon Davies Auditorium**

- You may take the exam on either date, but you may only take the exam once.
- Students who take the exam on the earlier date will be required to sign a pledge not to discuss its content with those who have not yet taken the exam.
- The contents of the two exams will overlap by somewhere between 25% and 75%.
- Arrangements for students who require accommodations have been made through the Resource Office of Disabilities. If you are a student for whom such accommodations are required, and you have not yet been informed of these arrangements, please contact judith.york@yale.edu

The final exam will consist of **three sorts of questions**:

- (A) Brief (2-4 sentence) definitions or other short-answer questions drawn from among the topics that appear in items (1), (2) and (3) of the study guide.
 - There will be between 10 and 15 of these questions
 - Each of these questions will be worth between 1 and 3 points for a total of 25-30 points
 - You should expect to spend roughly 1-3 minutes answering each of these questions
 - You should expect to spend a bit under 45 minutes on this part of the exam
- (B) Longer (5-7 sentence) discussions drawn from among the topics that appear in items (4) and (5) of the study guide.
 - There will be between 5 and 10 of these questions
 - Each of these questions will be worth roughly 5 points, for a total of 30-35 points
 - You should expect to spend roughly 5-7 minutes answering each of these questions
 - You should expect to spend a bit over 45 minutes on this part of the exam
- (C) Essay questions
 - Four essay questions will appear on the exam, selected from among the questions listed in item (6) below
 - You will be asked to answer two of these questions
 - Each of these questions will be worth 20 points, for a total of 40 points
 - You should expect to spend roughly 30 minutes answering each of these questions
 - You should expect to spend roughly 60 minutes on this part of the exam

(1) BASIC HISTORICAL FACTS

For each of the six historical thinkers that we read (Plato, Aristotle, Epictetus, Thomas Hobbes, Immanuel Kant, John Stuart Mill), be sure you know the following:

- The name of the work(s) by that author from which we read excerpts: e.g. Plato: *The Republic*, *The Phaedrus*; Hobbes: *Leviathan*. (For works not originally written in English, any standard translation of the title is fine: e.g. Kant: *Grounding/Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*.)
- The century in which the author completed the work that we read, e.g. 4th century BCE; 17th century CE.. (You do not need to know exact dates – just century.)
- The language in which the text that we read was originally composed, e.g. Plato, Aristotle: Greek; Kant: German.

On the exam, you will be provided with the name of one or more of these authors, and asked to provide some or all of the information above. This will not be a high-point-value question, but something of this kind will appear on all versions of the exam.

(2) BASIC PHILOSOPHICAL TERMS AND CONCEPTS

For each of the following concept-pairs, be sure that you understand the difference between them.

- Normative/descriptive
- Valid/sound
- Necessary/sufficient

On the exam, you may be provided with one or more of these concept-pairs, and asked to provide an example that reveals that you understand the difference between them. E.g. “Give two examples of arguments, each with the same first premise, one of which is valid but not sound, the other of which is both sound and valid.”

On the exam, you may be provided with one or more example-pairs, and asked to apply the relevant concept-pair to them. E.g. “Label each of the following statements as either normative or descriptive: ‘Cats are mammals.’ ‘Dogs have tails.’ ‘Cats should rule the world.’”

© Yale University 2012. Most of the lectures and course material within Open Yale Courses are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 license. Unless explicitly set forth in the applicable Credits section of a lecture, third-party content is not covered under the Creative Commons license. Please consult the Open Yale Courses Terms of Use for limitations and further explanations on the application of the Creative Commons license.

For each of the following terms, concepts and examples, you should be prepared to provide a brief (2-4 sentence) definition of the term or concept (with examples where appropriate), or a brief (2-4 sentence) description of the example.

Note: Terms, concepts and examples are grouped together by source in order to facilitate studying, but you should make sure that you understand each item individually.

