

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

**Question 1**

**(1 mark)**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If some bacteria can make sugar via photosynthesis then trees are not the only organism which use photosynthesis but some bacteria cannot make sugar via photosynthesis and therefore, trees are the only organism which use photosynthesis.

---

Denying the antecedent. (1 mark)

---

**Question 2**

**(2 marks)**

Explain why the following is a fallacious argument. In your explanation, name the fallacy.

Science cannot account for near-death experiences and so the only conclusion must be that these experiences point to an after-life which is beyond science.

---

Argument from ignorance. (1 mark)

---

While it is contentious to say that science can say nothing about near-death experiences, even if it could not (i.e. we remain scientifically ignorant) it would not follow that the conclusion is true. This is because the mere fact that we are ignorant is used as the sole reason in support of the conclusion. (1 mark)

---

**Question 3**

**(2 marks)**

Explain why the following is a fallacious argument. In your explanation, name the fallacy.

The reason we did not accept the proposal from Gary was because he has shown signs of being timid in the past in relation to his incident management.

---

Ad Hominem. (1 mark)

---

The reason used to support the conclusion attacks the person (Gary) not any feature of the proposal itself. (1 mark)

---

## The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

**Question 4****(1 mark)**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If you are eating an apple then you are being healthy. You are being healthy and so, you are eating an apple.

---

Affirming the consequent. (1 mark)

---

**Question 5****(2 marks)**

Explain why the following is a fallacious argument. In your explanation, name the fallacy.

I have a couple of friends who claim to be feminists and they are all annoying, so I think that all feminists must be annoying.

---

Hasty generalisation. (1 mark)

---

The argument uses a small sample size to infer characteristics in the much larger population.  
(1 mark)

---

**Question 6****(1 mark)**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If an electron is both a wave and a particle then I should be able to observe it in both states at the same time. I can observe an electron in both states at the same time. Consequently, an electron is both a wave and a particle.

---

Affirming the consequent. (1 mark)

---

**Question 7****(2 marks)**

Explain why the following is a fallacious argument. In your explanation, name the fallacy.

You might claim that socialism is the only just form of government but that's because you are a socialist yourself.

---

Genetic fallacy. (1 mark)

---

The inferential move relies purely on the source (origin) of the premise for its strength. (1 mark)

---

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

**Question 8**

**(1 mark)**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If the shoe fits then you are Cinderella but the shoe does not fit therefore, you are not Cinderella.

---

Denying the antecedent. (1 mark)

---

**Question 9**

**(1 mark)**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If Godzilla is larger than King Kong and King Kong is larger than Pikachu then Godzilla must be larger than Pikachu. But Godzilla is not larger than King Kong therefore, Godzilla is not larger than Pikachu.

---

Denying the antecedent. (1 mark)

---

**Question 10**

**(3 marks)**

Evaluate the strength of the second inference in the following argument. State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

People can sometimes hallucinate and sometimes we cannot even get a clear picture of reality, like in the rabbit/duck illusion cases. This is evidence that our senses can be fooled and hence cannot be trusted.

---

Inductive and weak. (1 mark)

---

Lacking cogency. (1 mark)

---

P1 is true; P2 is true; P3 is true; P1 and P2 to P3 is deductively valid; P3 to P4 is inductive and weak. (1 mark)

---

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

**Question 11**

**(3 marks)**

Evaluate the strength of the inference in the following argument. State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

Without free will there would be no justice. Given that justice is critical for a functioning society and that we have functioning societies, it follows that free will must exist.

---

Deductively valid (modus ponens). (1 mark)

---

Lacking cogency. (1 mark)

---

P1 is contentious and not obviously true; P2 is reasonably acceptable; P3 is contentious and 'functioning' is ambiguous; the inference is modus ponens. (1 mark)

---

**Question 12**

**(2 marks)**

Explain why the following is a fallacious argument. In your explanation, name the fallacy.

The neurosurgeon said that mental states like pain are identical to brain states like C fibers firing. Neurosurgeons know a lot about brains and so we should believe what he said about mental states and brain states.

---

Argument from Irrelevant Authority. (1 mark)

---

While it's true that neurosurgeons know a lot about brains, they are not the relevant authority on the relationship between mental states and brain states (i.e. neuroscientists or philosophers). (1 mark)

---

**Question 13**

**(3 marks)**

Evaluate the strength of the inference in the following argument. State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

Human beings have no fundamental nature. This is because God does not exist and it could only be through God that we could have a fundamental human nature.

