2014 Senior External Examination

Philosophy & Reason
Paper Two — Question book

Time allowed

- Perusal time: **10 minutes**
- Working time: **3 hours**

Examination materials provided

- Paper Two — Question book
- Paper Two — Response book

Equipment allowed

- QCAA-approved equipment

Directions

You may write in this book during perusal time.

Paper Two has **two** parts:

- Part A — Critical Reasoning
- Part B — Philosophy

Attempt **all** of Part A.

In Part B, you **must** attempt Question 1 and **one** other question.

Suggested time allocation

- Part A: 50 minutes
- Part B: 2 hours (1 hour per essay)

The suggested time allocation allows 10 minutes for checking responses.

Assessment

Paper Two assesses the following assessment criteria:

- Knowledge
- Application
- Communication

Assessment standards are at the end of this book.

After the examination session

Take this book when you leave.
Planning space
Part A — Critical Reasoning

Part A has **four** questions. Attempt **all** questions.
Your response to each question should be 50–100 words in length.
Write your responses in the response book.
Suggested time allocation: **50 minutes**.

Question 1

Consider the following argument:

A family has taken four trips to the snow over the past few years. They were all enjoyable, and as a result they are planning another one this year which they conclude will also be enjoyable.

a. Is this argument:
   • a valid deductive argument
   • an inductive generalisation
   • an inductive analogy
   • a statistical syllogism?

Justify your response with reference to the structure of the argument.

b. For each of the following (i–iv, taken separately) assess whether the argument is strengthened or weakened, and explain why.

   i. The previous trips were booked and planned through four different travel agencies.

   ii. The family concludes that not only will this next trip be enjoyable, it will be the best trip they’ve ever had.

   iii. The family had been on one previous trip (not four as previously stated).

   iv. The previous four trips were all to Perisher in NSW.

c. Create your own amendment to the argument that would neither strengthen nor weaken it.
Question 2
Consider the cartoon below.

i. Rewrite the boy’s argument in standard form, identifying the premises and the conclusion. (You may symbolise it if you wish.)

ii. Name the logical fallacy that the boy has committed, and explain why the premises do not support the conclusion.

Question 3
Read the following text, which appeared as a letter to the editor in *The Courier Mail*:

**Millions of people can’t be wrong when it comes to religious belief**

IN A free and democratic society, Paul Syvret is entitled to his opinion (C-M, Dec 17).

Yet the events surrounding the birth of Jesus and other matters reported in the Bible have been believed by millions of people for over 2000 years.

So if the bible, and in particular the New Testament which reports the life and times of Jesus Christ, are untrue, then one would have to admit it is the best “gotcha” ever played on humanity.

Let’s face it, the combined genius of minds such as Isaac Newton, Aristotle and Plato could never merely invent such a story. Surely then, it must have a basis in truth and religious “Truth” is no less valid an option for people than unbelief might be for others like Syvret.

Frank Edwards, Brighton

Evaluate the reasoning in this letter by:

- naming any deductive or inductive fallacies
- explaining any errors in the reasoning used, in terms of why the premises do not support the conclusion

and/or

- naming any modes of reasoning correctly used
- explaining the structure of such correct reasoning.
Question 4

A trampoline company sells a type of trampoline that, unlike traditional trampolines, does not have exposed springs around the edges.

The company claims that their product offers ‘fun, without all the injuries’.

Explain how this claim, while true, might create a false impression in the minds of consumers. You may use symbols such as quantifiers to aid your explanation.

End of Part A
Part B — Philosophy

Part B has five questions. You must attempt Question 1, and one other question selected from Questions 2–5. Both responses must be in essay form.

Planning space is overleaf.

Each response should be approximately 600 words in length. Write your responses in the response book.

Suggested time allocation: 2 hours (1 hour per essay).

You must attempt Question 1.

Question 1

Robin is a student with a promising future in medical science, but is struggling to afford very high university fees. Robin’s neighbour is an old woman who has a considerable amount of money in her apartment. Robin kills the old woman by lacing her tea with a poison that causes her to fall into a peaceful but permanent sleep. After killing her, Robin steals the money.

Robin argues that the neighbour was a malicious old woman, petty, cantankerous and scheming, useless to herself and to society (which happens to be true). Her life causes no happiness to herself or to others, and she has no family or friends to mourn her passing. Her money, if found after her death, would only have fallen into the hands of the government whereas Robin will use it to pay for an education and possibly go on to save millions of lives.

