UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

University of London

EXAMINATION FOR INTERNAL STUDENTS

For The Following Qualifications:-

B.A. B.Sc.

٠

Philosophy B2: Ethics

COURSE CODE :	PHILB002
---------------	----------

UNIT VALUE : 1.00

DATE : 05-MAY-05

TIME : 10.00

TIME ALLOWED : 3 Hours

05-C1033-3-40 © 2005 University College London

TURN OVER

B2 Ethics

Answer THREE questions. Candidates must not answer more than two questions on Hume (Section A) or on Kant (Section B). Avoid overlap in your answers.

SECTION A Hume

- 1. How does Hume explain away and reinterpret the apparent conflict between reason and the passions?
- 2. Why, according to Hume, is vicarious pride impossible?
- 3. Explain with respect to a specific example the operation of sympathy.
- 4. Is Hume's claim that the merit of virtuous action derives from a virtuous motive consistent with his account of justice?
- 5. How is sympathy the ground of the natural and artificial virtues?

SECTION B Kant

- 1. 'The good will always acts in accordance with duty.' Discuss.
- 2. What is Schopenhauer's criticism of the first derivation of Kant's moral law? How might Kant respond?
- 3. Why might a maxim's passing the universalizability test fail to be sufficient for its being morally permissible?
- 4. Setting procreation to one side, people are not brought into being by our actions. So how can they be ends?
- 5. How does Kant argue for the claim that if the rational will is free then the moral law is unconditionally valid for it?

SECTION C Hume vs Kant

- 1. Hume denies and Kant affirms that morality is grounded in reason. Who is right?
- 2. Would Kant regard Hume's natural virtues as exemplifications of the moral law? Why or why not?
- 3. Compare Hume's claim that virtue in rags is still virtue with Kant's discussion of the good will.
- 4. Hume and Kant are each engaged in projects of self-understanding. What is the moral point of such projects?
- 5. 'Hume explains moral judgements in terms of passions, whereas the passions play no role in Kant's explanation of moral judgement.' Discuss.