

Use the format for submitting assignments uploaded in Moodle. The word limit is 500. Please write clearly. Avoid grammatical errors, spelling mistakes and long winding sentences.

Total points: 10

---

Consider the following passages from Mill's *Utilitarianism*

“It is a strange notion that the acknowledgment of a first principle is inconsistent with the admission of secondary ones. To inform a traveller respecting the place of his ultimate destination, is not to forbid the use of landmarks and direction-posts on the way. The proposition that happiness is the end and aim of morality, does not mean that no road ought to be laid down to that goal, or that persons going thither should not be advised to take one direction rather than another.”

“[difficulties with moral obligation] are overcome practically with greater or with less success according to the intellect and virtue of the individual; but it can hardly be pretended that anyone will be the less qualified for dealing with them, from possessing an ultimate standard to which conflicting rights and duties can be referred. We must remember that only in these cases of conflict between secondary principles is it requisite that first principles should be appealed to. There is no case of moral obligation in which some secondary principle is not involved.”

How justified do you think is the claim that moral difficulties arise *only when* secondary principles conflict with each other? Can there be situations where a utilitarian's 'first'/'ultimate' principle comes in direct conflict with a secondary principle? How could such a conflict be resolved by “the intellect and virtue of the individual”? Use examples to illustrate your case.