Decide whether Robin’s actions were morally justifiable. In your response:

- choose two theories of moral philosophy that you have studied
- explain the intrinsic concepts of each theory, including any weaknesses
- explain how proponents of each theory would judge Robin’s actions
- draw a conclusion regarding the morality of Robin’s actions.
You must attempt one question from Questions 2–5.

Either

Question 2 — Philosophy of religion

a. Outline one of the following arguments for the existence of the Christian deity and explain its intrinsic concepts:
   • Cosmological argument
   • Teleological argument
   • Ontological argument.

   Analyse and evaluate the argument by discussing criticisms of the argument and any possible responses to these criticisms.

or

b. Outline the argument known as ‘The Problem of Evil’ against the existence of the Christian deity and explain its intrinsic concepts.

   Analyse and evaluate the argument by discussing some of the typical philosophical responses and their effectiveness in resolving the problem.

or

Question 3 — Philosophy of science

Outline the traditional problem of induction and explain its intrinsic concepts. Analyse and evaluate the argument by discussing at least one well-known ‘solution’ and commenting on the relevance of the problem to science.

or

Question 4 — Social and political philosophy

What does it mean to be free?

Compare the interpretation of the concept of freedom in two major political philosophies.

or

Question 5 — Philosophy of mind

Explain the main differences between dualist theories and materialist theories as responses to the mind–body problem. Name the individual theories included in your explanation.

End of Part B

End of Paper Two
Planning space
Planning space
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>The candidate demonstrates accurate recall and extensive understanding of a comprehensive range of concepts, ideas, procedures and principles. Occasional minor errors may be made, but do not indicate fundamental misunderstandings.</td>
<td>The candidate demonstrates accurate recall and understanding of a range of concepts, ideas, procedures and principles.</td>
<td>The candidate recalls and describes most concepts, ideas, procedures and principles.</td>
<td>The candidate recalls and describes some concepts, ideas, procedures and principles.</td>
<td>The candidate describes few concepts, ideas, procedures and principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>The candidate: • classifies and evaluates a wide range of simple and complex arguments, both sourced and artificial, and constructs well-supported arguments drawing on a wide range of inductive skills • outlines, analyses and evaluates philosophical theories, by: – explaining intrinsic concepts – explaining simple and complex relationships within and between theories – discerning and describing the application of theories in different contexts (including in the formulation of own and others’ views).</td>
<td>The candidate: • classifies and evaluates a range of simple and complex arguments, both sourced and artificial, and constructs, with some support, arguments that draw on a range of inductive skills • outlines, analyses and evaluates philosophical theories, by explaining: – most intrinsic concepts – simple (and some complex) relationships within and between theories.</td>
<td>The candidate: • classifies and evaluates simple arguments, and constructs arguments drawing on some inductive skills • outlines philosophical theories, and explains primary concepts.</td>
<td>The candidate: • classifies some simple arguments; few inductive skills are evident • describes some primary philosophical concepts.</td>
<td>The candidate: • occasionally classifies some simple arguments • describes very few philosophical concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>The candidate:</td>
<td>The candidate:</td>
<td>The candidate:</td>
<td>The candidate:</td>
<td>The candidate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• consistently and accurately employs discriminating vocabulary, and adheres to the conventions of language</td>
<td>• consistently employs appropriate vocabulary, and adheres to the conventions of language</td>
<td>• usually employs appropriate vocabulary and conventions of language</td>
<td>• makes some appropriate choices of vocabulary, and obeys some conventions of language</td>
<td>• makes inconsistent and inaccurate choices of basic vocabulary and conventions of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• consistently organises and presents information cogently and coherently, and communicates both evident and implied meaning effectively</td>
<td>• organises and presents information coherently, and communicates meaning effectively</td>
<td>• organises and presents information so that meaning is usually evident</td>
<td>• presents information and produces explanations that lack detail and clarity.</td>
<td>• presents disjointed information and descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• produces explanations, descriptions, arguments and justifications that are precise, pertinent and purposeful.</td>
<td>• produces clear and purposeful explanations, descriptions, arguments and justifications.</td>
<td>• produces explanations, descriptions and arguments that are adequate to convey intention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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