Ethics: contemporary perspectives



Ethics: contemporary perspectives [PY3115] (Prerequisite: PY1095)

Introductory reading

Mackie, J.L. Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990) revised edition.

Williams, B. Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy. (London: Fontana, 1985).

Sample examination questions

- 1. If a principle is a moral principle, must it be universalisable?
- 2. 'In order to act I must have some end which I desire to achieve by so acting.' Discuss.
- 3. Must cognitive theories about conflicts of obligation 'eliminate from the scene the ought that is not acted upon'?
- 4. Does consequentialism give a plausible account of the importance of consequences to the moral evaluation of actions?
- 5. Can consequentialism adequately account for the way in which we condemn ingratitude or disloyalty and the way in which we praise people who return good for evil?
- 6. Is the concept of character important to an adequate account of morality?
- 7. 'Impartiality is not the essence of morality; it is one particular virtue.' Discuss.
- 8. Is there an important distinction between saying that an act is intrinsically wrong and that it should under no circumstances be done?
- 9. Are emotions integral to morality? If so, how?
- 10. What is the best way of defining an altruistic act?
- 11. Are moral judgments true or false?
- 12. Discuss the idea that something is intrinsically valuable if and only if a moral person would choose it for itself.
- 13. What kind of objective moral considerations can there be?
- 14. Is there a problem about how moral considerations can motivate? Is this problem a special one for moral realists?
- 15. What is it for an action to be self-determined or autonomous? How is this related to moral responsibility?
- 16. Is there any form of moral relativism that can escape the charges of incoherence or self-contradiction?
- 17. If killing a baby is morally wrong, why isn't contraception also morally wrong?
- 18. How coherent is pacifism?

Ethics: contemporary perspectives

19. If a doctor has the resources to treat only one of two patients, what sort of grounds should he use to choose which one?