

Philosophy 100

Introduction to Philosophy

Spring 2026

University of Maryland, Baltimore County

Moshe Lando

Compiled from lectures by Dr. Christopher Arledge

Philosophy is the study of the fundamental principles that underlie knowledge, reality, and ethics.

This course discusses the following areas of philosophy:

1	Logic	3
1.1	Statements and Arguments	3
1.2	Deductive Arguments	3
1.3	Inductive Arguments	4
1.4	Informal Fallacies	4
2	Philosophy of Religion	7
2.1	Ontological Argument	7
2.2	Cosmological Argument	8
2.3	Design Argument	9
2.4	The Problem of Evil	10
3	Epistemology	12
3.1	Meno's Paradox and Anamnesis	12
3.2	Justified True Belief (JTB)	13
3.3	Gettier's Argument	13
3.4	Ancient Skepticism	13
3.5	Modern Skepticism	14
4	Ethics	16
4.1	Deontology	16
4.2	Utilitarianism	17
4.3	Virtue Ethics	18

1 Logic

1.1 Statements and Arguments

A **statement** is a sentence that is either true or false.

A **conditional statement** has the form **if a then b**. The **if** term is the **antecedent**, and the **then** term is the **consequent**.

An **argument** presents one or more **premise** statements and a **conclusion** statement and argues that if the premises are true, the conclusion is true as well.

Logic is the branch of philosophy that studies arguments. In **formal logic**, arguments are presented symbolically, with specific symbols indicating premises and conclusions. In **informal logic**, arguments are presented linguistically; premises and conclusions are indicated with terms such as **since** and **therefore**.

This course focuses on informal logic.

As opposed to formal logic, where arguments are presented explicitly, informal logic involves determining whether a sentence is a statement and whether a collection of statements is an argument.

A sentence is only a statement if its intent is to assert the truth of a factual claim. Where the intent is not assertion, such as in a warning, command, or question, the sentence is not a statement. Similarly, where the intent is to express a personal belief or opinion rather than to assert a factual claim, the sentence is not a statement.

A series of statements is only an argument if its intent is to support the truth of a conclusion based on the truth of premises. Where the intent is not to support the truth of a claim, the statements do not form an argument. This includes:

- Reports, where the intent is to relay information;
- Exposition, where the intent is to explain;
- Illustration, where the intent is to demonstrate.

1.2 Deductive Arguments

A **deductive argument** is an argument in which the conclusion is intended to follow from the premises as a logical necessity.

Deductive arguments include:

- **Mathematical arguments**, where the conclusion follows from mathematical principles established in the premises;
- **Arguments from definition**, where the conclusion follows from definitions established in the premises.

Deductive arguments follow specific structures.

Syllogisms are a class of deductive argument structures with two premises and one conclusion. These include:

- **Categorical syllogisms:** These have the form:
 1. **a** belongs to class **b**;
 2. Items of class **b** have property **c**;
 3. Therefore, **a** has property **c**.

1. Logic

- **Hypothetical syllogisms / *modus ponens*:** These have the form:

1. If **a**, then **b**;
2. **a**;
3. Therefore, **b**.

- **Disjunctive syllogisms:** These have the form:

1. Either **a** or **b**;
2. Not **a**;
3. Therefore, **b**.

A deductive argument is **invalid** if its conclusion does not follow from its premises as a logical necessity.

A deductive argument is **valid** if its conclusion follows from its premises as a logical necessity, regardless of whether the premises are true.

A deductive argument is **sound** if it is valid and its premises are true.

1.3 Inductive Arguments

An **inductive argument** is an argument in which the conclusion is intended to follow reasonably from the premises, though not as a logical necessity.

The bases of this reasoning include:

- Predictions, where the reasoning is based on past patterns;
- Argument from analogy, where the reasoning is based on similar patterns;
- Generalization, where a general principle is inferred from multiple specific statements;
- Argument from authority, where the reasoning is based on accepting the claims of a relevant authority;
- Causal arguments, where **a** is a cause of **b**, though **b** does not follow from **a** as a logical necessity; and **a** is true, so there is reason to infer **b**.

An inductive argument is **weak** if its conclusion does not reasonably follow from its premises.