Term, concept or example	Author and/or date of reading guide or lecture where you might find more information	Remarks
precommitment mechanism	Ariely (1/11)	
moral hypocrisy moral integrity	Batson (1/13)	
confabulation	Haidt (1/18)	
Linda the Bankteller case Asian disease problem attribute substitution heuristic	Kahneman (1/20) [see also Sunstein (3/1)]	
Grand Canyon skywalk case Charles and the slime case Alief	Gendler (1/20)	
wisdom courage moderation justice	Plato (1/25)	these are the four cardinal Greek virtues: you should know which “part(s) of the soul” each involves
virtues of thought virtues of character	Aristotle (1/25)	
progress principle adaptation principle	Haidt (1/25)	
PTSD berserk <i>mênis</i>	Shay (1/27)	
Harlow studies Bowlby studies	Haidt (2/1)	
forming a “we”	Nozick (2/1)	
classical conditioning (including unconditioned stimulus/response and conditioned stimulus/response)	Kazdin (2/8)	
operant conditioning (including reinforcement, punishment and extinction)	Kazdin (2/8)	
QALMRI	DirEx 5&6	
sunk costs	Nozick (2/15)	
Ulysses and the sirens	Lecture (2/15)	

Open Yale courses

© Yale University 2012. Most of the lectures and course material within Open Yale Courses are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 license. Unless explicitly set forth in the applicable Credits section of a lecture, third-party content is not covered under the Creative Commons license. Please consult the Open Yale Courses Terms of Use for limitations and further explanations on the application of the Creative Commons license.

deontology virtue ethics		for this question, we are just looking for a brief (2-4 sentence) characterization of each
good will inclination	Kant (2/22)	
transplant case bystander case trolley driver case fat man case “rights trump utilities”	Thomson (2/24)	
personal dilemma impersonal dilemma	Greene (3/1)	
constitutive luck circumstantial luck resultant luck causal luck	Nagel (3/3)	
deterrence retribution restitution rehabilitation	Various (3/22 & 3/24)	
telishment	Rawls (3/22)	
accidental wrongdoing negligent wrongdoing intentional wrongdoing	Darley (3/24)	
State of Nature First Law of Nature Second Law of Nature	Hobbes (3/29)	
Hume’s marsh-draining game tit-for-tat strategy	Shepsle & Bonchek (3/31)	
historical principle end-result principle Wilt Chamberlain example	Nozick (4/7)	
WEIRD subjects	Henrich et al (4/12)	
social norm norm entrepreneur	Sunstein (4/12)	

For each of the following studies, examples or concepts, be prepared to write a mid-length (5-7 sentence) paragraph describing the study, example or concept and explaining its significance. (In the case of the psychology studies, you may find it helpful to think about your answer in the form of a brief QALMRI. You do not need to remember the details of the set-up, or the nuances of the subtasks: just the basic structure and conclusions.)

Study, concept or example	Author and/or date of reading guide or lecture where you might find more information
Glaucon's challenge	Plato (1/13)
Batson coin flip studies	Batson (1/13)
Mischel marshmallow studies	Haidt (1/18) cf. (2/15)
Wason selection task	Evans (1/18) cf. (1/20)
System I/System II	Kahneman (1/20)
flow	Csikszentmihaly/Haidt/Annas (various)
<i>eudaimonia</i>	Aristotle (1/25)
virtue as a mean	Aristotle (1/25)
Milgram experiments	Milgram (1/27)
Stockdale's use of Epictetus' doctrines	Stockdale (2/3)
"retraining the elephant"	Haidt (2/8)
fundamental attribution error	Doris (2/10)
hyperbolic discounting	Ainslie/Nozick (2/15)
Omelas	Le Guin (2/17)
Greatest Happiness Principle	Mill (2/17)
Categorical Imperative	Kant (2/22)
crying baby case	Greene (3/1)
Lucky/Unlucky Alert & Lucky/Unlucky Cell Phone	Nagel/lecture (3/3)
ducking vs. shielding	Boorse & Sorensen (3/3)
tragedy of the commons	Various (3/31)
original position / veil of ignorance	Rawls (4/5)
reflective equilibrium	Rawls (4/5)
First and Second Principles of Justice	Rawls (4/5)
justice in holdings	Nozick (4/7)
Lockean Proviso	Nozick (4/7)
pure, perfect and imperfect procedural justice	Lecture (4/7)
banning of imitative poetry	Plato (4/14)
Myth of Er	Plato (4/14)

For each of the following quotations, be prepared to identify its author and the work in which it appeared, and to briefly (in 5-7 sentences) discuss its significance in the context of the relevant lecture or text.

