

PHILOSOPHY TRIPOS Part IA

SPECIMEN PAPER 2003

Paper 2
ETHICS

*Answer **four** questions only*

Write the number of the question at the beginning of each answer.

**You may not start to read the questions
printed on the subsequent pages of this
question paper until instructed that you may
do so by the Invigilator**

1. Can an emotivist account of ethical judgement be defended?
2. What is wrong with defining 'good'?
3. What does the existence of ethical disagreement show about the objectivity of moral judgements?
4. What can we say to the amoralist to convince her to be moral?
5. If some rights are not waivable, what does this show about the nature of rights?
6. Is consequentialism consistent with the existence of absolute rights?
7. Is happiness the maximisation of pleasure?
8. Are all charity workers egoists?
9. Must we adopt a retributivist account of punishment in order to condemn punishment of the innocent?
10. Does Rule Utilitarianism have any real advantages over Act Utilitarianism?

END OF PAPER