

EFFECTIVE ALTRUISM

PY4651

Semester 1, 2016-17

University of St Andrews

Dr Theron Pummer (module coordinator)

Office Hours: Mon, 11.15-1.15

Office: Edgecliffe B08

Phone: +44 (0)1334 462432

Email: tgp4@st-andrews.ac.uk

Prof Tim Mulgan

Office Hours: Tues, 3.30-4.30

Office: Edgecliffe 108 (office hours in Edgecliffe B08)

Email: tpm6@st-andrews.ac.uk

LECTURE: Mon, 9-11, Edgecliffe 104

TUTORIAL: Tues, 10-11, Edgecliffe 104 (sign up on MMS)

DESCRIPTION: ‘Effective altruism’ is a social movement that encourages us to do as much good as we can with our charitable activities (donations of money, time, and effort). In this module, we will explore a variety of philosophical questions that arise in the context of effective altruism. One set of questions concerns the core philosophical commitments of effective altruism: What philosophical views essentially underpin effective altruist claims about the importance of cost-effectiveness, numbers, and making a difference? Are they defensible? Is effective altruism compatible with non-consequentialism, including agent-centered moral options (e.g. to give some priority to oneself, or to those near and dear) and moral constraints (e.g. against doing harm)? What is the relation between effective altruism, rights, and justice? Another set of questions deals with issues arising from ‘within’ the effective altruist standpoint: What is the most important cause? Fighting extreme poverty, reducing animal suffering, reducing global catastrophic risks (more specifically reducing existential risks), shaping the far future, or what? Should we take into account the well-being of merely possible future persons? If so, how much weight should we give it relative to the well-being of actual persons? How should we decide where to give if there is no clearly best cause, or if we are clueless about the long term effects of our acts?

LEARNING OUTCOMES: By the end of this module, students should have gained a good critical understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of the effective altruism movement, the key arguments for and against various core effective altruist theses, and the potentially high impact role of philosophical research and teaching in the context of effective altruist efforts. Students will be able to analyze and evaluate critical discussion of and within effective altruism as it appears in philosophical literature and popular venues. They will be able to formulate and articulate their own views on the issues covered, and provide a rational defence of these views in written work and discussion.

COURSE MATERIALS: Nearly all of the course materials can be found online; citations or links are provided below. Some materials, marked with an ‘(MMS)’, will be made available on MMS. William MacAskill’s book, *Doing Good Better: Effective Altruism and a Radical New*

Way to Make a Difference (London: Faber & Faber, 2015), is available for purchase at Blackwell's Bookshop at the Student's Union in St Andrews (or can be [purchased online](#)).

POLICIES: Please read the latest version of the booklet 'Philosophy Handbook for Undergraduates' very carefully regarding absences, lateness of essays, academic alerts, plagiarism etc. Copies are available from the main office in Edgecliffe or online at: <http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/philosophy/current/ugrad/>.

ASSESSMENT: Your final grade for this module will be determined by two essays (40% of the overall course grade each) and participation on the blog (20% of overall course grade).

About the Two Essays:

The first essay must be submitted to MMS by Monday 24 October at 11.59pm (beginning of week 7), and the second by Friday 2 December at 11.59pm (end of week 12). The maximum length of each essay is 3,000 words (excluding the bibliography). Double-spaced 12-point Times New Roman font with normal margins; any internally consistent citation format is fine. Any requests for extensions or anything of an administrative nature should be addressed to the module coordinator (Pummer).

The first essay should be on a topic of your choosing relating to any of the topics spanning weeks 1 through 5, and the second relating to any of the topics spanning weeks 7 through 11 (see below for the schedule of topics). You will need to have your topic approved in advance: to have your topic approved, please simply add two to three sentences outlining the topic of your paper and the main claim you plan on defending at the end of your blog posts for weeks 4 and 8 (week 4 for the first essay and week 8 for the second essay; see below for details of the blog assignment). If you hear nothing back from us within a week, your topic is approved. We will contact you if we think you need to revise your focus.

