

**UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
ARTS FACULTY
MA EXAMINATION
for Internal Students
PHILOSOPHY NEW REGULATIONS**

GENERAL PHILOSOPHY

Answer THREE questions. Questions should be chosen from AT LEAST TWO sections. You may NOT take questions from an area which is the subject of either of your other two papers. Please write the titles of your other two papers at the top of your answer paper.

SECTION A: EPISTEMOLOGY AND METHODOLOGY

1. Can knowledge be analysed into justified true belief? If not, is there an additional missing ingredient?
2. 'A coherent set of beliefs can still be false.' Does this pose a serious problem for a coherence theory of justification?
3. Is there some means of knowing whether or not you are now dreaming?
4. Does inductive reasoning need to be justified?
5. Does the 'new riddle of induction' pose a fundamental problem for how we reason inductively?

SECTION B: ETHICS

6. 'Moral judgements are not descriptions of the world; they are either expressions of sentiment or exhortations to others.' Discuss.
7. Are we rationally or morally required always to produce the greatest good?
8. Is there a right to life?
9. 'In a deterministic world no one could be morally responsible for their actions.' Discuss.

PLEASE TURN OVER

10. EITHER (a) Can one ever blamelessly violate someone's right?
OR (b) Can the categorical imperative generate any substantive moral principles?

SECTION C: LOGIC & METAPHYSICS

11. Are there good reasons for distinguishing between sense and reference?

12. Are proper names rigid designators? If they were, would that show that names are not a kind of disguised definite description?
13. Are causes always sufficient for their effects? Are they always necessary for them?
14. Can X at one time be the same person as Y at another and yet not be the same animal?
15. 'There is no philosophically useful distinction to be had between analytic and synthetic truth.' Discuss.

SECTION D: POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

16. How can considerations of what I would hypothetically choose in conditions of ignorance tell me what I ought to do in the actual circumstances?
17. 'There is no rational demand to make everyone equal rather than just to make the worst off as well off as possible.' Discuss.
18. Does liberty necessarily conflict with equality?
19. Is tacit consent sufficient to ground political obligation?
20. Does respect for liberty require that the law allow us to harm ourselves?

SECTION E: SYMBOLIC LOGIC

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

Part I.

- (a) Can an unsound argument be valid?
- (b) Is the following argument valid: 'Logic can be difficult, therefore logic can be difficult'?
- (c) How should one define the *scope* of a logical connective?
- (d) Can a sound argument have a false conclusion?

[4 marks]

Part II.

Give definitions of the following:

- (a) Logical equivalence
- (b) Algorithm
- (c) Deductive proof

[3 marks]

Part III.

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

Either both Mary and Cynthia are each ignorant of the truth or they are both trying to protect the thief. Unless the thief was able to make a getaway silently, Mary and Cynthia will know the truth. The broken glass confirms the fact that the getaway was not silent. Therefore, Mary and Cynthia are both trying to protect the thief.

[5 marks]

PLEASE TURN OVER

Part IV.

- (i) Translate the following arguments into first order predicate calculus ('Predicate' in Guttenplan). In each case, provide a key or interpretation for your use of symbols.

(a) **No philosophers are popstars. Therefore, no popstars are philosophers.**

(b) All philosophers are wise. All intellectuals are snobs. Therefore, if all who are wise are intellectuals, all philosophers are snobs.

(c) The quickest runner is someone who runs faster than all others. I ran faster than you. Therefore, you are not the quickest runner.

[6 marks]

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

[6 marks]

- (iii) Write a paragraph or two on each of the following:

(a) The reason why truth tables do not provide a test for validity in predicate logic.

(b) The relationship between consistency and validity.

(c) The material conditional.

[9 marks]

END OF PAPER