

Your Name _____

Your TA's Name _____

Time allowed: 90 minutes. This section of the exam counts for one-half of your exam grade.

No use of books or notes is permitted during this section of the exam.

ANSWER EXACTLY TEN OF THE FOURTEEN QUESTIONS ON THESE FIVE PAGES. Please answer the questions on the sheets provided. If you need more space, use the back sides of these sheets.

1. Imagine that a petition is delivered to the White House signed by the overwhelming majority of the people of Iraq. The petition is addressed to the President of the U.S. and says, "Please invade us and save us from our current rulers, who grossly violate our rights to freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of worship." The petition is carefully examined. All of the signatures are genuine. According to Walzer's doctrine of humanitarian intervention, would a military invasion of Iraq that aimed to fulfill the request of the petitioners qualify as a just war, other things being equal? Why or why not?

2. Suppose one chooses to borrow money by making an insincere promise to pay back what one has borrowed, this being done in order to get money. Explain how Kant's categorical imperative doctrine answers the question, "Would this choice be morally wrong?". Would it make any difference to Kant's judgment of the case if we stipulate that one's further aim in acting is (a) to use the money to buy a fancy car for oneself or (b) to use the money to contribute to famine relief? Why or why not?

3. Suppose that historians in the year 2010 discover that our understanding of the American Civil War of 1860-1865 has been based on misunderstanding of the relevant facts. It turns out that actually the Southern States that formed the Confederacy had already abolished slavery and freed all slaves by 1840, so the Civil War was not fought over the slavery issue. The Southern States wanted to secede and form their own independent nation, because the Southerners held themselves to be a culturally distinct community, an independent national community with no significant ties to Yankees in the North. The issue was secession. Just suppose. In these imagined circumstances, if the English sympathized with the Southern secessionist aims and intervened militarily on the side of the South, would this be a just war on the part of England according to Walzer's just war theory? Why or why not?

4. What are the two concepts of rules (ways of conceiving rules) that John Rawls distinguishes in his essay "Two Concepts of Rules"? In this essay what point does Rawls make, using this distinction, concerning the justifiability of utilitarianism?

5. Suppose that Mary is a well-informed anorexic. She wants above all to conform to her thin body ideal, and she is fully aware that in order to conform to it, she must adhere to a severe diet, which will kill her within a few months. She prefers death at a young age to living with a body that fails to satisfy her thin body ideal. She is fully aware of all the empirical facts that might be relevant to her choice in this matter. (a) Would her desire for a thin body at all costs qualify as a rational desire according to the view advanced by Richard Brandt in his essay in the Course Reader? (b) Would adhering to her severe diet in the circumstances described be good for her according to the views advanced by Richard Kraut in his essay in the Course Reader? In each case, why or why not? (If you need more information to answer either (a) or (b), explain what information you would need.)

6. In *Just and Unjust Wars* Walzer describes an event that occurred in France during World War II. Partisans (guerrilla fighters) disguised as civilians in a potato field ambush German troops marching by and kill several of them. Explain how the right of noncombatant immunity as interpreted by Walzer in his chapter on “Guerrilla War” determines the justifiability of fighting as a guerrilla warrior (as in the example) and what justifiably may and may not be done by soldiers fighting against guerrilla warriors.

7. In his essay “Autonomy and Deontology” Thomas Nagel suggests that deontological restrictions are “formally puzzling.” He writes, “How can there be relative reasons to respect the claims of others? How can there be a reason not to twist someone’s arm which is not equally a reason to prevent his arm from being twisted by someone else?” How does Nagel answer or resolve this puzzle in this essay?

8. Explaining his account of when a nation or group that goes to war has a just cause in chapter 4 of *Just and Unjust Wars*, Walzer refers to what he calls the “legalist paradigm” and the “domestic analogy.” Explain these phrases and the points about just war that Walzer uses them to assert.

9. According to Kant, morality (if it is not just a bunch of false claims with no rational backing) must consist of categorical imperatives. (In Kant's terminology, an imperative is a prescription or command of reason) What exactly is the difference between an imperative that is **categorical** and one that is **not categorical**?

10. State John Rawls's position in his "Fifty Years after Hiroshima" on the moral justifiability of the U.S. decision to drop nuclear bombs on Japanese cities toward the end of World War II. According to Rawls, was this decision morally acceptable or not? For what reasons?

11. In "Famine, Affluence, and Morality," Peter Singer argues that morality requires people who are well off to do what they can (without lying, stealing, murdering, or violating other moral constraints) to prevent avoidable bad things like premature death from disease or malnutrition from befalling needy distant strangers, up to the point at which further contributions by the affluent would render them no better off than those who are worse off. Apply the position advanced by Susan Wolf in her essay "Moral Saints" to Singer's conclusion just stated. What view would she take of Singer's proposal? Be sure to explain the gist of Wolf's position.

12. State carefully one significant objection against the Doctrine of Double Effect that is made either by Philippa Foot in “The Problem of Abortion and the Doctrine of Double Effect” or by Judith Thomson in her essay “Self-Defense.”

13. Suppose that in certain periods of human history (for example, ancient Greece) slavery, though very bad for slaves, gives rise to a more than counterbalancing amount of happiness for slaveholders and other people, so that slavery in these circumstances surprisingly turns out to be justified by utilitarianism. In chapter 5 of *Utilitarianism* Mill takes up the difficulty that there appears to be a conflict between utilitarianism and justice. Given what he says about rights and justice in that chapter, how would he respond to the claim just made about slavery, happiness, and utilitarianism, which might be regarded as an objection against utilitarianism?

14.. Suppose that my neighbor is an angry guy and has taken a strong dislike to my young son. As matters now stand, there is a significant chance he will seriously harm my son. I can prevent him from harming my son, but only by credibly, seriously threatening that if he harms my son, I will retaliate by killing his infant daughter. Would this threat by me qualify as an immoral threat according to Michael Walzer? Would this threat by me qualify as an immoral threat according to Gregory Kavka? In each case, why or why not?