Please do get in touch at any point if you are at all unsure about the appropriateness of your topic (we hope you'll make use of our recommended readings in searching for a paper topic; if you are thinking about writing on something that does not significantly connect with any of the required or recommended readings, that is a sign that it may be inappropriate, and thus wise for you to check with us before proceeding further). One point that's worth flagging right now: this is a *philosophy* course. This means that your paper will need to somehow contribute to a philosophical debate. While there are many extremely important empirical questions surrounding effective altruism – and we encourage you to think carefully about them – your two essays must have a sufficiently philosophical focus. Again, if you are in doubt about the appropriateness of your topic, please come speak with us.

The Philosophy Handbook for Undergraduates contains lots of valuable information and advice about writing your essay. In addition, you may benefit from the following resources on writing philosophy essays:

- Portmore, D., '[Tips on Writing a Philosophy Paper](#)'
- MacAskill, W., '[How to Do Well in Philosophy Part #1 – Essays and Productivity](#)'

About the Blog:

You are required to post a blog each week on the module's Moodle page (no blogs are required for weeks 1 and 6, making a total of nine blogs). You are required to post to the blog by Monday

of the relevant week at 4pm. Post *one* question, comment, or objection regarding one of the assigned readings for the week. Your post should be no longer than two paragraphs.

Blog contributions will be scored on simple scale: '2' is full credit (thoughtful and clear contribution), '1' is partial credit (for unclear contributions, or contributions that lack any independent thinking or analysis), and '0' is no credit (for very confused, very minimal, or off topic posts, or for failing to submit a post by the set deadline). Obviously you must be concise if you aren't to exceed the two paragraph limit. Don't bother mentioning whether you enjoyed the assigned reading; this isn't literary criticism. Your question, comment, or objection should help with the assessment of a philosophical claim or argument found in the required reading.

There is one blog for each seminar group. You should have access to the blog for your seminar group only. The module coordinator (Pummer) will start each discussion with an initial post merely announcing the topic of the week (e.g. 'Week 4: Making a Difference'). You should enter your post as a response to this initial post, instead of as a new discussion topic. You won't get any credit for responding to others' posts, but it would be great if you did so anyway!

There is a *blog competition*: Pummer and Mulgan will together select two blog posts from weeks 2-5, and another two from weeks 7-11, as 'outstanding posts'. Winners of the competition will be invited to have their posts displayed publicly on the *Centre for Ethics, Philosophy and Public Affairs* website: <http://ceppa.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/>. (Upon receiving this invitation, posts to go on the website may be expanded from two paragraphs to three or four paragraphs, if desired.)

ADVICE AND EXPECTATIONS: This is a 30-credit module, so it should occupy about half of your working week – around 18-20 hours per week. If you feel that you are having trouble keeping up, even though you're spending 18-20 hours per week on this module, come and talk to us.

You should come to lectures and tutorials each week prepared to discuss the material from the assigned readings. Since most of the readings have been written with an audience of professional philosophers in mind, this will likely require reading, making notes, and re-reading. Remember that only three of the 18-20 hours per week will be spent in class, so you should expect and plan to spend 15-17 hours per week thinking about the material on your own. For each week, there are required readings for the lecture and tutorials, and several recommended readings. To excel, you should read at least some of these supplementary readings each week. That said, it is better to gain a good understanding of a couple of them rather than rushing through all of them.

In preparing for the lectures and tutorials, you need to think about what you hope to get out of them: what you don't understand, what you'd like to understand better, what you think about the issues. Make a note of these points in advance of lectures and tutorials. Make time afterwards to look at those notes again, to see how you've progressed. If you don't feel you've progressed, then come and talk to one of us.

Lectures will be primarily for introducing the issues. But since the class is two hours long, we expect there to be a significant amount of discussion even in lectures. Thus, you should read through the material at least once before lecture.

You also need to plan ahead for your essays. Beyond the required reading for lectures and tutorials, you may also want to explore the recommended readings, and you will need to read more deeply on the topic you select for your essay. In addition to those listed below, we will be

happy to suggest further readings if you talk to us about your interests; you can also make use of the following resources:

- Google Scholar (<http://scholar.google.com>)
- *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (<http://plato.stanford.edu>)
- *Philosophy Compass* (<http://philosophy-compass.com/>)
- PhilPapers (<http://philpapers.org>)

A final bit of advice is that philosophy is not just for dead white guys. Please see here for some evidence: <http://looksphilosophical.tumblr.com/>

SCHEDULE OF TOPICS AND READINGS:

WEEK 1: Introduction to Effective Altruism (Pummer)

Required Reading:

- MacAskill, W., *Doing Good Better: Effective Altruism and a Radical New Way to Make a Difference* (London: Faber & Faber, 2015).
- Singer, P., ‘[Famine, Affluence, and Morality](#)’ *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 1 (1972): 229-43.
- Unger, P. *Living High and Letting Die: Our Illusion of Innocence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), chapter 2 only.

