Time allowed

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

Examination materials provided

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

Equipment allowed

- QSA-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

Explain the difference between an inductive generalisation and an inductive analogy by:

• giving a brief definition of each
• providing a simple example of each
• identifying the difference in their structures
• outlining factors that affect the strength of each.

Question 2

Identify the logical fallacy in the argument below. Explain why the premises do not support the conclusion, and provide a counter-example that shows the invalidity of the argument.

“Anybody who exercises will sweat. Max is sweating, therefore Max is exercising”.

Question 3

Read the following text adapted from a letter to the editor of The Age newspaper.

(Note: “John Smith” is a fictional political leader who supports adding fluoride to tap water.)

Once again, John Smith is at his narrow-minded best. As many have said: “My mind is made up, so don’t confuse me with facts.” This accurately sums up John Smith. Facts are only facts if he can see a political advantage in taking them on board.

There is a lot of scientific evidence available now that shows the shortcomings and danger of fluoride in the water supply. One wonders how many scientists with a pro-fluoride view are paid by companies that benefit from it.

It is fair to say that the increase in tooth decay has probably more to do with today’s diets (too much junk food and soft drinks) than not drinking fluoridated tap water. No matter who is right or wrong, we should have the choice when it comes to the intake of fluoride. There is enough information available these days to make informed decisions about most things.

Identify two logical fallacies that occur in the text.

For each fallacy, justify your identification by explaining how the characteristics of the fallacy are present in the text.
Question 4

Twenty20 is to cricket what My Kitchen Rules or MasterChef are to a good restaurant meal.

#cricket

Note: Twenty20 is a shortened version of cricket played in about three hours.

Analyse this argument by:

• identifying the intended conclusion of the argument (i.e. what does the writer want us to believe about Twenty20 cricket?)
• explaining how the writer seeks to support the conclusion, including any assumptions that the reader must accept in order to accept the conclusion
• commenting on the overall effectiveness of the argument in supporting the intended conclusion.

End of Part A
Planning space
**Part B — Philosophy**

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

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).

**Question 1**

Read the following information.

> Organ donation has saved and improved countless lives. But medical advancements have led to a rise in demand for organs that is outpacing donation rates.

> Looking at deceased donors per million population — a commonly used benchmark — rates vary widely around the world.

> Spain leads internationally with 34 deceased donors per million population, according to figures from the International Registry of Organ Donation and Transplantation.

> Australia, on the other hand, noticeably lags countries with comparable health care systems with just 12 deceased donors per million population.

> A variety of factors impact organ donation rates, from the legal environment to training to cultural obstacles, experts said.

> In Japan, for example, the law prevents children from donating organs, but there is also an overall reluctance to donate organs that is rooted in Shinto and Buddhist attitudes towards death.

> Even in the US, which is one of the leading countries for organ donations, there are still some cultural obstacles and religious concerns about what constitutes death.

> It’s a mixed picture for donor rates in the US, according to Joel Newman of the United Network for Organ Sharing, which runs the country's only organ transplant network.

> “People in their own lifetime, even if they have positive feelings about organ donation, don't make a commitment,” he said. “They don't fill out donor cards or have a conversation with their family.”

> Countries like Spain, Belgium and Norway have passed “presumed consent” laws where individuals are automatically considered an organ donor unless they opt out.

(adapted text from http://edition.cnn.com)

**Your task**

Imagine that you are a freelance ethicist engaged by the Australian Government to provide advice on the issue of the introduction of an “opt-out” system of organ donation.

Under this proposed system, individuals over the age of 18 who have been declared brain-dead by two independent doctors would be presumed to have given consent for their organs to be donated, unless they had signed a “refusal to donate” declaration and registered it with the Australian Organ Donation Authority.
Advise the government on whether such a system should be introduced by:

- choosing two ethical theories that you have studied
- outlining the intrinsic concepts of each of your chosen ethical theories
- explaining how the proponents of each of your chosen theories would respond to the issue of the introduction of an “opt-out” system for organ donation
- advising the government if it should introduce the proposed system, giving reasons for your decision.

You may refer to the information in the article in your response.

**Question 2 — Philosophy of religion**

*Either*

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*

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.

**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.

**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.

**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
### Assessment standards derived from the Philosophy & Reason Senior External Syllabus 2004

**Paper Two**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></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><strong>Application</strong></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: • consistently and accurately employs discriminating vocabulary, and adheres to the conventions of language • consistently organises and presents information cogently and coherently, and communicates both evident and implied meaning effectively • produces explanations, descriptions, arguments and justifications that are precise, pertinent and purposeful.</td>
<td>The candidate: • consistently employs appropriate vocabulary, and adheres to the conventions of language • organises and presents information coherently, and communicates meaning effectively • produces clear and purposeful explanations, descriptions, arguments and justifications.</td>
<td>The candidate: • usually employs appropriate vocabulary and conventions of language • organises and presents information so that meaning is usually evident • produces explanations, descriptions and arguments that are adequate to convey intention.</td>
<td>The candidate: • makes some appropriate choices of vocabulary, and obeys some conventions of language • presents information and produces explanations that lack detail and clarity.</td>
<td>The candidate: • makes inconsistent and inaccurate choices of basic vocabulary and conventions of language • presents disjointed information and descriptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>