

Part A. Write identifications on this sheet of paper (30%). Then in your blue exam book, use and explain ideas from at least two of them in a philosophic essay on beneficence (10%, see below, Part B).

1. . . . “Is there one word which may serve as a rule of practice for all of one’s life?” . . . “Is not *reciprocity* [likeness to self] such a word? What you do not want done to yourself do not do to others.”

2. . . . the natural end which all men seek is their own happiness. Now humanity could no doubt subsist if everyone contributed nothing to the happiness of others but at the same time refrained from deliberately impairing their happiness. This is, however, only to agree negatively and not positively with *humanity as an end in itself* unless every one endeavors also, so far as in him lies, to further the ends of others. For the ends of a subject who is an end in himself must, if this conception is to have its *full* effect in me, be also, as far as possible, *my* ends.

3. The great majority of good actions are intended not for the benefit of the world, but for that of individuals, of which the good of the world is made up; and the thoughts of the most virtuous men need not on these occasions travel beyond the particular persons concerned, except as far as is necessary to assure himself that in benefiting them he is not violating the rights, that is, the legitimate and authorized expectations, of anyone else.

4. No reason can be given why the general happiness is desirable, except that each person, so far as he believes it to be attainable, desires his own happiness. This, however, being a fact, we have not only all the proof which the case admits of, but all which it is possible to require, that happiness is a good, that each person’s happiness is a good to that person, and the general happiness, therefore, a good to the aggregate of all persons.

5. Rational beings . . . are called *persons* because their nature already marks them out as ends in themselves—that is, as something which should not be used merely as a means—and consequently imposes to that extent a limit on all arbitrary treatment of them.

6. “Let everyone be as happy as Heaven wills or he can make himself; I won’t deprive him of anything; I won’t envy him; only I have no wish to contribute anything to his well-being or to his support in distress!” Now admittedly if such an attitude were a universal law of nature, mankind could get along perfect well . . . yet it is impossible to *will* that such a principle should hold everywhere as a law of nature. For a will which decided in this way would be in conflict with itself, since many a situation might arise in which the man needed love and sympathy of others, and in which, by such a law of nature sprung from his own will, he would rob himself of all hope of the help he wants for himself.

Part B (60% + 10%). Use at least two of the quotations identified in Part I to develop your discussion of the following question according to the ethical theories of Confucius, Immanuel Kant, and J. S. Mill. (You may substitute the pluralist theory of W. D. Ross for one of the three.) Do we individually have a moral obligation to help those in absolute poverty in other parts of the world? Consider the following, concrete case of a possible duty of beneficence on the part of S: a child (a stranger to S) has fallen into a pond, with S, an out-of-towner, as nearby but with other people also in the vicinity, and with S as a good swimmer but under the obligation to meet a busload of relatives at the airport (suppose that S is already little late) to direct them to their accommodations. Fill out further circumstances as you see fit. Does this case, as viewed through the lens of each of the three theories, illumine the issue of whether we have a duty of beneficence towards those living in absolute poverty?