---

Deductively valid (modus tollens). (1 mark)

---

Lacking cogency. (1 mark)

---

P1 is contentious; P2 is not true; the inference is modus tollens (If human beings have a fundamental human nature then god exists; God does not exist; therefore, human beings have no fundamental human nature) and hence, deductively valid.

---

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

**Question 14**

**(3 marks)**

Evaluate the strength of the inference in the following argument. State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

If police are unfairly targeting certain members of the public then the police force is being unlawful. There are 20 times more Aboriginal Australians per head of population in jail in WA. Therefore, the WA Police are committing an injustice.

---

Inductively moderate. (1 mark)

---

Lacking cogency. (1 mark)

---

P1 is true; P2 is true. The inference is inductively moderate and this is due to two reasons: 1) intelligence is a slightly ambiguous term and so, even if we assumed the premises were true it does not necessitate nor strongly support the conclusion and 2) it is not weak as solving puzzles and tool use is related to intelligence. (1 mark)

---

**Question 15**

**(3 marks)**

Evaluate the strength of the inference in the following argument. State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

If you could harm someone by your actions the state is right to stop you. Calling someone a racist hurts them and so, calling people racist should be prevented by the state.

---

Deductively valid (modus ponens). (1 mark)

---

Lacking cogency. (1 mark)

---

P1 is not true as the potential to harm cannot be the only reason for the state to negate a citizen's freedom; P2 is not true or is at least contentious; the inference is modus ponens and hence, deductively valid.

---

**The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)**

**End of Section One**

## The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

## Section Two: Philosophical analysis

40% (40 Marks)

## Question 14

(20 marks)

The following dialogue is an excerpt from a classroom community of

inquiry. You are required to

- summarise (2 marks)
- clarify (6 marks)
- and critically evaluate the contributions of each participant. (12 marks)

DESCRIPTION	MARKS
<b>Criterion 1: Summary (2 marks)</b>	
Identifies the main position of the first participant.	1
Identifies the main position of the second participant.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Criterion 2: Clarification (6 marks)</b>	
<b>Concepts</b>	
States philosophical concepts that frame the argument of the first participant.	1
States philosophical concepts that frame the argument of the second participant.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Arguments</b>	
For each participant:	
Explains the arguments (e.g. by using relevant examples)	2
Describes the arguments.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–4</b>
<b>Criterion 3: Evaluation (12 marks)</b>	
<b>Examples</b>	
Explains the relevance of examples/counter examples of the first participant.	1
Explains the relevance of examples/counter examples of the second participant.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Premises</b>	
For each participant:	
Provides reasons to justify their stated acceptability of the premises.	2
States the acceptability of the premises.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–4</b>
<b>Inferences</b>	
For each participant:	
Provides reasons to justify their stated strength of the inferential moves.	2
States the strength of the inferential moves.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–4</b>
<b>Cogency</b>	
Assesses the cogency of the argument of the first participant.	1
Assesses the cogency of the argument of the second participant.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>20</b>

School Curriculum and Standards Authority 2015

## The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

**Dialogue Topic**

- The process of interpreting works of art and literature

**Overall argument - Taylor**

Taylor interprets the meaning of Beauty and the Beast to be a moral story about not judging a book by its cover. Taylor represents the way participants in a community of inquiry should listen and respond carefully to the points made by others. Taylor takes Jules' interpretation seriously, even though it is different to their own and asks whether or not you can make two distinct readings of a narrative artwork. Even if one can make multiple readings of an artwork, they conclude that appropriately and accurately interpreting and evaluating artworks is quite difficult. Taylor is also worried that the story is patriarchal and discriminatory (or 'not feminist'), but they consider a counter argument to their own point in that the female lead character's nature is portrayed as strong and brave.

