

SECTION A: EPISTEMOLOGY AND METAPHYSICS

1. What, if anything, does Descartes's 'cogito' prove?
2. Should knowledge be defined as justified true belief?
3. Explain the distinction between internalism and externalism in epistemology. Are there good arguments to prefer one of these to the other?
4. 'It is true that observing a large number of ravens all of which are black does not prove that all ravens are black. Nevertheless, it does prove that they probably are.' Discuss.
5. How does Goodman's 'new riddle of induction' differ from the 'old riddle'? Does the new riddle have a solution?

SECTION B: ETHICS

6. 'If values existed, we would need a special epistemological faculty to detect them.' Discuss.
7. Does utilitarianism ignore the value of integrity?
8. Is abortion murder?
9. How convincing is Kant's claim that only a good will has unconditional worth?
10. What is autonomous action?

SECTION C: LOGIC AND METAPHYSICS

11. Explain and illustrate Frege's distinction between sense and reference.
12. Can there be contingent identities?
13. Has Quine shown that there is no distinction between analytic truths and synthetic truths?
14. Is there such a thing as personal identity?
15. What is it for one thing to cause another?

SECTION D: POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

16. Would people in Rawls's Original Position choose the difference principle?

PLEASE TURN OVER

17. Does Rawls provide good grounds for depriving the parties in the original position of knowledge of their particular conceptions of the good?
18. Is taxation on a par with forced labour?
19. Critically analyse Locke's theory of private property.
20. Does Mill's liberty principle rest on utilitarian foundations?

SECTION E: SYMBOLIC LOGIC

Answer all parts of this question. The maximum mark for each part is indicated in square brackets.

Part I.

- (a) Can an invalid argument have true premises and a true conclusion? If it can, give an example.
- (b) Can a valid argument have false premises and a true conclusion? If it can, give an example.
- (c) Is the following argument valid: 'Tony smokes. Tony does not smoke. Therefore, Tony smokes'? Explain your answer.
- (d) What connective has widest scope in the following sentence: 'If John will win or Tony will win, and John does not win, then Tony will win'?

[4 marks]

Part II.

Give definitions of the following:

- (a) Consistency.
- (b) Logical equivalence.

[2 marks]

Part III.

Use a formal method to show that the following argument is valid:

It's either the case that, if Moriarty shows, Watson will catch him, or the case that, if Moriarty shows, Holmes will catch him. If Watson catches Moriarty, then the opal will be safe. But if the opal is not safe, Holmes didn't catch Moriarty. So, if Moriarty shows, the opal will be safe.

[4 marks]

PLEASE TURN OVER

Part IV.

- (i) Translate the following into first-order predicate calculus ('Predicate' in Guttenplan). In each case provide a key or interpretation for your use of symbols.
- (a) No smoker swims. Therefore, no swimmer smokes.
 - (b) Tony smokes. Every smoker snores. So, Tony snores.
 - (c) There are politicians that are loathed by every politician. Hence, some politicians loathe themselves.
 - (d) If Bill smokes, there are exactly two smokers.

[8 marks]

- (ii) Show that each of (i)(a), (i)(b), and (i)(c) is valid.

[6 marks]

Part V.

Briefly discuss each of the following:

- (a) The notion of formal validity.
- (b) The relationship between validity and cogency.
- (c) The translation of English 'if, then' by the material conditional.

[9 marks]

END OF PAPER