ETHICS

Answer three questions only.

Write the number of the question at the beginning of each answer. If you are answering an either/or question, indicate the letter as well.

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) Can there be rights without corresponding duties?

Or (b) Are there any natural rights?

Either (a) Does the amoralist pose a threat to the justification of morality?

Or (b) Is the amoralist irrational?

What is the strongest argument in favour of motive utilitarianism? Does it work?

Why does it matter if 'good' cannot be defined?

Can there be any truth in ethics if ethical judgements merely express emotion?

Can rights and consequentialist considerations be reconciled?

What is the strongest backward-looking justification of punishment? Does it work?

Can a hedonist consistently claim that it is better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a pig satisfied?

What role should intuitions play in moral theory?

Is it strange that there should be facts that tell you what to do?
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