

Reading Questions for February 9

These questions cover two readings: the first is by Julian Baggini and Peter S. Fosl and is called “Divine Command.” The second is by D. Robert MacDougall and Griffin Trotter and is called “Rights and Basic Health Care.” The answers do not have to be turned in. You will probably have to read more than once to get the answers. We are going to continue to read the MacDougall/Trotter on Wednesday, so you only need to read up to the end of the questions for today.

*Background:*

In this section of the course, in addition to talking about whether we have a right to health care, we are exploring the relationship between law and morality and between religion and morality. Today, by reading the Baggini/Fosl piece, we are going to look at the relationship between religion and morality.

Next, we’ll read a piece by MacDougall and Trotter. This piece is an introduction to a set of articles recently written about rights and basic health care. In reading it, we’ll be able to get a survey of some of the issues that people are currently thinking about in connection with rights and health care.

*Questions:*

1. The “Divine Command” piece explains divine command theory and offers two worries about it – the worry about knowledge of divine commands and the Euthyphro dilemma. What are these two worries? Do they show that divine command theory is implausible, or is there a way around them?
2. On pages 531-2, the authors describe the first paper, which is by Eberl, Kinney and Williams. This paper argues that there is a right to health care. How does their argument go? MacDougall and Trotter are worried about their assumption that a right to health care follows from a right to health. Why are they worried about this assumption? Do you think it is plausible and why?

3. On pages 532-3, the authors summarize a paper by Narveson. How does Narveson's view compare with that of Engelhardt, the author we read last week? Do you agree with him? Why or why not?