

Tuesday 24 May 2016

09.00 – 12.00

---

Paper 3

ETHICS

*Answer **three** questions only.*

*Write the number of the question at the beginning of each answer. If you are answering an either/or question, indicate the letter as well.*

**STATIONERY REQUIREMENTS**

*20 Page Answer Book x 1*

*Rough Work Pad*

**You may not start to read the questions  
printed on the subsequent pages of this  
question paper until instructed that you  
may do so by the Invigilator**

1. 'If it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, we ought, morally, to do it.' Is it a good objection to this principle that to live by it would be profoundly disruptive to cherished personal projects?
2. Can we compare small harms to many with large harms to few?
3. EITHER (a) 'Contractualists cannot give a satisfactory account of promissory obligation because they must presuppose it.' Discuss.  
  
OR (b) 'The practice of promising is justified by its use to society.' Discuss.
4. Do sentimentalists provide too contingent a foundation for morality?
5. 'Only rationalists can provide an extensionally adequate account of moral obligation.' Discuss.
6. Should a theist be a voluntarist about moral obligation?
7. 'A has reason to  $\phi$  iff A would be motivated to  $\phi$  if A were to deliberate rationally and were fully informed.' Discuss.
8. 'If present sacrifice for future benefit is rational, so is sacrifice of one person's good for the sake of another's.' Discuss.
9. EITHER (a) Why might we be responsible for being weak willed?  
  
OR (b) 'The akratic person abandons rational calculation.' Why does this not simply count as vice or ignorance?
10. EITHER (a) Is the fact that virtue is rare a good response to the situationist challenge?  
  
OR (b) Are there any viable action-guiding principles in virtue ethics?

END OF PAPER