Daniel Immerman
Moral Problems

Mini Paper 6

Instructions: this assignment should be **printed out** and turned in **in class** on **February 25**. (If for some reason you need to email it to me, do so before class starts). This paper should be under a page. I like to grade as anonymously as possible, so please **do not put your name on the top of the paper, but instead put it on the opposite side of the page (or on a second page, if you can't print double-sided).** If you have any questions about how to complete the assignment, please let me know.

> On pages 411-2 of his article, "Self-Defense and the Killing of Noncombatants: A Reply to Fullinwider," Alexander proposes what he takes to be the correct formulation of the Principle of Self-Defense. What is the best counter-example you can think of to this principle? How can the principle be modified to get around the counterexample?

Here are some tips for this paper (these hold for philosophy papers in general).

- What is especially impressive, when you're trying to find a counter-example or an objection, is if you can find one that the author will agree with (of course, this is not always possible). For instance, if you offered a counterexample that hinged on the claim that it's never ok to kill innocents, that will be less impressive because Alexander seems to think it's ok to kill innocents sometimes. So if you showed him your counterexample, it wouldn't cause him to revise his views. But if you found one that even he admitted was a counterexample, then it would force him to revise his views.
- Sometimes, in order to come up with a counterexample or an objection that everyone will agree with, you have to come up with a situation that's somewhat strange. Most ethicists think that it's fine to invoke strange scenarios. (I should note that there are some exceptions).