An inductive argument is **strong** if its conclusion reasonably follows from its premises, regardless of whether the premises are true.

An inductive argument is **cogent** if it is strong and its premises are true.

1.4 Informal Fallacies

Fallacies are flaws in arguments.

In a **formal fallacy**, an argument fails to meet the structure of a valid or strong argument.

In an **informal fallacy**, an argument may meet the structure of a valid or strong argument; however, its claim that the conclusion follows from the premises is flawed.

Fallacies of Relevance In a fallacy of relevance, a conclusion is supported by a premise that is not relevant to the truth of the conclusion.

This includes attempts to exploit a trait or desire of the audience, as well as appeals to factors that may be valid motivations for specific actions but do not indicate the truth or falsehood of a claim. Common examples include:

- Appeal to the people: This includes an appeal to the desire to be popular. This also includes the **bandwagon argument**, where a claim's popular acceptance is used to argue for its truth;
- Appeal to vanity: This appeals to the audience's pride;
- Appeal to snobbery: This appeals to the audience's desire to be elite;
- Appeal to force: This supports a claim with a threat;
- Appeal to pity;
- Appeal to tradition.

Additional examples include:

- **Red herring:** Where the arguer introduces a distraction;
- **Straw man:** Where the arguer introduces and argues against a weaker version of their opponent's claim;
- ***ad hominem*:** Where an argument pertains to the individual proposing a claim rather than to the claim itself. These include:
 - *ad hominem* abusive: where the argument claims a fault in the individual;
 - *ad hominem* circumstantial: where the argument claims the individual is biased;
 - *tu quoque*: where the argument points to other actions or statements of the individual that are inconsistent with their current claim.

Fallacies of Weak Induction In a fallacy of weak induction, the premise is relevant to the truth of the conclusion; however, it is not sufficient to reasonably support the conclusion. These include:

- Appeal to unqualified authority;
- Appeal to ignorance, where a claim is supported by the lack of countering evidence;
- Hasty generalization, where a general principle is inferred from specific statements that do not warrant the generalization;
- Slippery slope, where an event is evaluated based on a hypothetical chain of outcomes;
- Weak analogy, where the reasoning is based on insufficiently similar cases;
- False cause, where one event is unjustifiably assumed to be the cause of another. This includes:
 - *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, where the proposed justification of causality is temporal proximity;
 - *non causa pro causa*, where the proposed justification of causality is nontemporal, such as locational proximity;
 - Oversimplified cause, where the proposed cause is an overly simplified representation of the actual complex cause;
 - Gambler's fallacy, where causality is assigned between independent random events.

1. Logic

Additional Fallacies Additional fallacies include:

- Fallacy of presumption, where a premise is assumed without justification;
- Complex question, where an unjustified premise is implied;
- False dichotomy, where two alternatives are presented as mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive when in fact they are either not mutually exclusive or not collectively exhaustive because other options exist;
- Suppressed evidence, where premises that defeat a conclusion are ignored;
- Fallacy of ambiguity, where the meaning of an ambiguous term is shifted from the premise to the conclusion;
- Equivocation, where the meaning of a word with multiple meanings is shifted from the premise to the conclusion;
- Fallacy of illicit transference, which includes:
 - Composition, where attributes that are properties of individual components are assigned to a collective;
 - Division, where attributes that are properties of a collective are assigned to individual components.

2 Philosophy of Religion

This chapter examines the philosophy of religion related to the existence of God. This includes three arguments for the existence of God: the **ontological argument**, **cosmological argument**, and the **argument from design**, and one argument against the existence of God: the **problem of evil**.

2.1 Ontological Argument

The ontological argument is presented by **Anselm of Canterbury** in the *Proslogion*. It has two parts, Proslogion 2 and Proslogion 3.

This argument is:

- Deductive;
- Analytical: based on the definition of terms, rather than a specific reality;
- *a priori*: relies solely on reason, rather than experience.