Recommended Reading:

- Singer, P., *The Most Good You Can Do: How Effective Altruism Is Changing Ideas about Living Ethically* (London: Yale University Press, 2015).
- Srinivasan, A., ‘[Stop the Robot Apocalypse](#)’ (review of William MacAskill’s *Doing Good Better*), *London Review of Books* (24 September 2015).
- McMahan, J., ‘[Philosophical Critiques of Effective Altruism](#)’ *The Philosophers’ Magazine* Issue 73, 2nd Quarter 2016, pp. 92-99.
- Clough, E., ‘[Effective Altruism’s Political Blindspot](#)’ *Boston Review* (and [Hauke Hillebrandt’s response](#), also see ‘[The Logic of Effective Altruism](#)’ particularly [Angus Deaton and replies to him](#), *Boston Review*) (2015).
- Karnofsky, H., ‘[The lack of controversy over well-targeted aid](#)’ *The GiveWell Blog* (2015).
- Wiblin, R., ‘[Effective altruists love systemic change](#)’ *80,000 Hours Blog* (2015).
- Timmerman, T., ‘[Sometimes there’s nothing wrong with letting a child drown](#)’ *Analysis* 75 (2): 204-212 (2015).
- Barry, C., and Øverland, G., ‘[How Much for the Child?](#)’ *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 16 (1): 189-204 (2013).
- Kamm, F., ‘[Does Distance Matter Morally to the Duty to Rescue?](#)’ *Law and Philosophy* 19 (6): 655-681 (2000).
- Budolfson, M., ‘[Global Ethics and the Problem with Singer and Unger’s Argument for an Extreme Duty to Provide Aid](#)’ (unpublished).

- Cullity, G., '[Asking Too Much](#)' *The Monist* 86 (3): 402-418 (2003).
- Arneson, R., '[Moral Limits on the Demands of Beneficence?](#)' in *The Ethics of Assistance: Morality, Affluence, and the Distant Needy*, ed. by Deen K. Chatterjee (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 33-58.
- Railton, P., '[Alienation, Consequentialism, and the Demands of Morality](#)' *Philosophy & Public Affairs* Vol. 13, No. 2. (Spring, 1984), pp. 134-171.
- Ashford, E., '[The Demandingness of Scanlon's Contractualism](#)' *Ethics* 113 (2): 273-302 (2003).
- McElwee, B., '[What is Demandingness?](#)' in *The Limits of Moral Obligation*, eds. M. van Ackeren and M. Kühler, Routledge, forthcoming, 2015.
- Mogensen, A, MacAskill, W., and Ord, T., 'Giving Isn't Demanding', in *Philanthropy and Philosophy: Putting Theory into Practice*, ed. Paul Woodruff (New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming). (MMS)

WEEK 2: Cost-Effectiveness: Size, Number, Uncertainty, and Aggregation (Pummer)

Required Reading:

- Ord, T., '[The Moral Imperative Toward Cost-Effectiveness in Global Health](#)' *Centre for Global Development* (2013).
- Kamm, F., '[Cost Effectiveness Analysis and Fairness](#)' *Journal of Practical Ethics* (2016).
- Hare, C., '[Obligations to Merely Statistical People](#)' *Journal of Philosophy* 109 (5-6): 378-390 (2012).

Recommended Reading:

- Caviola, L. et al., '[The evaluability bias in charitable giving: Saving administration costs or saving lives?](#)' *Judgment and Decision Making*, Vol. 9, No. 4, July 2014, pp. 303-315.
- Taurek, J., '[Should the Numbers Count?](#)' *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 6 (1977): 293-316.
- Parfit, D., '[Innumerate Ethics](#)' *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 7 (1978): 285-301.
- Timmermann, J., '[The Individualist Lottery: How People Count, But Not Their Numbers](#)' *Analysis* 64 (2004): 106-12.
- Kamm, F., '[Aggregation and Two Moral Methods](#)' in *Intricate Ethics: Rights, Responsibility, and Permissible Harm*, Oxford University Press 2007.
- Liao, M., '[Who Is Afraid of Numbers?](#)' *Utilitas* 20 (2008): 447-61.
- Temkin, L., '[Aggregation and Problems about Trade-offs](#)' in *Rethinking the Good: Moral Ideals and the Nature of Practical Reasoning*, Oxford University Press 2012.
- Crisp, R., '[Well-Being](#)' *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.).