Note: part of the purpose of this assignment is to encourage you to look back over the lecture slides and the readings. So even if you are studying for the exam in a group, do download the slides and take a look at these quotations in the contexts in which they were presented in lecture, as well as in the original texts.

- (a) “Leontius, the son of Aglaion, was going up from the Piraeus along the outside of the North Wall when he saw some corpses lying at the executioner's feet. He had an appetite to look at them, but at the same time he was disgusted and turned away. For a time he struggled with himself and covered his face, but finally, overpowered by the appetite, he pushed his eyes wide open and rushed towards the corpses saying, ‘Look for yourselves, you evil wretches, take your fill of the beautiful sight!’” [See Lecture of 01.18.11]
- (b) “We learn a craft by producing the same product that we must produce when we have learned it: we become builders, for instance, by building, and we become harpists by playing the harp. Similarly, then, we become just by doing just actions, temperate by doing temperate actions, brave by doing brave actions.” [See Lecture of 01.27.11]
- (c) “When a leader destroys the legitimacy of the army’s moral order by betraying ‘what’s right’ (thémis) he inflicts manifold injuries on his men.” [See Lecture of 01.27.11]
- (d) “I observed a mature and initially poised businessman enter the laboratory smiling and confident. Within 20 minutes he was reduced to a twitching, stuttering wreck. He constantly pulled his earlobe, and twisted his hands. At one point he pushed his fist into his forehead and muttered: “Oh God, let’s stop it.” And yet he continued to respond to every word of the experimenter, and obeyed to the end.” [See Lecture of 02.01.11]
- (e) “When you are about to take some sort of action, remind yourself what sort of action it is. If you are going to take a bath, put before your mind what happens at baths. There are people who splash, people who jostle, people who are insulting. Say: “I want to take a bath and to keep my choices in accord with nature...I cannot [be]... annoyed with things that happen.” [See Lecture of 02.03.11]
- (f) “For actions...to be done temperately or justly it does not suffice that they themselves have the right qualities. Rather, the agent must also be in the right state when he does them... First, he must know that he is doing virtuous actions. Second, he must decide on them, and decide on them for themselves. Third, he must do them from a firm and unchanging state.” [See Lecture of 02.10.11]
- (g) “The mark of a principle is that it ties the decision whether to do an immediate particular act...to a whole class of actions of which the principle makes it part. This act now stands for the whole class.” [See Lecture of 02.15.11]
- (h) “The motive has nothing to do with the morality of the action. He who saves another creature from drowning does what is morally right, whether his motive be duty or the hope of being paid for his trouble.” [See Lecture of 02.15.11]

© Yale University 2012. Most of the lectures and course material within Open Yale Courses are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 license. Unless explicitly set forth in the applicable Credits section of a lecture, third-party content is not covered under the Creative Commons license. Please consult the Open Yale Courses Terms of Use for limitations and further explanations on the application of the Creative Commons license.

- (i) “An action done from duty has its moral worth, not in the purpose that is to be attained by it, but in the maxim according to which the action is determined” [See Lecture of 02.22.11]
- (j) “It is intuitively plausible that people cannot be morally assessed for what is not their fault, or for what is due to factors beyond their control.” [See Lecture of 03.03.11]
- (k) “The conditions demarcating retribution explain what otherwise appears to be a ludicrous phenomenon. If someone sentenced to death falls perilously ill or... attempts suicide, then the execution is postponed and measures are taken to bring the condemned person back to health so that he can then be executed...” [See lecture of 03.22.11]
- (l) “Punishment teaches what not to do. It does not teach what to do.” [See lecture of 03.24.11]
- (m) “If other men will not lay down their right as well as he, then there is no reason for anyone to divest himself of his... for that were to expose himself to prey, which no man is bound to, rather than dispose himself to peace.” [See lecture of 03.29.11]
- (n) “The principles of justice of the basic structure of society are [those] that free and rational persons concerned to further their self-interest would accept in an original position of equality as defining the fundamental terms of their association” [See lecture of 04.05.11]
- (o) “People want their society to look and be just. But must the look of justice reside in a resulting pattern rather than in the underlying generating principles?” [See lecture of 04.07.11]
- (p) “If we want the guardians of our city to think that it’s shameful to be easily provoked into hating one another, we mustn’t allow...stories about gods warring or plotting against each other.” “If we’re to persuade our people that no citizen has ever hated another and that it’s impious to do so, then that’s what should be told” in stories. [See lecture of 04.14.11]