Proslogion 2 Proslogion 2 argues that God must actually exist:

1. The atheist acknowledges the concept of God;
2. If one acknowledges the concept of an entity, that entity exists in their mind;
3. Then God exists, at least in the mind;
4. This concept of God is that of the **greatest possible being (GPB)**;
5. Actually existing is greater than only existing in the mind;
6. Then the GPB is one that actually exists and not one that only exists in the mind;
7. But God exists, and God is the GPB, and an existing GPB actually exists; therefore, God must actually exist.

Proslogion 3 Proslogion 3 argues that God must necessarily exist. This follows a similar structure to Proslogion 2 but differs in step 5:

5. Necessarily existing is greater than not necessarily existing;
6. Then the GPB is one that necessarily exists and not one that does not necessarily exist;
7. But God exists, and God is the GPB, and an existing GPB necessarily exists; therefore, God must necessarily exist.

Greatest Possible Island Objection The **greatest possible island objection** to the ontological argument is presented by **Gaunilo of Marmoutiers** in the *On Behalf of the Fool*:

- By the logic of the ontological argument, a similar argument can be made to prove the actual and necessary existence of the ‘greatest possible island’.
- Rather, step 2 is false: the acknowledgement of the concept of an entity does not constitute the entity existing in the mind.

2.2 Cosmological Argument

The cosmological argument is presented by **Thomas Aquinas** in the *Summa Theologica*.

This argument is:

- Deductive;
- Synthetic: based on specific realities, rather than the definition of terms;
- *a posteriori*: relies on experience, rather than solely on reason.

Since this argument is synthetic and *a posteriori*, it is not as strong as the ontological argument, which is analytical and *a priori*.

The argument is presented over five ways. Each presents a property that exists within an ordered sequence or gradation which must ultimately terminate with God.

Way One

1. Things are in motion;
2. A thing can only be in motion if was moved by another thing which is itself in motion;
3. This sequence cannot have existed forever;
4. Therefore, there must have been an initial unmoved mover;
5. But this defies #2;
6. Then there must be something that is not subject to #2;
7. This something must be God.

Way Two

1. Things are caused;
2. A thing can only be caused if it was caused by another thing which is itself caused;
3. This sequence cannot have existed forever;
4. Therefore, there must have been an initial uncaused causer;
5. But this defies #2;
6. Then there must be something that is not subject to #2;
7. This something must be God.

Way Three

1. Things exist;
2. A thing can only exist by depending on another thing which itself exists;
3. This sequence cannot have existed forever;
4. Therefore, there must have been an initial independent existence;
5. But this defies #2;
6. Then there must be something that is not subject to #2;
7. This something must be God.

Way Four

1. Things that exist have gradated goodness;
2. Things that exist with gradated properties represent the thing that possesses the maximum of that property,
3. The thing that possesses the maximum of a property is the cause of the property existing in a gradated form in other things;
4. Then there must be a thing that possesses the maximum goodness;
5. This thing must be the cause of gradated goodness in all other things;
6. This thing must be god.

Way Five

1. Things exist that are unintelligent yet act to an end;
2. Things that are unintelligent cannot act to an end unless directed by an intelligent thing;
3. The natural things in the world are such unintelligent things that act to an end;
4. Then the natural things in the world must be directed by an intelligent thing;
5. This thing must be God.

Objections The first three ways are stronger than the last two.

Objections to the first three ways include:

- For premise #3, perhaps these sequences have indeed existed forever;
- For premise #7, perhaps there are other things that are not subject to premise #2;
- Premise #7 begs the question why God is not subject to premise #2.

2.3 Design Argument

The design argument is presented by **William Paley** in the *Natural Theology*.

This argument is:

- Inductive;
- Synthetic;
- *a posteriori*.

Paley argues by analogy:

1. If one were to encounter a watch, they would infer from the purpose, order, and complexity of the watch that it was designed and created;
2. The natural world displays purpose, order, and complexity;
3. Therefore, one can infer that the natural world was designed and created.

