

FINAL EXAM ESSAY SECTION PHILOSOPHY 13 FALL, 2002

Your Name _____

Your TA's Name _____

No use of books or notes will be permitted at any time during the final exam.

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

Answer ONE A question and ONE B question from the list below on the attached sheets. Each of your answers counts equally for grading purposes. (Please indicate which questions you are answering.)

A1. In *Just and Unjust Wars* Walzer rejects the idea that the right of noncombatant immunity as he conceives it may permissibly be infringed according to a "sliding scale" (see pp. 228-232). Instead he adopts the doctrine he calls "supreme emergency." Carefully state Walzer's overall position on the right of noncombatant immunity as qualified by supreme emergency. Defend or criticize Walzer's position and compare it to G.E.M. Anscombe's in "War and Murder" or to Amartya Sen's position in "Rights and Agency" or to John Rawls's in "50 Years after Hiroshima."

OR

A2. According to Walzer's *Just and Unjust Wars*, a just war is always a war against aggression or a justified pre-emptive war or a justified intervention. State Walzer's theory of just war. Develop a significant criticism of this account of just war and either defend Walzer against the criticism or the criticism against Walzer. (Here is one possible criticism: "There are types of war that are sometimes justifiable but that do not fit into any of Walzer's categories, so his categories are flawed.")

B1. On p. 38 of his *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant states the humanity formula of the categorical imperative in these words: "So act that you use humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of another, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means." Explain this version of the categorical imperative principle in your own words. Compare and contrast Thomas Hill's and Christine Korsgaard's interpretations of the humanity formula. What does this principle imply concerning the moral permissibility of each of the following: (a) suicide for pain relief, (b) suicide to avoid deteriorating into a demented existence, (c) deceiving innocent people to advance a good cause, (d) killing innocent people to advance a good cause. In each case, explain how you arrive at your answer. Does the guidance that the humanity formula gives in examples (a) through (d) support or discredit Kant's position? How so? **[Exam continues on next page]**

OR

B2 Kant identifies being moral with being wholeheartedly resolved to act only on universalizable maxims. That is to say, a moral agent is disposed to act in conformity with the categorical principle come what may. Elucidate the universal law version of the categorical imperative doctrine. In chapter 1 of *Utilitarianism* Mill criticizes this doctrine. He states that when Kant "begins to deduce from this precept any of the actual duties of morality, he fails, almost grotesquely, to show that there would be any contradiction, any logical (not to say physical) impossibility, in the adoption by all rational beings of the most outrageously immoral rules of conduct." Assess Mill's criticism in the light of Kant's four examples of applying his principle.