A. Determine which of the following passages contain a moral argument. If a moral argument is present determine whether its conclusion is about an action, a person, or about something else. If the conclusion is about an action, determine whether it is a consequentialist or deontological argument and put it into either the consequentialist or the deontological argument form. In some cases, no argument is present but the passage is a statement of a either a consequentialist or deontological moral view.

1. Watch it! If you touch that, you will burn yourself.
   No moral argument.
2. Step on a crack and you break your mother’s back.
3. Don’t lie to me!
4. If you falsely claimed that the book they sent you was defective and asked for another, that would be theft. You should never steal.
5. Careful with that PDA! I bought it so you should be careful not to break it!
6. You have committed a crime most foul. I sentence you to fifteen years in prison.
7. Evelyn’s car is old and right now it is really dirty. But it never fails to get her where she wants to go.
   No argument.
8. You shouldn’t even think about climbing that boulder. If you fell, you’d really hurt yourself.
   No moral argument.
9. “As members of the academic community, students are expected to recognize and uphold standards of intellectual and academic integrity. The university assumes as a basic and minimum standard of conduct in academic matters that students be honest and that they submit for credit only the products of their own efforts. Both the ideals of scholarship and the need for fairness require that all dishonest work be rejected as a basis for academic credit.” Georgia State University Undergraduate Catalog, 2007-2008 (Atlanta: GA: Georgia State University, 2007) p. 70.
10. “I begin with the assumption that suffering and death from lack of food, shelter, and medical care are bad. [...] My next point is this: if it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, to do it. [...] People do not feel in any way ashamed or guilty about spending money on new clothes or a new car instead of giving it to famine relief. (Indeed, the alternative does not occur to them.) This way of looking at the matter cannot be justified.” Peter Singer, “Famine Affluence, and Morality,” from John Perry, Michael Bratman, and John Fischer, Introduction to Philosophy, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007) pp. 529-530.


11. “Poland’s new government is right to be taking a skeptical second look at the Bush administration’s proposal to station 10 interceptor missiles there as part of a European-based missile-defense system. The pragmatic conservatives voted into power in October want to make sure that the project offers real security benefits to Poland that outweigh its potential diplomatic costs.” Editorial, “The Poles Get Cold Feet” The New York Times, December 30, 2007, p. WK7.


12. “New Year’s Eve tends to be the day of the year with the most binge drinking (based on drunken driving fatalities), followed closely by Super Bowl Sunday. Likewise, colleges have come to expect that the most alcohol-filled day of their students’ lives is their 21st birthday. So, some words of caution for those who continue to binge and even for those who have stopped: just as the news is not so great for former cigarette smokers, there is equally bad news for recovering binge-drinkers who have achieved a sobriety that has lasted years. The more we have binged — and the younger we have started to binge — the more we experience significant, though often subtle, effects on the brain and cognition.” Paul Steinberg, “The Hangover That Lasts,” The New York Times, December 29, 2007, p. A31.

No explicit argument. But a consequentialist moral argument is strongly suggested.

13. “After 32 years of ruling Indonesia with an iron fist and a grabbing hand, then-President Suharto [of Indonesia] was forced to step down in 1998. While gone from power, he clearly is not forgotten. A few months ago, an Indonesian court ordered Time magazine to pay the former dictator a judgment now valued at about $111 million in a libel case. The verdict, which Time is challenging, should not be allowed to stand. [...] The court’s decision is a threat to a free press. We hope the panel that hears Time’s appeal will see Suharto’s suit for what it really is — the last grasp for vindication by an autocrat with no legitimate case to argue.” Editorial, “Time and the Dictator” The New York Times, December 29, 2007, p. A30.


14. “In the course of robbing a Holiday Inn in Dallas, Texas in late 1985, Miller-El and his accomplices bound and gagged two hotel employees, whom Miller-El then shot, killing one and severely injuring the other. During jury selection in Miller-El’s trial for capital murder, prosecutors used peremptory strikes against 10 qualified black venire members. Miller-El objected that the strikes were based on race and could not be presumed legitimate, given a history of excluding black members from criminal juries by the Dallas County District Attorney’s Office. The trial court received evidence of the practice alleged but found no “systematic exclusion of blacks as a matter of policy” by that

No argument.

15. “The present case does not involve minors. It does not involve persons who might be injured or coerced or who are situated in relationships where consent might not easily be refused. It does not involve public conduct or prostitution. It does not involve whether the government must give formal recognition to any relationship that homosexual persons seek to enter. The case does involve two adults who, with full and mutual consent from each other, engaged in sexual practices common to a homosexual lifestyle. The petitioners are entitled to respect for their private lives. The State cannot demean their existence or control their destiny by making their private sexual conduct a crime. Their right to liberty under the Due Process Clause gives them the full right to engage in their conduct without intervention of the government.” Lawrence v. Texas 539 U.S. 558 (2003) at 558.