

## Ethical Theory

---

### Concepts in Normative Ethics: *Constraints on the Good*

As you read the material for the next class, keep the questions below in mind. To answer these questions you will have to reflect critically on what you have read and possibly re-read important passages. Keep in mind that there are two basic kinds of information that you need to look for in the readings:

1. What are the main points or conclusions that an author accepts with respect to a particular issue?
2. What are the reasons, important considerations, and evidence that lead the author to accept that conclusion?

For our purposes, *it is information of the second sort that will be our primary concern* since our most basic task is to *evaluate the reasons and evidence* that are offered to support accepting one possible conclusion about an issue, rather than another.

Although I strongly suggest that you write out brief answers to these questions, you do not have to turn in written responses. You do, however, need to be prepared to speak intelligently to these issues in the next class meeting.

#### Readings

- Shelly Kagan, *Normative Ethics*, chapter 3.1–3.3.

#### Questions

1. What does it mean to say that “commonsense morality recognizes a *constraint* against doing harm”? In other words, what is a “constraint” and why is it plausible to think that doing harm is a good candidate for such a thing?
2. What is a deontological moral theory and how does it differ from a consequentialist moral theory?
3. Explain the argument claiming that consequentialism permits too much. What are the most plausible responses to this argument?
4. In discussing constraints, Kagan brings in the ideas of thresholds and scope. What are these and what difficulties can they create when applied to a prohibition against doing harm?