

Study Sheet for FinalPossible Short-Answer Questions (You'll have to answer 10/11—3 pts each)

- (1) State all three formulations of Kant's categorical imperative.
- (2) What is the difference between hypothetical and categorical imperatives?
- (3) Define "direct normative utilitarianism."
- (4) Describe three of the six arenas in which Mill says we use the terms "just" and "unjust."
- (5) How does Kant define 'humanity'?
- (6) According to Mill, which two psychological traits distinguish human judgments of justice and injustice from the desire for revenge commonly found in non-human animals?
- (7) According to Kant, what is the difference between unconditioned value and intrinsic value?
- (8) Explain the difference between subjective and objective justification.
- (9) Define 'autonomy'. What value must be weighed against autonomy to determine whether aborting a late stage fetus is morally permissible?
- (10) What is the difference between a priori and a posteriori moral knowledge? Describe what Kant would consider an article of a priori moral knowledge. Describe what Kant would consider an item of a posteriori moral knowledge.
- (11) What, according to Kant, are the two functions of "empirical ethics"?
- (12) Explain why Kant thinks that happiness does not have unconditioned value.
- (13) Kant thinks that only actions done from duty have true moral worth. State the "**counterfactual** account" of what makes it the case that an act is done *from* duty.
- (14) Kant thinks that only actions done from duty have true moral worth. State the "**actual** account" of what makes it the case that an act is done *from* duty.
- (15) Define 'indirect normative utilitarianism'.
- (16) Explain Mill's distinction between *internal* and *external* sanctions.
- (17) Define "supererogatory."
- (18) Who was Kitty Genevose? What is the relevance of her case for views on which we have no positive duties?
- (19) How does Mill analyze the concept of moral obligation?
- (20) Does Mill think the miser and the monk are happy?
- (21) How might someone argue for the consistency of the following two positions: (a) killing a fetus is never justified; (b) capital punishment is a justified punishment for convicted murderers?
- (22)*
- (23) Define 'meta-ethics' and list three meta-ethical views.
- (24) Is 'murder is wrong' necessarily true? Is it analytically true? Why or why not?
- (25) Define 'perfect duty' and 'imperfect duty' and provide an example of each.
- (26) What questions does moral psychology address? List some positions in moral psychology and describe the answers they give to these questions.
- (27) State the principle we've been calling "Rationality as Conceptual Supervenience."
- (28) According to Mill, how can we determine which of two kinds of pleasure is more worthy of promotion?
- (29) According to Mill, what population should we consider when we're trying to evaluate which of several available actions will maximize happiness?
- (30) Explain the difference between desire-dependent and desire-independent categorical imperatives.
- (31) Kant lists two reasons why acting from duty is more worthy of praise and esteem than benevolent inclination (i.e. doing the right thing because one feels like doing it). What are these two reasons?

- (32) State the principle we've been calling "Perfect Benevolence."
- (33) Describe three functions that Mill assigns to a first principle of morality.
- (34) Explain the difference between consequentialism and utilitarianism.
- (35) Explain how Williams argues against the seemingly obvious claim that it cannot be immoral to have done what you knew would make the world better than it would have been had you refrained from acting or performed any other action then available to you.
- (36) State the principle of utility.
- (37) Define "non-culpable ignorance."

Possible Medium-Length Essay Questions (You'll have to answer 3/4—10pts each)

- (1) Apply the principle of utility and Kant's Categorical Imperative to the issue of suicide. When if ever do these principles permit those who follow them to commit suicide? Which theory provides a better guide? Make sure to consider the various circumstances in which a person might commit suicide and defend your answer with argumentation.
- (2) Apply the formulation of humanity version of the categorical imperative to laziness or sloth. Why, according to Kant, is laziness immoral? Are Kant's reasons compelling? Defend your answer with an argument.
- (4) Does our intuitive response to Nozick's experience machine present a problem for utilitarianism? Does it present a problem for all forms of consequentialism? Explain your answers.
- (5) To argue that happiness is the only thing people want for its own sake, Mill argues that having money is part of a miser's happiness and displaying virtue is part of a monk's. Is Mill right about this? Is this compatible with his claim that happiness is pleasure? Is happiness just the satisfaction of your desires or your getting what you want even when your getting what you want doesn't bring you pleasure? Can someone think she is happy when she really isn't?

Possible Long Essays (you'll have to answer 2—no choices—20 pts each)

- (1) Suppose John is led by his sympathy for the people trapped in the crumbling world trade center to run in and try to rescue them. Does his act have moral value? Does he deserve credit or praise for what he has done? What would Kant say? Suppose instead that John doesn't want to go in, and doesn't feel any sympathy for those trapped. (He is emotionally numb or in shock.) But he goes in anyway because he knows it is his moral duty to do his duty as a fireman. Does his act have moral value? Does he deserve credit or praise for what he has done? What would Kant say? What, if anything, distinguishes the value of the act done from sympathy from the value of the act done from duty? What, if anything, explains why some people do what they know duty demands of them while others fail to do what they know they are obligated to do?
- (2) The first formulation of the categorical imperative provides us with a way to test principles (or maxims) to see whether it would be moral to act on those principles. Critics have complained that the test is both too weak (it lets in bad principles) and too strong (it keeps out perfectly fine principles). Explain these criticisms using examples. How might Kant respond to these criticisms?
- (3) State Kant's first formulation of the categorical imperative. Does the categorical imperative on this formulation prohibit lying to escape embarrassment? What sort of inconsistency (if any) arises from adopting and acting on a policy of lying to escape embarrassment and at the same time doing what the categorical imperative tells you to do? In what conditions would a utilitarian object to someone's having lied to escape embarrassment? Which moral theory provides a better guide for our thinking about lying in general? Make sure you use examples to back up your answers.

(4) Describe how a Kantian would argue that slavery is immoral. (Make sure to analyze and apply the formula of humanity in this context.) Describe how a utilitarian would argue against slavery. Make sure to explain Mill's theory of rights when you do this. Which theory provides us with a better way of understanding what is so immoral about enslaving someone?

(5) Singer argues that it is wrong to walk past a child drowning in shallow water to keep from ruining your shoes. He then argues that there is no morally relevant factor to distinguish this act from spending money on shoes when you know this money could be used to save the life of a child facing disease or malnutrition. Assess Singer's argument. How much weight should we give to the needs and interests of other people when we are deciding what to do? Is it ok to favor your own wellbeing over the wellbeing of strangers? If so, why? And how much can you favor your own interests and the interest of your "circle" over the interests of those outside of it if you're to continue to think of yourself as a morally decent person? Compare and contrast how Utilitarians and Kantians would approach these questions.

(6) According to the relativist about character a person is immoral or has a bad character just in case her behaviors and attitudes are significantly worse than those of others in her social cohort. Is relativism about character true? When answering this question make sure to comparatively assess people in different historical and cultural contexts: e.g. an evaluation of the attitudes and actions of a husband in the U.S. today vs. an evaluation of the attitudes of a husband in rural Libya today; or a comparison of slave owners in ancient Greece vs. slaveholders in the American South. Is moral relativism compatible with the principle we've been calling "Rationality as Conceptual Supervenience"? Why or why not?