EXPHIL03E and EXPHIL03 Exam Spring 2016 – self-study variant

Tuesday December 6th - at 09:00-13:00 (4 hours)

The set consists of two pages

No books or aids are permitted during the exam

Both part I and part II must be answered

Part I: History of Philosophy and Science

Either:

1. Aristotle on happiness

In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle seeks an answer to the question: "What is the best and highest good for human beings"? Give a short account of why he feels it is necessary to ask this question.

He argues that the highest good for human beings is happiness, but then the question arises as to what this is. He starts by looking at some common opinions about the nature of happiness, but these are rejected. What are these answers, and why does he reject them?

What is his own answer to the question as to what happiness is, and what are his reasons for this answer?

Or:

2. Hume and Kant

Answer both part a) and b).

- a) Give an account of David Hume's analysis of the relationship between cause and effect. Make use of his example concerning billiard balls.
- b) Immanuel Kant rejects Hume's conclusions, and argues that the statement that all events have a cause, is synthetic a priori. Explain what Kant means by this.

Part II: Ethics

Either:

3. Virtue ethics and deontology

Answer all 3 parts, a), b) and c).

- a) What are the most important differences between virtue ethics and deontology? Answer this question on the basis of Rosalind Hursthouse's and Charles Fried's normative theories.
- b) The virtue ethicist Rosalind Hursthouse claims, in her discussion of abortion, that by exercising a moral right, "I can do something cruel, or callous ... that is, act viciously". So Hursthouse argues that one can do something vicious by exercising a moral right. How does she argue for this position?
- c) How can a deontologist like Fried argue against the opinion that exercising a moral right should have no relevance for the moral evaluation of an action?

Or:

4. Smart and Fried

Answer all 3 parts, a), b) and c).

A fighter pilot launches a missile against a military target. The missile hits home, but also kills a number of civilians living close to the military base. In a consequent public inquiry into the case, the pilot emphasizes that she never intended to kill civilians, but this was unfortunately unavoidable due to the fact that the enemy had placed military constructions in a built-up area.

- a) Give an account of utilitarianism, based on JJC Smart's essay *Outline of a system of utilitarian ethics*. How would Smart have assessed this situation? Make use of his terms "rational action" and "right action".
- b) In his text *Elements*, Charles Fried distinguishes between 1) intended consequences, and 2) foreseen, but non-intended side effects of an action, and claims that this is a significant distinction in ethics. Explain why he feels that this distinction is so important, and also which relevance it has in order to decide if the fighter pilot acted rightly or wrongly under the circumstances outlined above.
- c) Give a short account of Fried's principle of respect for persons, and why this is important in deontology.