

---

## C12T5P3 测试练习

### What's the purpose of gaining knowledge?

A 'I would found \_\_\_\_\_ an institution \_\_\_\_\_ where any people can find instruction \_\_\_\_\_ in any subject.' That was the founder's motto \_\_\_\_\_ for Cornell University, and it seems an apt \_\_\_\_\_ characterization of the different university, also in the USA, where I currently teach philosophy \_\_\_\_\_. A student can prepare for a career \_\_\_\_\_ in resort management \_\_\_\_\_, engineering, interior design \_\_\_\_\_, accounting, music, law enforcement \_\_\_\_\_, you name it. But what would the founders of these two institutions have thought of a course called 'Arson \_\_\_\_\_ for Profit'? I kid you not \_\_\_\_\_: we have it on the books. Any undergraduates who have met \_\_\_\_\_ the academic requirements \_\_\_\_\_ can sign up for \_\_\_\_\_ the course in our program \_\_\_\_\_ in 'fire science'.

B Naturally, the course is intended for \_\_\_\_\_ prospective \_\_\_\_\_ arson investigators \_\_\_\_\_, who can learn all the tricks \_\_\_\_\_ of the trade \_\_\_\_\_ for detecting whether a fire was deliberately \_\_\_\_\_ set, discovering who did it, and establishing a chain of evidence \_\_\_\_\_ for effective prosecution \_\_\_\_\_ in a court of law \_\_\_\_\_. But wouldn't this also be the perfect course for prospective arsonists \_\_\_\_\_ to sign

---

up for? My point is not to criticize academic programs in fire science: they are highly welcome as part of the increasing professionalization \_\_\_\_\_ of this and many other occupations \_\_\_\_\_. However, it's not unknown for a firefighter to torch \_\_\_\_\_ a building. This example suggests how dishonest and illegal behavior, with the help of higher education, can creep \_\_\_\_\_ into every aspect \_\_\_\_\_ of public and business life.

C I realized this anew \_\_\_\_\_ when I was invited to speak before a class in marketing, which is another of our degree \_\_\_\_\_ programs. The regular \_\_\_\_\_ instructor is a colleague \_\_\_\_\_ who appreciates the kind of ethical \_\_\_\_\_ perspective \_\_\_\_\_ I can bring as a philosopher. There are endless ways I could have approached this assignment \_\_\_\_\_, but I took my cue \_\_\_\_\_ from the title of the course: 'Principles of Marketing'. It made me think to ask the students, 'Is marketing principled? \_\_\_\_\_' After all, a subject matter can have principles in the sense of being codified \_\_\_\_\_, having rules, as with football or chess, without being principled in the sense of being ethical. Many of the students immediately assumed \_\_\_\_\_ that the answer to my question about marketing principles was obvious: no. Just look at the ways in which everything under the sun \_\_\_\_\_ has been marketed;

---

obviously it need not be done in a principled (=ethical) fashion.

D Is that obvious? I made the suggestion, which may sound downright \_\_\_\_\_ crazy in light of the evidence, that perhaps marketing is by definition principled. My inspiration \_\_\_\_\_ for this judgment is the philosopher Immanuel Kant, who argued that anybody of knowledge consists of an end (or purpose) and a means \_\_\_\_\_ .

E Let us apply \_\_\_\_\_ both the terms \_\_\_\_\_ ‘means’ and ‘end’ to marketing. The students have signed up for a course in order to learn how to market effectively. But to what end? There seem to be two main attitudes \_\_\_\_\_ toward that question. One is that the answer is obvious: the purpose of marketing is to sell things and to make money. That other attitude is that the purpose of marketing is irrelevant \_\_\_\_\_ : Each person comes to the program and course with his or her own plans, and these need not even concern the acquisition \_\_\_\_\_ of marketing expertise \_\_\_\_\_ as such. My proposal \_\_\_\_\_ , which I believe would also be Kant’s, is that neither of these attitudes captures \_\_\_\_\_ the significance of the end to the means for marketing. A field of knowledge \_\_\_\_\_ or a professional endeavor \_\_\_\_\_ is defined by both the means and the end; hence \_\_\_\_\_ both deserve \_\_\_\_\_ scrutiny \_\_\_\_\_ .

---

Students need to study both how to achieve X, and also what X is.

F It is at this point that ‘Arson for Profit’ becomes supremely \_\_\_\_\_ relevant \_\_\_\_\_. That course is presumably all about means: how to detect and prosecute \_\_\_\_\_ criminal activity. It is therefore assumed that the end is good in an ethical sense. When I ask fire science students to articulate the end, or purpose, of their field, they eventually generalize \_\_\_\_\_ to something like, ‘The safety and welfare of society \_\_\_\_\_,’ which seems right. As we have seen, someone could use the very same knowledge of means to achieve a much less noble end, such as personal profit via \_\_\_\_\_ destructive \_\_\_\_\_, dangerous, reckless \_\_\_\_\_ activity. But we would not call that firefighting. We have a separate word for it: arson. Similarly, if you employed the ‘principles of Marketing’ in an unprincipled \_\_\_\_\_ way, you would not be doing marketing. We have another Term for it: fraud \_\_\_\_\_. Kant gives the example of a doctor and a poisoner, who use the identical \_\_\_\_\_ knowledge to achieve their divergent \_\_\_\_\_ ends. We would say that one is practicing medicine \_\_\_\_\_, the other, murder \_\_\_\_\_.