2. Philosophy of Religion

Counters to Potential Objections Paley counters several potential objections to the argument from design:

- Objection: One cannot infer the universe's creation from its design without having witnessed this creation.
- Counter: If one were to encounter a watch, they would infer its creation from its design, without having witnessed this creation.
- Objection: One cannot infer the universe's creation from its design, since the universe seems imperfect, parts of the universe seem superfluous, and there are parts of the universe we do not understand.
- Counter: If one were to encounter a watch, they would infer its creation from its design, even if it seemed imperfect, parts seemed superfluous, and there were parts of the watch they did not understand.
- Objection: Perhaps this universe was created by another universe.
- Counter: If one were to encounter a watch, they would infer its creation from its design, and reject the possibility that it was created by another watch, since this sequence cannot have existed forever.
- Objection: Perhaps the universe was formed by natural law.
- Counter: If one were to encounter a watch, they would infer its creation from its design, and reject the possibility that it was formed by natural law, since natural law requires a lawgiver and enforcer.

Natural Selection The **theory of natural selection** is presented by **Charles Darwin** in the *On the Origin of Species*. It states that the specific design of the biological world is the result of iterative mutation and natural selection based on fitness. This theory is an objection to Paley's argument, since it presents an explanation for the biological world displaying design despite not having been designed and created.

This objection may be countered by claiming that the biological world is too complex to have arisen from natural selection.

In addition to providing a counter to Paley's argument, the theory of natural selection can also be presented as an affirmative argument against the existence of God, since it claims that the design of the biological world is due to natural selection, rather than design and creation.

This argument may be objected to by claiming that natural selection is the mechanism by which God designs.

2.4 The Problem of Evil

The problem of evil argues affirmatively against the existence of a morally good God.

This argument is presented in three levels of strength. The first two are deductive; the third is inductive.

The strongest argument, the **logical problem of evil**, argues:

1. A morally good being would not allow suffering if they were capable of preventing it;
2. An omnipotent being would be capable of preventing suffering;
3. There is suffering;
4. Therefore, there must not be a morally good, omnipotent being.

This argument is unsound, since a morally good being could allow suffering even if they were capable of preventing it if there were sufficient reason.

The **weaker logical problem of evil** addresses this by adding a premise:

2. Philosophy of Religion

1. A morally good being would not allow suffering if they were capable of preventing it unless there were sufficient reason;
2. There is no sufficient reason to allow suffering;
3. An omnipotent being would be capable of preventing suffering;
4. There is suffering;
5. Therefore, there must not be a morally good, omnipotent being.

While this argument is not affirmatively unsound, premise #2 is unsupported.

The **evidential problem of evil** addresses this by modifying the premise to make the argument inductive:

1. A morally good being would not allow suffering if they were capable of preventing it unless there were sufficient reason;
2. There is probably no sufficient reason to allow suffering;
3. An omnipotent being would be capable of preventing suffering;
4. There is suffering;
5. Therefore, there is probably not a morally good, omnipotent being.

Responses to the Problem of Evil Responses to the problem of evil include:

- Appreciated Goods: Suffering is necessary for the appreciation of good;
- Character Building: Suffering is necessary for the development of character;
- Free Will: Suffering is a consequence of the existence of free will;
- Best Possible World Defense: It may not be possible for there to exist a universe without suffering;
- Hidden Reason: God may have a reason to allow suffering that we do not know or cannot comprehend.

Gratuitous Suffering **Gratuitous suffering** is suffering that cannot be justified. While the previous responses may justify much suffering, some suffering, such as that of animals, appears to be gratuitous.

3 Epistemology

Epistemology is the branch of philosophy concerned with the nature of knowledge. This includes questions such as:

1. What is knowledge;
2. What distinguishes knowledge from belief;
3. How knowledge is possible if there is always room for doubt.

This chapter examines:

- **Meno's paradox**, where **Plato** questions how knowledge can be attained through learning;
- **Anamnesis**, Plato's explanation of knowledge and learning;
- **Justified true belief (JTB)**, the classical definition of knowledge;
- **Gettier's argument**, which questions JTB;
- **Ancient skepticism**, specifically **Academic** and **Pyrrhonian skepticism**;
- **Modern skepticism**, specifically **Cartesian skepticism**.

3.1 Meno's Paradox and Anamnesis

Meno's paradox is presented by Plato in the *Meno*:

- Suppose an individual learns **a**;
- There are two options that are mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive, called **horns**: Either the individual already knew **a**, or they did not;
- Horn 1: The individual already knew **a**. Then they did not learn it;
- Horn 2: The individual did not already know **a**. Then how did they know to seek **a**, and how did they recognize **a** as true when they encountered it?