WEEK 3: Justice and Doing Harm (Pummer)

Required Reading:

- Gabriel, I., '[Effective Altruism and Its Critics](#)' *Journal of Applied Philosophy* (2016).

- Ashford, E., 'Severe Poverty as an Unjust Emergency' in *Philanthropy and Philosophy: Putting Theory into Practice*, ed. Paul Woodruff (New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming). (MMS)
- Pummer, T., '[Risky Giving](#)' *The Philosophers' Magazine* Issue 73, 2nd Quarter 2016, pp. 62-70.

Recommended Reading:

- Parfit, D., '[Equality and Priority](#)' *Ratio*, vol. 10, no. 3 (December, 1997), pp. 202-221.
- Ashford, E., '[Obligations of Justice and Beneficence Towards the Severely Poor](#)' in Thomas Pogge, Patricia Illingworth and Leif Wenar (eds.), *The Ethics of Philanthropy* (OUP 2009).
- Pogge, T., [World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms](#) (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002). ([Summary here.](#))
- Barry, C., and Øverland, G., [Responding to Global Poverty: Harm, Responsibility, and Agency](#) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).
- Wenar, L., '[Poverty is No Pond: Challenges for the Affluent](#)' in *Giving Well: The Ethics of Philanthropy*, ed. Patricia Illingworth, Thomas Pogge, and Leif Wenar (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- Woollard, F., and Howard-Snyder, F., '[Doing vs. Allowing Harm](#)' *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.).

WEEK 4: Making a Difference (Pummer)

Required Reading:

- Kagan, S., '[Do I Make a Difference?](#)' *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 39 (2): 105-141 (2011).
- Budolfson, M., '[The Inefficacy Objection to Consequentialism, and the Problem with the Expected Consequences Response](#)' *Philosophical Studies* (forthcoming).
- Nefsky, J., 'How You Can Help, Without Making a Difference' (unpublished). (MMS)

Recommended Reading:

- Nefsky, J., '[Consequentialism and the Problem of Collective Harm: A Reply to Kagan](#)' *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 39 (4): 364-395 (2011).
- Nefsky, J., '[Fairness, Participation, and the Real Problem of Collective Harm](#)' *Oxford Studies in Normative Ethics* (2015).
- Chappell, R., '[There is No Problem of Collective Harm: A Reply to Nefsky](#)' (unpublished).
- Dougherty, T., '[Vagueness and indeterminacy in ethics](#)' *The Routledge Handbook of Metaethics*, Tristram McPherson & David Plunkett (eds.), forthcoming.
- Quinn, W., '[The Puzzle of the Self-Torturer](#)' *Philosophical Studies* Vol. 59, No. 1 (May, 1990), pp. 79-90.
- Arntzenius, F. and McCarthy, D., '[Self-Torture and Group Beneficence](#)' *Erkenntnis* Vol. 47, No. 1 (Jul., 1997), pp. 129-144.

- Andreou, C., '[Environmental Damage and the Puzzle of the Self-Torturer](#)' *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 34 (1): 95-108 (2006).
- Pinkert, F., '[What If I Cannot Make a Difference \(And I Know It\)?](#)' *Ethics* 125, no. 4 (July 2015): 971-998.
- Budolfson, M. and Spears, D., 'Effective Altruism, Marginal Impact, and Fundraising: Weak Links in Effective Altruism's Chain' (unpublished). (MMS)

WEEK 5: Demands on Where to Give (Pummer)

Required Reading:

- McMahan, J., '[Doing Good and Doing the Best](#)' in *Philanthropy and Philosophy: Putting Theory into Practice*, ed. Paul Woodruff (New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).
- Pummer, T., '[Whether and Where to Give](#)' *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 44 (1): 77-95 (2016).
- Norcross, A., '[Reasons Without Demands: Rethinking Rightness](#)' *Contemporary Debates in Moral Theory*, ed. J. Dreier (Oxford, 2006), pp. 38-53.

