UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

MPHIL EXAMINATIONS

for internal students

Ethics

10:00-13:00, Wednesday 15th May, 2002

Candidates should answer THREE of the following questions.
Please avoid overlap in your answers.

1. EITHER   (a)   'The debate between cognitivists and non-cognitivists is not one about the objectivity versus the subjectivity of morality.' Discuss.

   OR   (b) 'To be *moral*, moral knowledge would have to be essentially motivating; to be *knowledge*, moral knowledge would have   not to be essentially motivating. Hence "moral knowledge" is a contradiction in terms.' Discuss.

2.   Is moral wrongness helpfully understood in terms of what individuals owe one another?

3.   Is it possible for an act of mine to have been wrong even though I could not have known that it was wrong?

4.   'If one acts contrary to duty, then the underlying principle of one's action must give rise to a contradiction of one sort or another .' Discuss.

5.   Under what conditions is there a best thing to do in a situation, all things considered? From what point of view is it to be identified?

6. (a) 'I must φ, but I won't'; (b) 'I ought to φ, but I won't'. Is (b) less problematic than (a)? If so, why?

7. 'If one can save either A alone or both A and B, one ought to save both A and B. Therefore, if one can save either A alone or both B and C, one ought to save B and C.' Discuss.

8. What kind of freedom is required for moral responsibility?

9. How far can morally good people disagree morally?

10. Can virtues conflict?

11. Is there any reason to expect moral problems to be soluble by moral theory?

12. To what extent is your having a reason to φ a fact about yourself?

13. 'There is much talk of the misery which we cause to the brute creation; but they are recompensed by existence. If they were not useful to man, and therefore protected by him, they would not be nearly so numerous' (Dr Johnson). How good a justification is this of the exploitation of other animals by humans?

END OF PAPER