

Moral Psych S 21

According to Kumar, a person thinks of a rule violation (or an action that she classifies as “wrong” in some way) as a distinctively **moral** wrong just in case she thinks of it as (1) serious, and she thinks of the rule which has been transgressed as (2) general, (3) authority-independent, and (4) objective.

(1) Explain Kumar’s account of what distinguishes judgments of immorality from other forms of criticism by providing analyses of what Kumar means in saying moral rules are conceptualized as **general, authority-independent, and objective**. (2) Assess Kumar’s theory of moral judgment by describing its fit with your own morality. Do the actions you think of as immoral violate rules you think of as general, authority-independent and “objective” in the sense at issue? (3) Describe and assess Stich’s arguments against Kumar’s account of moral judgment. Is Stich right to reject Kumar’s account or can Kumar’s account be adequately defended from Stich’s criticisms? If Stich’s criticisms are valid, how might Kumar revise his account to accommodate Stich’s concerns? (4) Describe Stich’s skepticism about the “naturalness” of the distinction between moral norms and non-moral conventions. Do you agree that this distinction is drawn differently by different people or different communities? Does that undermine your confidence in drawing the distinction as you now draw it? (5) Must we make substantive moral assumptions (or value judgments) to distinguish moral norms from mere conventions? If so, does this undercut the scientific status of the distinction? Why or why not?

5-6 pages double-spaced, normal font and margins.

Assigned: 4/7/21

Due: 4/21/21