Plato solves this paradox through the theory of **anamnesis**:

- The individual has a soul;
- Prior to birth, the soul possesses all knowledge;
- At birth, the soul forgets this knowledge;
- When an individual learns **a**, they are not attaining new knowledge; rather, the soul is recollecting knowledge it once possessed;
- This recollection is what prompts the individual to seek **a**, and how the individual recognizes **a** as true when they encounter it.

3.2 Justified True Belief (JTB)

In the *Meno*, Plato explains the difference between knowledge, or *epistēmē*, and true belief, or *doxa*: True belief alone is fleeting; knowledge is the belief that is tied down by being able to explain the reason for it.

This serves as the foundation for the definition of knowledge in classical philosophy, **justified true belief (JTB)**. Here, knowledge has three components:

1. **Belief:** An individual believes A;
2. **Truth:** A is true;
3. **Justification:** The individual is justified in believing A.

3.3 Gettier's Argument

Edmund Gettier challenges the JTB definition in the paper *Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?*

Gettier begins with two premises:

1. It is possible for a false belief to be justified;
2. Justification is closed under entailment: If an individual is justified in A, and A necessitates B, then the individual is justified in B.

Based on these premises, Gettier constructs a scenario where a belief is true and justified, but the justification involves an error, and the belief is true by luck:

- An individual is justified in A;
- A leads to B;
- The individual believes B;
- By premise #2, the individual is justified in B;
- A is false; by premise #1, this does not contradict the individual being justified in A;
- Although A is false, B is true.

By JTB, the individual's belief in B constitutes knowledge, since all three requirements - belief, truth, and justification - are met; however, intuitively, it should not.

Additional examples provide a simpler version of Gettier's argument without needing Gettier's second premise of closure under entailment:

- **Russell's clock example:** An individual looks at a clock and concludes the current time based on the time displayed on the clock. Unbeknownst to them, the clock is broken, but it happens to be stuck at the correct current time;
- **Goldman's fake barn example:** An individual sees a barn and concludes that what they are seeing is a barn. Unbeknownst to them, all other identical barns in the area are fake barns, but the one they see happens to be real.

3.4 Ancient Skepticism

Skepticism is classified as **ancient** and **modern**.

Ancient skepticism includes **academic skepticism** and **Pyrrhonian skepticism**.

3. Epistemology

Academic Skepticism Academic skepticism is the ideology that true knowledge does not exist since nothing is certain and everything can be doubted. A major flaw in this ideology is that it is self-defeating and circular: If nothing is certain, then it is not certain that nothing is certain.

Pyrrhonian Skepticism In contrast to academic skepticism, Pyrrhonian skepticism is not an ideology, but a practice. It presents the method of **equipollence**: raising equally plausible arguments for the affirmation and rejection of any proposition. This naturally results in the suspension of judgement, which leads to **ataraxia**: the tranquility that results from the lack of distress over uncertainty.

Pyrrhonian skepticism includes five **modes**. These are analyses that apply to many propositions that frame the argument such that judgement cannot be rendered:

- **Dispute**: There are valid arguments both ways;
- **Infinite regress**: The proposal A is justified by B, which is in turn justified by C, in an infinite regress;
- **Hypothetical**: The proposal A is justified by B, but B itself is neither proven nor disproven;
- **Reciprocal**: The proposal A is justified by B, but B is justified by A;
- **Relativity**: The proposition exists relative to a subjective framework.

3.5 Modern Skepticism

Modern skepticism extends from doubting our certainty of propositions to doubting more fundamental pre-suppositions, such as the nature of reality itself.

Cartesian skepticism questions whether we can be certain that our perceptions reflect reality.

Ladder of Doubt The **ladder of doubt** is presented by **René Descartes** in the *Meditations on First Philosophy*. It describes scenarios where an observer is being deceived but has no way of determining so, since the deception is indistinguishable from reality:

- **Sensory deception**: Suppose an individual's senses were deceiving them. They would have no way of distinguishing these perceptions from reality;
- **Dream argument**: Suppose an individual were dreaming. They would have no way of distinguishing the dream from reality;
- **Evil demon**: Suppose an individual's perceptions were being directly deceived by an evil demon. They would have no way of distinguishing these perceptions from reality.

