

1. Is there anything morally wrong with chemically inducing love for one's children? If so, what? If not, why not?

2. Are parents ever morally obligated to chemically induce love for their children? In what conditions? If not, why not?

3. Is it morally wrong for parents to not love their children? Why or why not?

An argument (about 3)

- I. If A is not capable of doing x, then A is not morally obligated to do x.
- II. Some parents are not capable of loving their children.
- III. Thus, some parents are not morally obligated to love their children.

4. Are there counterexamples to I? If so, are any relevantly similar to having children who you do not love?

Liao's argument

- i. There is nothing [inauthentic / wrong] with helping to induce love for one's child by: (a) getting more sleep, (b) thinking about why one's child needs love, (c) dealing with the psychological barriers to loving one's child, or (d) spending quality time with one's child.
 - ii. There is no *morally relevant difference* between (a)-(d) and chemically inducing love for one's child.
 - iii. Thus, there is nothing [inauthentic / wrong] with chemically inducing love for one's child.
5. Imagine that your parent said to you, "When you were an infant I didn't love you... Your parent goes on to say one of the following:
- "But I realized I was sleep deprived, and when I got more sleep I then began to love you and I love you still."
 - "But I thought about how much you need and deserve love, and I started to love you, and I love you still."
 - "But I realized that I resented you because you were unplanned, and when I realized that, I stopped resenting you and began to love you, and I love you still."
 - "But then I spent a lot of time hanging out with you, and started to love you, and I love you still."
 - "But then I took some pills which made me love you, and I love you still."

Does there seem to be a difference between hearing these different things? Would they affect you differently? Should they affect you differently?