**Overall argument – Jules**

Jules interprets the meaning of Beauty and the Beast to be about love and how Romantic love can be transformative, but they are also worried that the story is patriarchal and discriminatory (or 'not feminist'). Jules challenges the stereotypical gender roles portrayed in this example as well as other classical fairy stories and concludes that the endings should be different rather than 'and they got married and lived happily ever after'. Jules also poses that those evaluating the artwork should be able to agree on whether or not an artwork is good. But 'good' could be moral and/or aesthetically (artistically/formally) good. Jules appeals to their feminist values to ultimately conclude that the artwork would have been better if it exemplified these values - which are moral, rather than aesthetic or formal features of the narrative artwork.



The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 15

(20 marks)

Choose **one (1)** of the following passages and

- summarise (2 marks)
- clarify (8 marks)
- and critically evaluate it. (10 marks)

Description	Marks
<b>Criterion 1: Summary (2 marks)</b>	
Identifies the topic.	1
Identifies the main conclusions.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Criterion 2: Clarification (8 marks)</b>	
<b>Concepts</b>	
Explains core concepts using illustrative examples.	3
Describes core concepts.	2
States core concepts.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Arguments</b>	
Identifies the arguments in the texts and clarifies the premises and inferences.	5
Identifies the arguments in the texts and clarifies some of the premises and inferences.	4
Identifies the arguments in the texts and refers to some of the premises and inferences.	3
Identifies the arguments in the texts.	2
Identifies an argument or some arguments in the texts.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Criterion 3: Evaluation (10 marks)</b>	
<b>Premises</b>	
Identifies the major premises and evaluates their acceptability using illustrative examples.	4
Identifies the major premises and evaluates their acceptability.	3
Identifies the major premises and states their acceptability.	2
Identifies some of the major premises.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Inferences</b>	
Identifies the inferential moves and evaluates inferential strength using illustrative examples.	4
Identifies the inferential moves and evaluates inferential strength.	3
Identifies the inferential moves and makes some assertions about inferential strength.	2
Identifies some inferential moves.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Cogency</b>	
Assesses the cogency of the argument based on their evaluation of premise acceptability and inferential strength.	2
Makes assertions about cogency.	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Overall total</b>	<b>20</b>

### The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

#### Modernism and Postmodernism

The modernist acts as though there is one story to tell about how things are. Because the dominant narrative is informed by those in positions of power, the story the modernist tells reinforces the agenda of privileged white men. It is still the case that educated white men hold all the power – whether they are commanding heads of businesses, reporting on news stories, funding sporting teams, or deciding which Hollywood stories will get screened. We are constantly surrounded by the insidious message that it is better to be white, and male. However, this perspective, which has often been sold to us as ‘an objective point of view’, is being challenged by postmodernism. The postmodernist believes there are many stories to tell and many voices worth listening to; there are multiple interpretations of everything. This scares the modernist, who wishes to defend the existence of facts, morality, and Objective Truth.

P1: White educated men currently hold all the power.

P2: The dominant narrative is informed by those in positions of power.

P3: The message that it is better to be white and male is ubiquitous.

P4 (mc): The story the modernist tells reinforces the agenda of privileged white men.

P5: The message that it is better to be white and male is considered an objective point of view by the modernist.

P6: Post-modernists believe there are multiple interpretations of everything, not one objective point of view from which to decide things.

P7: The modernist wishes to defend the existence of facts, morality, and Objective Truth.

P8 (MC): The modernist is scared.

$$\begin{array}{c} \underline{1+2+3} \\ \downarrow \\ \underline{4+5+6+7} \\ \downarrow \\ 8 \end{array}$$

- Disputes about realism and the limits of interpretation including modernism and postmodernism.

**The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)****Art and beauty**

Beauty is completely subjective. To judge something as beautiful is to feel personally moved by that object and it is simply the case that the opinion of individuals as to what is considered beautiful differs. People never uniformly agree on which artworks are beautiful. To evaluate the concept of beauty, first you must be able to understand the criteria offered in the defense of beauty. Only if an artwork contains this criteria may an argument be presented for its beauty. However, such criteria is unforthcoming. Even when many people do agree that a certain artwork is beautiful, they often have difficulty in explaining exactly why this is the case. For instance, The Mona Lisa is often considered the most beautiful portrait painting in the world. Yet, when asked why it is so beautiful, it is difficult to pinpoint the criteria by which we are judging the work's beauty. We often resort to saying that we felt moved by the painting, and feelings such as these are subjective. This is why it is often said that beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

P1: Criteria for beauty is difficult, if not impossible, to clarify.