Recommended Reading:

- Wessels, U., '[Beyond the Call of Duty: The Structure of a Moral Region](#)' *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement* 77 (2015): 87-104.
- Barry, C., and Lawford-Smith, H., 'On Satisfying Duties to Assist' (unpublished). (MMS)
- Lang, G., '[Should Utilitarianism Be Scalar?](#)' *Utilitas* 25 (1): 80-95 (2013).
- Slote, M., and Pettit, P., '[Satisficing Consequentialism](#)' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Supplementary Volumes, Vol. 58 (1984), pp. 139-163, 165-176.
- Chappell, R., '[Willpower Satisficing](#)' (unpublished).
- Scheffler, S., *The Rejection of Consequentialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).
- Kagan, S., *The Limits of Morality* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).
- Crisp, R., and Pummer, T., 'Effective Justice' (unpublished). (MMS)

WEEK 6: Independent Learning Week

- The first essay must be submitted to MMS by Monday 24 October at 11.59pm (beginning of week 7).

WEEK 7: Future People Part I: The Nonidentity Problem (Mulgan)

Required Reading:

- Parfit, D., *Reasons and Persons*, Oxford University Press, 1986 edition, chapter 16: The Non-identity Problem. (e-book)

Recommended Reading:

- Benatar, D., *Better Never to Have Been*, Oxford University Press, 2006. (e-book)

- Heyd, D., 'The intractability of the nonidentity problem', in Roberts, M., and Wasserman, D. (eds.), *Harming Future Persons: ethics, genetics and the nonidentity problem*, Springer, 2009, chapter 1, pp. 3-25. (e-book)
- Kumar, R., "Who can be wronged?", *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 2003, 31, pp. 99-118.
- Kumar, R., 'Wronging future people: a contractualist proposal', in Gosseries, A., and Meyer, L., (eds.) *Intergenerational Justice*, Oxford University Press, 2009, chapter 9, pp. 251-272. (e-book)
- Parfit, D., *Reasons and Persons*, Oxford University Press, 1986 edition, Appendix G: Whether causing someone to exist can benefit this person. (e-book)
- Roberts, M., "Is the Person-Affecting Intuition Paradoxical?", *Theory and Decision*, 2003, 55, pp. 1-44.
- Roberts, M., 'The Nonidentity Problem', *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- Southwood, N., 'Moral Contractualism', *Philosophy Compass*, 4(6), 926-937, December 2009.
- Weinberg, R., 'Identifying and Dissolving the Non-Identity Problem', *Philosophical Studies*, 137(1), 3-18, January 2008.

WEEK 8: Future People Part II: The Repugnant Conclusion (Mulgan)

Required Reading:

- Parfit, D., *Reasons and Persons*, Oxford University Press, 1986 edition, chapter 17: The Repugnant Conclusion. (e-book)
- Mulgan, T., *Future People*, Oxford University Press, 2006, chapter three. (e-book)

Recommended Reading:

- Arrhenius, G., Ryberg, J., and Tännsjö, T., 'The Repugnant Conclusion', *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- Broome, J., *Weighing Lives*, Oxford University Press, 2004. (e-book)
- Greaves, H., '[Population Axiology](#)' *Philosophy Compass* (forthcoming)
- Parfit, D., *Reasons and Persons*, Oxford University Press, 1986 edition, chapter 19: The Mere Addition Paradox. (e-book)
- Parfit, D., "Overpopulation and the Quality of Life", in P. Singer (ed.), *Applied Ethics*, Oxford University Press, 1986, pp. 145-164.
- Parfit, D., 'How we can avoid the repugnant conclusion', John Dewey Memorial Lecture, 2012. (MMS)
- Portmore, D., "Does the Total Principle Have Any Repugnant Implications?", *Ratio*, 12, 1999, pp. 80-98.
- Ryberg, J., "Parfit's Repugnant Conclusion.", *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 46, number 183, April 1996, pp. 202-213.
- Tännsjö, T., 'Why We Ought to Accept the Repugnant Conclusion', *Utilitas*, 2002, 14(3), pp. 339-359.
- Temkin, L., "Intransitivity and the Mere Addition Paradox", *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 1987, volume 16, number 2, pp. 138-187.

