

**Instructions:** Write name legibly. Explain so that smart people who have not taken our class will understand.

**Explain what Mary Midgley means by ‘moral isolationism’, using mostly your own words (p. 80).**

**For each of the following, indicate whether the claim is true or false by circling/underlining/etc. one option.**

True False *Mary Midgley claims that moral isolationism makes no sense at all (p. 80).*

True False *Mary Midgley claims that moral isolationism is an impossible position (p. 81).*

True False *Mary Midgley thinks that we all believe that outsiders cannot criticize our culture (p. 82).*

True False *Mary Midgley provides empirical evidence for what people believe.*

True False *Mary Midgley thinks that we need “good factual evidence” about people’s beliefs (p. 85).*

**Complete these arguments against moral isolationism.**

1. *If “we believe that outsiders can, in principle, deliver perfectly good indictments”, then “it must clearly apply to \_\_\_\_\_.” (p. 82)*

2. *And “we believe that outsiders can, in principle, deliver perfectly good indictments.”*

So, \_\_\_\_\_.

1. *If “we could not, in principle \_\_\_\_\_ [other cultures]”, then we could not praise them. (p. 82).*

2. *But “we certainly do need to praise other [cultures].”*

So, \_\_\_\_\_.

**Mary Midgley thinks that understanding is an important part of praising or criticizing societies. Explain.**

**Complete Mary Midgley’s argument in a way that makes the premises support the conclusion**

1. *If “we are deprived of our opinions about other societies”, then we should “ban... moral reasoning”. (p. 83)*

2. *Moral Isolationism is the view that \_\_\_\_\_*  
\_\_\_\_\_.

*So, if Moral Isolationism (is true), then we should ban moral reasoning.*

Jesse Prinz responds to allegations that “[moral] relativism entails that we have no way to criticize Hitler” and “[moral] relativism entails that moral debates are senseless” (Prinz, p. 5-6). Based on Prinz’s responses, would Prinz think that that last argument about moral isolationism and moral reasoning is good? Why?

**Explain whether the following passages appeal to intuition. This can be done in one to a few sentences.**

*“Moral Isolationism would [entail moral skepticism]. None of us is going to accept this sceptical diagnosis. We cannot do so, because our involvement in moral isolationism does not flow from apathy, but from a rather acute concern about human hypocrisy and other forms of wickedness. But we polarize that concern around a few selected moral truths. We are rightly angry with those who despise, oppress or steamroll other cultures.” (Midgley, 83-84)*

*“we decide whether something is wrong by introspecting our feelings: if an action makes us feel bad, we conclude that it is wrong. Consistent with this, people’s moral judgments can be shifted by simply altering their emotional states. For example, psychologist Simone Schnall and her colleagues found that exposure to fart spray, filth, and disgusting movies can cause people to make more severe moral judgments about unrelated phenomena. Psychologist Jonathan Haidt and colleagues have shown that people make moral judgments even when they cannot provide any justification for them.” (Prinz, 3)*

*“Morally as well as physically, there is only one world, and we all have to live in it” (Midgley, 87).*

Mary Midgley writes, *“Suppose... that I criticize the bisecting Samurai, [...] [S]omeone will protest, [saying] that I have no right to make criticisms like that of another culture. [And they] will justify the Samurai.” (Midgley, 84).* Must a moral relativist protest and justify thusly, according to Jesse Prinz? (Prinz, 5). Why?

Midgley claims that, *“Ideals like discipline and devotion will not move anybody unless he himself accepts them” (Midgley, 85).* Must the moral relativist disagree, according to Jesse Prinz? (Prinz, 3). Why?