Based on these scenarios, Descartes asks how one can ever be certain of their perceptions:

1. For an individual in one of these scenarios, reality is indistinguishable from perception;
2. Then an individual in such a scenario has no way of determining so;
3. Then one can never be certain that they are not in such a scenario;
4. In such a scenario, the individual's perceptions do not reflect reality;
5. Then how can one ever be certain that their perceptions reflect reality?

3. Epistemology

cogito ergo sum Descartes addresses his ladder of doubt by declaring ***cogito ergo sum***: I think therefore I am; meaning, one can at least be certain of their own existence, since the act of doubting requires a doubter.

Descartes then introduces a series of deductions, where from one's existence they may deduce the existence of God, and ultimately arrive at the conclusion that God would not allow them to be perpetually deceived by their senses, dream, or an evil demon.

Other Responses Other responses to Descartes' ladder of doubt include:

- **Contextualism:** Knowledge need not be absolute, and may instead depend on context, such as what possibilities are being considered. Thus, while one can doubt whether their perceptions are accurate, they may still possess knowledge within the context of ordinary knowledge, where such skeptical possibilities are not being considered;
- **Relevant alternative:** Knowledge requires taking only relevant alternatives into account; irrelevant alternatives may be discarded. Thus, while one can doubt whether their perceptions are accurate, such skeptical possibilities are not relevant to ordinary knowledge, and may therefore be discarded;

Internalism vs. Externalism **Internalism** and **externalism** are two conflicting views regarding the justification criterion for knowledge:

- In the internalist view, a belief is only knowledge if the individual is aware of its entire chain of justification from first principles;
- In the externalist view, a belief is knowledge as long as it arises from a reliable cognitive system.

Cartesian skepticism poses a stronger challenge to knowledge by the internalist view than by the externalist view.

4 Ethics

Ethics is the branch of philosophy concerned with morality.

Here we discuss three ethical systems:

- **Deontology**, attributed to **Immanuel Kant**, focuses on the **intent** behind actions, with the underlying moral principle being the **categorical imperative**;
- **Utilitarianism**, attributed to **Jeremy Bentham** and **John Stuart Mill**, focuses on the **consequences** of actions, with the underlying moral principle being the **principle of greatest happiness**;
- **Virtue ethics**, attributed to **Aristotle**, focuses on the **character** of the actor, with the underlying moral principle being the **mean**.

4.1 Deontology

Deontology is presented by Immanuel Kant in the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*.

Kant declares that the only unconditional good is the **good will**: a will that acts from duty. The morality of an action depends on whether it is done from duty. It is not enough that the action aligns with duty; duty must be the motivating cause of the action.

Kant then reasons that a will acting from duty must be motivated by reason alone, rather than by the desired outcome of a specific circumstance. These duties must therefore be governed by **categorical imperatives**: principles that hold universally and absolutely, rather than **hypothetical imperatives**: principles that hold only with respect to achieving a specific goal.

Kant gives three formulations of the categorical imperative:

1. **Universal Law**: Act only on maxims you can will as universal laws;
2. **Kingdom of Ends**: Act as if your maxims were those of a legislating member in a universal kingdom of ends;
3. **Humanity as an End**: Always treat rational agents as ends rather than merely as means.

Kant establishes three postulates required for this system:

1. **Freedom**: Only a free individual can act from duty;
2. **Immortality**: Complete conformity of the will to duty cannot be achieved in a finite lifetime. Progress toward moral perfection is therefore an infinite process. Since reason dictates that one **ought** to strive toward moral perfection, it must be that one **could** do so; therefore, there must be an immortal and enduring soul capable of pursuing this progression;
3. **God**: Reason dictates the possibility of the highest good, where an individual's happiness is proportional to their virtue. Since this cannot be guaranteed by the natural world, it must be guaranteed by a supreme being.

