

Phil 108, Final Exam

Please submit your answers to the exam questions on bSpace, under “Assignments > Final Exam,” by 2:30 pm. You are responsible for bounced emails, missing or unopenable attachments, connection failures, etc. You may want to copy and paste your answers into the text box provided on bSpace, in addition to uploading them, just to be safe.

If you have any trouble submitting on bSpace, you may email your answers to both:

kolodny@berkeley.edu

kpickering@berkeley.edu

with an explanatory note, by 2:30 pm.

Good luck!

Part 1 of 2:

Answer **three** of the following *four* review questions from *before* spring break.

1. Murphy concludes that we are not required to give most of our income to relief agencies. Why does the intuition that in the Two-Child Shallow Pond case you are required to save both children seem to cast doubt on this conclusion? How does Murphy respond?
2. How might someone appeal to the Doctrine of Double Effect to explain why it is permissible to kill the one in Bystander, but not in Transplant? How would Thomson reply?
3. Why, according to Quinn, would it be “incoherent” for morality to make positive rights harder to override than negative rights, so that we are permitted to kill two to save one? That is, why would we still end up with the conclusion that we are *not* permitted to kill two to save one?
4. It is generally thought to be wrong to punish a person *ex post facto*: for breaking a law that wasn’t passed until *after* the person acted. How would Bentham explain this? How would a retributivist explain it?

Part 2 of 2:

Answer **three** of the following *four* review questions from *after* spring break.

5. Consider this proposed rule: “Do what would have good results if everybody did it. Don’t do what would have bad results if everybody did it.” How might this rule explain why I should vote, even though my vote won’t make a difference to the outcome? Why would Glover nevertheless reject the rule? Explain with an example.

6. "If no one has a valid complaint about how he or she was treated by what you did, then what you did wasn't wrong." Explain how the case of conservation vs. depletion puts this claim into question.
7. "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?
8. Can one consistently (i) oppose mitigating climate change, but also (ii) oppose redistributing wealth from the rich to the poor, through foreign aid, etc.? Why does Broome think that these stances are hard to reconcile morally?