

# PHI 202 | Precept on lectures 7 and 8

Michal Masny | 24 Sep 2020

## READINGS:

Quinn, W. (1989). *Actions, Intentions, and Consequences: The Doctrine of the Double Effect*.  
Thomson, J. J. (1986). *Killing, Letting Die, and the Trolley Problem*.

## THE TROLLEY PROBLEM

(1) What is the Trolley Problem, exactly? What would a solution to this problem look like?  
(Whole group)

(2) What is the significance of the Trolley Problem for non-consequentialist ethical theories? What is the significance of the Trolley Problem for consequentialist ethical theories?  
(Breakout rooms)

## KILLING AND LETTING DIE

(3) Even if the distinction between killing and letting cannot on its own solve the Trolley Problem, does it mean that there is no morally relevant distinction here?  
(Whole group)

## THE DOCTRINE OF THE DOUBLE EFFECT (DDE)

(4) *Amanda*: "For the doctrine of double effect, I am still confused about intentions "in the narrow sense". It seems to me that for a lot of these examples, it is not exactly intuitive to me what counts as an intention and what counts as foreseen."  
(Whole group)

## SCANLON'S MORAL CONTRACTUALISM

(5) *Logan*: What would Scanlon's view say about cases like *Switch* and *Footbridge*?  
(Explain)

## SOLVING THE TROLLEY PROBLEM

(6) Which of the presented solutions to the Trolley Problem, if any, do you find the most convincing? Why?  
(Free-flowing discussion)

Some questions to consider in this context:

- (a) *Sofia & Kevin C*: What if the choice in *Footbridge* were between pushing the large man and letting 1,000 people die?
- (b) *Sean*: What if the choice in *Switch* were between 1 and 4, or 95 and 100?
- (c) *Kevin H*: Are we too quick to reject debunking explanations?