1. In course readings Robert Adams affirms a version of a divine command theory of moral obligation. He then confronts this theory with a problem he labels “Abraham’s Dilemma.” State in your own words Adams’s divine command theory, the difficulty he poses for it, and his response to the difficulty. Does Adams’s response successfully meet the difficulty? Why or why not?

2. In his essay “Moral Luck,” Thomas Nagel writes, “Kant believed that good or bad luck should influence neither our moral judgment of a person and his actions, nor his moral assessment of himself.” Nagel adds that Kant’s position on moral luck “appears to be wrong, but it arises in response to a fundamental problem about moral responsibility to which we possess no satisfactory solution.” Should we accept or reject the no-moral-luck thesis?

3. Is sexual fidelity in marriage morally required, never morally required, or morally optional (required if the couple agrees to it but not otherwise)? Contrast the approaches to answering this question supplied by Mill’s utilitarianism and Kant’s categorical imperative doctrine. What factors would determine the answers each of these doctrines would reach? Which method of determining what ought to be done seems superior to you? For what reasons? (If both approaches strike you as unacceptable, defend your opinion.)

4. Are there any kinds of action that one ought morally never to do whatever the consequences? Consider one of these examples of moral rules that some affirm to be exceptionless: (1) Do not kill innocent nonthreatening people, (2) Do not betray those you love, or (3) Do not break your promise when doing so would seriously harm the person to whom the promise was made. With regard to the example you have chosen, ought one always to follow the rule, whatever the consequences? Your discussion should consider relevant arguments in some of the following course authors: Robert Nozick, Thomas Nagel, Amartya Sen, J.S. Mill, or Immanuel Kant.

**

Best wishes on all of your finals; have a good quarter break.