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

Assessment standards are at the end of this book.

After the examination session

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

Part A consists of the following media article extract from a news website, and five comments on page 3 that were posted in response.

The article is provided as context only. You are not required to make any specific response to the article. Your task is to analyse the comments.

Your evaluation of each comment should be 50–100 words in length.

Write your responses in the response book.

Suggested time allocation: 50 minutes.

Media article

New packs plain ugly

A proposed change to laws regulating the packaging and display of cigarettes has attracted considerable media attention during 2011.

If the change comes into effect, it will become a legal requirement for cigarettes to be presented in plain packaging.

Your task

For each of the five comments, evaluate the reasoning used.

Justify your evaluation by

• identifying and naming any fallacies committed; and
• explaining such fallacies, with reference to the text of the comment
and/or
• identifying and naming any argument correctly used; and
• explaining such correct reasoning, with reference to the text of the comment.
Comments

Comment 1
We already have this in the ACT and it hasn't made any difference. Everyone I know who normally smokes, still smokes just as much as they did before.

Comment 2
I am a non-smoker, never have and never will. But, these Orwellian steps just smack of Big Brother.
Why not just keep on educating people about the hazards of smoking, and let people who CHOOSE to smoke do just that? After all, smoking is still legal and the Government still makes $$$ from it!!
Next on the list — plain alcohol bottles, plain food wrappers, plain clothing ranges, plain old conformity.

Comment 3  (In response to Comment 2)
Gee, smokers' rights huh?
Don't worry about the rights of passive smokers. Don't worry about the influence these addicts have on others more impressionable. Rights are not given and exercised in a bubble.
By the way, my mother died from smoking. I really don't think that was her choice.

Comment 4  (In response to Comment 3)
Let's ban alcohol and fatty foods as well.
I'm sure you would not object to a blanket ban on beer, wine, vodka, McDonalds, KFC, Pizza Hut and every other takeaway food place that isn't a health food bar.
You find smoking offensive and want it banned, so you would obviously be OK with things other people find offensive: after all, you're not a hypocrite … are you?
If you are worried about passive breathing making people sick, can we quarantine people who have even the basic flu? I don't like catching the flu off other people so can we isolate those from society until they are no longer contagious?

Comment 5  (In response to Comment 2)
Let's just apply the same principle to heroin, speed, ecstasy and those other things as well while we are at it.
There is obviously a demand for these drugs and people could CHOOSE whether to use them or not. Think of all the money the government is losing by not allowing this.
And while we are going on about the Nanny State, let's do away with all those other restrictions on choice and be able to do what we choose to do, like buy dynamite and explosives over the counter, buy any form of firearm, arsenic etc. And what about the laws that stop me choosing to keep pigs in my backyard and slaughter them there? I mean — it is my yard and my choice.


End of Part A
Part B — Philosophy

Part B has five questions. Attempt two questions, as follows:

- Question 1 — respond in essay form
- Questions 2 to 5 — respond in essay form to one question of your choice.

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 — Ethics/Moral philosophy

Joseph is about to submit his final university assignment. He has been offered a well-paying job, but is required to graduate before he takes up the position. As the sole parent of two young children, he is looking forward to finally being in paid employment after several years of struggling as a student to support his family.

Joseph needs to achieve a passing grade in this final assignment to graduate. His youngest child often disturbs his sleep at night, and his work on the assignment so far has not been as productive as he would have liked. Although he has done his best, he is not sure if he will make the grade.

The day before the assignment is due, a friend of Joseph’s, sympathetic to his family situation, offers to review and amend his assignment. Joseph gratefully accepts, and when he receives the amended assignment it is dramatically improved, to the point where there is very little of his own work still evident.

Although he is aware that, if discovered, the university would view the situation as a case of cheating, Joseph nonetheless submits the amended assignment.

Evaluate the morality of Joseph’s submission of the assignment, with reference to either Utilitarianism or Kantian Ethics. Include a discussion of objections that may be raised by critics of your chosen ethical theory.

Question 2 — Philosophy of religion

Either

Name and set out one of the traditional arguments for the existence of God.

Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of this argument, comparing and contrasting with other named arguments.

or

Set out the problem that the existence of evil poses against belief in the existence of God.

Discuss the problem, presenting some of the typical philosophical responses.

Question 3 — Philosophy of science

Outline the traditional Problem of Induction and, through a discussion of at least one well-known “solution”, assess 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 2004 senior external syllabus for Philosophy & Reason

#### 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>