© Yale University 2012. Most of the lectures and course material within Open Yale Courses are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 license. Unless explicitly set forth in the applicable Credits section of a lecture, third-party content is not covered under the Creative Commons license. Please consult the Open Yale Courses Terms of Use for limitations and further explanations on the application of the Creative Commons license.

Four of the following questions will appear on the exam, and you will be expected to answer two of the four. (You may choose which two of the four you answer.)

You should expect to spend roughly 30 minutes on each of your answers. (We recognize that some of the questions may seem naturally to lend themselves to longer answers than others, but (assuming that you write at a typical exam pace), you do not need to spend more than 30 minutes to provide an adequate answer.)

- (1) Consider the problem of procrastination (or your own example of a case involving weakness of the will), drawing on at least two of the course readings. Explain (in a way that connects your answer to the course's larger themes) how the problem arises, and describe (in a theoretically-informed way) one or more strategies for avoiding it.
- (2) Discuss Glaucon's challenge by briefly presenting at least one of the arguments that Glaucon uses to motivate this challenge, and then, drawing on at least two different authors (philosophers or psychologists) that we read, presenting at least two replies or responses (supportive or critical) to that challenge.
- (3) Choose one of Epictetus' suggestions from *The Handbook*, and –drawing on at least two different authors we have read –explain how that suggestion is either endorsed or challenged in contemporary therapeutic practice or empirical psychological work.
- (4) Describe Bernard Williams' case of Jim and the Indians, and explain how a sophisticated utilitarian, deontologist or virtue theorist (choose one of these views for your discussion) would advise Jim to think about the dilemma it poses, both in terms of how he should act, and how he should think about his action.
- (5) Discuss the problem that Judith Jarvis Thomson calls “the trolley problem” in a way that brings out why it is so perplexing. Drawing on the writings of (early or late) Judith Jarvis Thomson or Josh Greene or Cass Sunstein, offer a solution to (or explanation of) the problem.
- (6) Consider two ideas discussed in Thomas Nagel's essay “Moral Luck:”
 - The “intuitively plausible” *condition of control*: “that people cannot be morally assessed...for what is due to factors beyond their control.”
 - The phenomenon of *moral luck*: the fact that, very often, even when “a significant aspect of what someone does depends on factors beyond his control...we continue to treat him in that respect as an object of moral judgment.”Drawing on at least two additional authors (philosophers or psychologists) that we have read, explain how the issue of moral luck informs, constrains or raises problems for their theory or project.
- (7) Consider a case of wrongdoing (you may select your own example). Drawing on two or more theories of punishment that we discussed, compare and contrast two different accounts of and justifications for why the perpetrator ought (or ought not) to be punished.
- (8) Give an example of a real-life prisoners' dilemma and carefully explain why it is a prisoners' dilemma. (Feel free to use a chart to do this efficiently.) Then, drawing on one or more suggestions from the readings, propose a strategy whereby the dilemma's suboptimal outcome might be avoided.
- (9) Imagine that it is a US election year, and that you are a speechwriter for one of the Presidential nominees (you can choose which party s/he represents). You are preparing your candidate for an upcoming televised debate about increasing taxes to pay for increased services. On your desk are copies of *A Theory of Justice* and *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. Write a memo to your candidate discussing at least two examples, concepts or arguments from these books that s/he might use in the debate, or expect to hear used by the other nominee.