M.A. EXAMINATION 2003

for Internal Students

PHILOSOPHY

<u>General Philosophy</u>

Tuesday, 27 May: 10.00 - 1.00.

Answer <u>THREE</u> questions. Questions should be chosen from <u>AT LEAST TWO</u>
sections. Avoid overlap in your answers.

You may <u>NOT</u> 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.

<u>SECTION A</u>: EPISTEMOLOGY AND METHODOLOGY

1.   'You cannot prove that you are not dreaming. So you cannot know that you are
      not dreaming.' Discuss.

2.   What, if anything, is wrong with the definition of knowledge as justified true
      belief? What might be a way of improving on the definition?

3.   Explain the difference between an externalist and an internalist account of
      justification. What reason is there to prefer one to the other?

4.   Would a solution to Goodman's new riddle of induction solve the traditional
      problem of induction?

<u>SECTION B</u>: ETHICS

5.   Is it an error to believe that values are objective?

6.   How, if at all, is utilitarianism inconsistent with the integrity of the moral
      agent?

7.   'Abortion is permissible even if the foetus has the moral status of a person.'
      Discuss.

8.   'If one acts contrary to duty, then the maxim of one's action must give rise to a
      contradiction in conception or in willing.' Discuss.

© University of London 2003
UL 03 /

9. Is one responsible for what one has done only if one could have done otherwise?

SECTION C: LOGIC AND METAPHYSICS

10. Why did Frege think it necessary to introduce the sense/reference distinction in addition to the concept (function)/object distinction?

11. 'Is the morning star the evening star?' 'Well, it might be, but then again it might not be.' Does the possibility of a context in which this conversation would be entirely plausible refute the necessity of identity? Explain.

12. What, according to Quine, are the two dogmas of empiricism, and how does he think they should be replaced?

13. 'If my brain were halved and each half placed in a new living body, I would, assuming all my present knowledge and capacities were preserved equally by each half, be neither of the two resultant persons.' Discuss.

14. 'Singular causal truths entail the existence of some covering causal law (whether we know the law or not).' Discuss arguments for and against this claim.

SECTION D: POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

15. Is Rawls justified in depriving parties in the original position knowledge of their particular conceptions of the good?

16. Does Rawls have good reason to prefer the difference principle to average utilitarianism constrained by a guaranteed social minimum?

17. Does Nozick's Wilt Chamberlain argument demonstrate that egalitarianism is unjust?

18. Locke's account of property appeals to labour-mixing; value-adding; the leaving of enough and as good for others; and the right of self-preservation. Are these elements of a single, coherent account of the conditions under which one may come to own property in a state of nature?

19. Does Mill provide a good defence of the proposition that the state may not criminalize people's behaviour in order to prevent them harming themselves?

SECTION E: SYMBOLIC LOGIC

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

UL03/

Part I.

(a) Can a valid argument have a false conclusion? If it can, give an example.
(b) Can an unsound argument have true premises? If it can, give an example.
(c) Is the following argument valid: 'The Earth is square. If the Earth is square, then Tony Blair is Prime Minister. Therefore, Tony Blair is Prime Minister'?
(d) What connective has widest scope in the following sentence: 'If Sally works hard and John cheats, they'll both pass'?

[4 marks]

Part II.

Give definitions of the following:

(a) Logical equivalence
(b) Decision procedure.

[2 marks]

Part III.

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

Moriarty will steal either the diamond or the opal. He won't steal the diamond unless Sherlock guards the opal and Watson guards the diamond. But Watson won't guard the diamond. Therefore, Moriarty will steal the opal.

[4 marks]

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 fools are logicians. Therefore, no logicians are fools.
    (b) Some philosophers are logicians. All logicians are pedantic. Therefore, some philosophers are pedantic.
    (c) Jenny can carry all the books. Anyone who can do that is very strong. Therefore, Jenny is very strong.
    (d) There are exactly two great philosophers.

[8 marks]

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

[6 marks]

(iii) Briefly discuss each of the following:

    (a) The utility of a test for validity.

      (b)   The relationship between consistency and validity.

      (c)   The material conditional.

[9 marks]

END OF PAPER