WEEK 9: Ethics for a Broken World (Mulgan)

Required Reading:

- Mulgan, T., *Ethics for a broken world: reimagining philosophy after catastrophe*, Acumen, 2011, Introductory Lecture: Philosophy in the age of affluence. (e-book or MMS)
- Mulgan, T., 'Utilitarianism for a Broken World', *Utilitas*, 27, 2015, pp. 92-114.

Recommended Reading:

- Jamieson, D., *Reason in a Dark Time*, Oxford University Press, 2014, especially chapters 5 and 6. (e-book)
- Mulgan, T., 'Ethics for Possible Futures', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 2014, 114, pp. 57-73.
- Mulgan, T., 'Theory and intuition in a broken world', in S. G. Chappell (ed.), *Intuition, theory, and anti-theory*, Oxford University Press, 2015, pp. 151-166. (e-book)
- Mulgan, T., 'Answering to future people: Responsibility for climate change in a breaking world', *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, published online early.
- Nathanson, S., "Review of Mulgan *Ethics for a Broken World*", *Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews*, 10 September 2012. <http://ndpr.nd.edu/news/33196-ethics-for-a-broken-world-imagining-philosophy-after-catastrophe/>
- Singer, P., Review of Mulgan, *Ethics for a Broken World*, *Philosophical Quarterly*, 2013, 63 (250), pp. 187-189.

WEEK 10: Existential Risks (Mulgan)

Required Reading:

- Bostrom, N., 'Existential Risk Prevention as a Global Priority', *Global Policy*, 4, 2013, pp. 15-31.
- Broome, J., 'The Most Important Thing about Climate Change', in J. Boston, A. Bradstock, and D. Eng (eds.), *Public Policy: Why Ethics Matters*, ANU Electronic Press, 2010, pp. 101-116.

Recommended Reading:

- Bostrom, N., *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*, Oxford University Press, 2014, especially chapters 7 and 9.
- Broome, J., *Climate Matters*, WW Norton, 2012, Chapter 8: The Future versus the Present, pp. 133-155. (e-book)
- Lear, J., *Radical Hope: Ethics in the face of cultural devastation*, Harvard University Press, 2006. (e-book)
- Mulgan, T., 'Ethics for Possible Futures', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 2014, 114, pp. 57-73.
- Mulgan, T., 'Moral Philosophy, Superintelligence, and the Singularity', draft manuscript. (MMS)
- Chalmers, D., 'The Singularity: A Philosophical Analysis', *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 17, pp. 7-65, 2010.

- Mulgan, T., 'Theorising about justice for a broken world', in K. Watene and J. Drydyk (eds.), *Theorizing Justice: Critical Insights and Future Directions*, London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2016, pp. 15-32. (MMS)
- Paul, L. A., *Transformative Experience*, Oxford University Press, 2014. (e-book)
- Parfit, D., *Reasons and Persons*, Oxford University Press, 1986 edition, Concluding Chapter. (e-book)
- Vallentyne, P., and Kagan, S., 'Infinite Value and Finitely Additive Value Theory', *Journal of Philosophy*, 94, 1997, pp. 5-26.

WEEK 11: Cluelessness and the Far Future (Pummer)

Required Reading:

- Lenman, J., '[Consequentialism and Cluelessness](#)' *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 29 (4): 342-370 (2000).
- Greaves, H., '[Cluelessness](#)' (unpublished).

Recommended Reading:

- Cowen, T., '[The Epistemic Problem Does not Refute Consequentialism](#)' *Utilitas* 18 (4): 383-399 (2006).
- Dorsey, D., '[Consequentialism, Metaphysical Realism and the Argument from Cluelessness](#)' *Philosophical Quarterly* 62: 48-70 (2012).
- Burch-Brown, J., '[Clues for Consequentialists](#)' *Utilitas* 26 (1): 105-119 (2014).
- Askill, A., 'Effective Altruism and Cluelessness'. (MMS)
- Beckstead, N., *On the Overwhelming Importance of Shaping the Far Future* (PhD Dissertation, Rutgers University, 2013), chapter 1.

WEEK 12:

- The second essay must be submitted to MMS by Friday 2 December at 11.59pm (end of week 12).