

**PHILOSOPHY TRIPOS Part II**

---

Wednesday 28 May 2003

9 to 12

---

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.*

*The question marked with an asterisk may not be answered by candidates also offering Paper 9.*

**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 Is there any interesting analogy between moral judgements and colour judgements? If so, what is it?
- \*2 **Either** (a) 'Act as if the maxim of your action were to become through your will a universal law of nature' (KANT). Does this injunction suffice to tell us how to act?  
**Or** (b) Why does Kant think that duty is ethically fundamental? Is this view defensible?
- 3 Is there a defensible subjectivist account of well-being?
- 4 Must acting morally make my life go better?
- 5 **Either** (a) Can a right to abortion be grounded in a woman's right to the use of her own body?  
**Or** (b) Does the value of autonomy support the claim that genetic engineering should be available on request?
- 6 'Quasi-realism cannot be coherently formulated, and is therefore self-defeating.' Discuss.
- 7 Can I have good grounds not to want what I need?
- 8 Does disagreement on moral values cast serious doubt on moral realism?
- 9 Outline and assess the claim that there are incommensurable values.
- 10 Do my past desires have any relevance in determining how it is rational for me to act?

END OF PAPER