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.
Either (a) Give the best defence you can of the view that the existence of evil is compatible with the existence of God.

Or (b) Give the best defence you can of the view that at least one of the cosmological argument or the design argument is sound.

Either (a) 'A cause is an object, followed by another, such that all objects similar to the first are followed by objects similar to the second?' Does this provide an adequate characterization of the nature of a cause?

Or (b) In what sense, if any, are causes necessary and sufficient for their effects?

Must fatalism be true?

Does compatibilism merely redefine the word 'free'?

Either (a) Is there a successful causal objection to substance dualism?

Or (b) Is the multiple realization objection to type-identity a form of conceivability argument?

Either (a) Are mental properties correctly defined by the Ramsey sentence of some psychological theory?

Or (b) Does functionalism require that if two entities have anything mental in common, they have almost everything mental in common?

What is a person?

Does the possibility that we are dreaming undermine our right to claim that we have genuine knowledge of the existence of an external world?

Is knowledge justified true belief? If not, what is it?

Is induction rational? If so, how?
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