Objections to Deontology Objections to deontology include:

- **Empty formalism**: The categorical imperative is too abstract to yield concrete duties;

- **Hidden consequentialism:** A key component of deontology is that the morality of an action depends solely on the action itself rather than its consequences, since consequences are relevant only to hypothetical imperatives, not categorical imperatives. However, Kant's formulation of the categorical imperative, to act only on maxims that can be willed as universal laws, requires considering the consequences of these maxims being universal; thus, Kant implicitly relies on considerations of consequences;
- **Murderer at the door:** Deontology leads to overly absolute moral principles. For example, by deontology, one must never lie, even to a murderer seeking a victim.

4.2 Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is presented by Jeremy Bentham in the *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*.

Consequentialism is the view that the morality of an action depends on its outcome. Utilitarianism is a form of consequentialism where the morally desired outcome is the maximization of pleasure and the minimization of pain. Bentham introduces the **hedonic calculus**, where the pleasure and pain that result from an action can be quantitatively analyzed to determine the action's morality.

The principle of greatest happiness is presented by John Stuart Mill in the *Utilitarianism* as an expansion and formulization of Bentham's utilitarianism:

- The only desirable ends are pleasure and the absence of pain;
- An action is morally right in proportion to its promotion of pleasure and prevention of pain for all who are affected by it;
- The pleasure and pain of all affected individuals is given equal consideration; no individual or group, including the actor themselves, is given greater consideration than any other.

Mill also differentiates between higher and lower pleasures. While Bentham treats all pleasure as qualitatively equal and differing only in quantity, Mill introduces qualitative gradations of pleasure, where intellectual pleasures rank higher than bodily pleasures.

Objections to Utilitarianism Objections to utilitarianism include:

- **Transplant surgeon:** By utilitarianism, the moral imperative is to maximize aggregate pleasure. Then it follows that, for example, a doctor should remove the organs of one healthy patient to save multiple sick ones;
- **Rights and justice:** By utilitarianism, the only desirable end is maximizing aggregate pleasure. Then what is the place of rights and justice? If maximizing aggregate pleasure takes precedence over rights and justice, then it follows that, for example, a judge should convict an innocent individual if doing so placates an angry mob and leads to greater aggregate pleasure;
- **Experience machine:** By utilitarianism, the only desirable end is pleasure and the absence of pain. Then what is the place of a value such as authenticity, which is generally chosen over pleasure and the absence of pain? For example, most would reject the chance to perpetually live in a hypothetical experience machine that provides perfect pleasure with no pain in favor of authenticity;
- **Integrity:** By utilitarianism, the only desirable end is pleasure and the absence of pain. Then what is the place of a value such as integrity, which is generally chosen over pleasure and the absence of pain?

4. Ethics

- Demandingness: By utilitarianism, the pleasure and pain of all individuals affected by an action is given equal consideration, and that of the actor themselves is not given greater consideration. But this results in impossible demands; for example, by utilitarianism, every dollar an individual spends on themselves that could have brought greater pleasure to someone else is immoral;
- Calculation problem: Calculating the total pain and pleasure an action causes to everyone affected is impossible.

4.3 Virtue Ethics

Virtue ethics is presented by Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics*:

- The highest good is **eudaimonia**: living the good life;
- The good life is that of an individual who possesses virtuous character shaped by reason;
- One develops virtuous character by acting habitually in accordance with virtue;
- In general, virtue is the course that follows the mean, where responses are neither excessive nor deficient;
- The specifics of virtue and eudaimonia cannot be precisely defined and must be learned from **moral exemplars**.

Aristotle identifies four types of people:

- The **virtuous** desires what is right and does what is right;
- The **enkratic** does not desire what is right, knows what is right, and exercises self-control to do what is right;
- The **akratic** does not desire what is right, knows what is right, and does not exercise self-control to do what is right;
- The **vicious** does not desire, know, or do what is right.

Objections to Virtue Ethics Objections to virtue ethics include:

- Circularity: Virtuous action is defined as action in accordance with virtue, but virtue is defined as performing virtuous action;
- Non-specificity: Virtue is too vague to dictate how specifically to act;
- Conflicting values: If virtue itself is the only good, how does one determine what to do when different virtues conflict?

