

Third Writing Assignment

Assigned, class 2 of week #7 (in the recitation section), due a day after class 2 of week #9 (one day after the recitation section of week #9).

Let the following be *HARMAN'S THESIS*:

Sentences of the form: $\neg\forall$ 'it would be morally wrong of P to D' have no truth value considered independently of any context of utterance. For example, suppose Adam is deciding whether or not to be cloned. Then, in one context of utterance, 'it would be morally wrong of Adam to be cloned' is true, while in another context that sentence is false. (Cf. $\neg\forall$ P is tall', $\neg\forall$ P is moving', etc.)

Harman thinks that *HARMAN'S THESIS* is a "reasonable inference" from the "most plausible explanation of moral diversity".

Explain what the most plausible explanation of moral diversity is, according to Harman. Briefly assess his reasons for thinking so. Is *HARMAN'S THESIS* a reasonable inference from this explanation of moral diversity? Why or why not?

Remember: Give reasons for your answers. It might be worth looking over Jim Pryor's [Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper](#) and the handout on arguments before you begin writing.

Five or six double-spaced numbered pages. No late papers will be accepted unless you have a very good excuse, such as illness.

No footnotes, no quotations (although you may use bits of terminology from the readings or the handouts, as appropriate).

See the Assignments section of the syllabus for further guidance.