

Phil 108, Final Exam

Complete both Part I and Part II.

Email your answers to both:

chislenko@berkeley.edu

kolodny@berkeley.edu

by 6:00PM. As always, you are responsible for unopenable attachments, bounced emails, connection failures, etc.

Good luck!

Part I: Answer **two** of the following three review questions from before the midterm.

1. What is “revelatory projective grouping”? What is an example? What is “distorting projective separating”? What is an example?
2. Come up with your *own* examples of the following kinds of cases:
 - a. Your action makes no difference, because if you don’t do the bad thing, someone else will.
 - b. Your action makes no difference, because it is only when N or more people do it that the bad thing happens.
 - c. Your action makes no difference, because no matter how many people do it, an additional person’s doing it makes no difference to whether something bad happens. This is so even though when 10,000 people do it, something bad happens that would not happen if zero people did it.The examples of a and b should be drawn from real life. The example of c can be fiction.
3. What, according to Singer, might lead us the paradoxical conclusion that there is nothing morally wrong about creating a child that one will be morally obligated to euthanize?

Part II: Answer **four** of the following five review questions from after the midterm.

1. “It is permissible to harm someone, without her consent, if it is necessary for benefitting her.” How would Shiffrin argue against this claim? What follows for the permissibility of procreation?
2. Many abortions involve *killing* the fetus before cutting off its life support (i.e., removing it from the uterus and cutting the umbilical cord). Are such abortions permissible according to the Principle of Withdrawing Aid? Supposing (at least for the sake of argument) that such abortions are permissible, does Thomson’s argument explain why?

3. “In 1954, executives of the United Fruit Company persuaded the Eisenhower administration to organize and direct a coup that overthrew the democratic government of Guatemala and installed a new regime that returned to the company some uncultivated lands that had been nationalized in an effort to aid the peasants.” Suppose that the coup could have been prevented at least as effectively, proportionally, etc. by attacking the executives. Would it have been permissible to attack the executives? What would traditional Just War Theory imply? What would McMahan’s revisionist theory say? Why?
4. Some legal codes have punished the family of criminals, “vicariously,” when the criminal could not be found. What would Bentham say about this practice? What would a retributivist say?
5. “Setting up a system in which m-punishments reliably follow crimes is justified as a way of deterring future crime. But each particular m-punishment is not itself justified as a way of deterring future crimes.” Is this a consistent view? How so?