P2: People do not uniformly agree on which artworks are beautiful.

P3: Even when agreement on an evaluation of an artwork is generally found, people have difficulty in explaining why the artwork was evaluated as such.

P4: People often use descriptions of feelings to explain why they evaluated an artwork a certain way.

P5: Feelings are subjective.

P6(MC): Evaluations of beauty are subjective.

$$\frac{1+2+3+4+5}{\phantom{1+2+3+4+5}} \\ \downarrow \\ 6$$

- Aesthetic concepts, including beauty, taste, and judgement.

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

**On Government Surveillance**

The data retention laws were introduced to Australia in 2016 as part of a measure for the government to protect the country against organised crime and terrorism. This means that every phone call, text message or email that you send, every web page that you access will be tracked by the government and this information (metadata) will be retained for two years. This data will then be accessed if you are found to threaten someone’s life, in order to protect the government’s revenue or if you are being charged with a crime that carries a sentence of more than two years in prison. Critics of the law believe that this action is spying, and infringes on basic human rights, but this view is wrong. The collection of metadata is clearly a good thing. This is because if you pose a threat to society then your data will be accessed. But you don’t pose a threat to society, so your data won’t be accessed. Therefore, you have nothing to fear from the law if you are innocent.

P1: If you pose a threat to society then your data will be accessed.

P2: You don’t pose a threat to society.

P3(mc): You have nothing to fear from the law if you are innocent.

P4(MC): The collection of metadata is clearly a good thing.

P5(MC): The collection of metadata is not spying and does not infringe on basic human rights.

1+2

↓

3

↓

4

↓ ↓

5 6

- privacy and its limits
- government interference and surveillance

## The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

## Section Three: Extended argument

30% (30 Marks)

Description	Marks
<b>Criterion 1: Philosophical understandings</b>	
Demonstrates a critical understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question and uses sophisticated philosophical language and concepts.	9–10
Demonstrates understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question and uses appropriate language and concepts.	7–8
Demonstrates an understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question and uses some appropriate philosophical language and concepts.	5–6
Demonstrates some understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question.	3–4
Demonstrates a limited understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question.	1–2
Fails to demonstrate an understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question.	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Criterion 2: Philosophical argument</b>	
Constructs a relevant, cogent argument, which demonstrates originality, and a deep understanding of philosophical method (e.g. relies on plausible assumptions, demonstrates logical insight, effectively uses examples and counter-examples where appropriate).	14–15
Constructs a relevant, cogent argument, which demonstrates a sound understanding of philosophical method.	12–13
Constructs a relevant, moderately cogent argument, which demonstrates some understanding of philosophical method.	10–11
Constructs a relevant, moderately cogent argument (e.g. may contain some errors in reasoning or fails to consider possible objections where appropriate).	8–9
Constructs a relevant, weak argument (e.g. may make controversial assumptions, beg the question and/or commit some other serious errors of reasoning such as informal or formal fallacies)	6–7
Constructs a weak argument that makes few relevant claims (e.g. commits several serious errors of reasoning, has tenuous/occasional links with the question).	4–5
Makes some claims relevant to the question but fails to construct any argument (e.g. merely makes assertions, merely discusses the thoughts of others).	2–3
No relevant argument (e.g. fails to address the question).	0–1
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Criterion 3: Clarity and structure</b>	
Writes with structure and clarity (e.g. clarifies key terms, sign-post key steps of the argument, logical ordering of topics).	4–5
Writes with some structure and some clarity.	2–3
Writing is poorly structured and lacks clarity (e.g. fails to clarify key terms, unclear argument structure).	0–1
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Overall total</b>	<b>30</b>

School Curriculum and Standards Authority 2015

## The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

**Question 18**

You should not make an ethical judgment of an artwork.

- aesthetic concepts, including beauty, taste, and judgement

**Question 19**

Thought-experiments do not lead us to truth.

- the role of metaphor and analogy in inquiry
- observation and thought experiment

**Question 20**

There should be no limit to freedom of expression.

- freedom of expression and its limits

**Question 21**

Words refer to real objects in the world.

- the use of symbols, signs and signification (semiosis) to understand the world
- the use of symbols and concepts to understand the way things are

**Question 22**

Without others ethics does not exist.

- the I-thou relationship as a fundamental element of ethics